

◆THE◆OLD◆TESTAMENT◆STUDENT◆

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER, 1888.

No. 2.

THERE are two ways of finding evidence for the existence of the intelligent first cause, or the manifestation of deity. One is that of the child and the savage which finds the divine presence especially revealed in the unexpected, the startling and extraordinary; in such phenomena as an eclipse or a sudden and terrible storm. The other is that of the instructed mind which finds greater evidence in phenomena exhibiting law and order, such as the harmonious movement of the heavenly bodies, the regular succession of day and night, summer and winter, seed-time and harvest. Should not this latter mode of seeking divine revelation be more frequently applied in the study of the Old Testament? For, is it not true, that many too often think of God's revelation of himself under the old dispensation as chiefly found in connection with the wonders of the Exodus or those embodied in the stories of Elijah and Elisha, neglecting almost entirely the revelation in the prophetic word, in the unfolding of the idea of the Divine kingdom of grace and redemption? Shall not more attention be given to the miracle of the divine word?

"BENE orasse est bene studuisse." These familiar words attributed to Luther, are to be emphasized to those engaged in Biblical study. In these days of critical analysis and historical research we are apt to overlook the necessity of being drawn into close communion and fellowship with the Author and Source of all truth. While piety itself is not wisdom, there is no truer word than the Scripture, "the beginning of wisdom is the fear of God;" and there is no method more truly scientific than that which asks help from above.

SOME of the expressions and forms of thought in which the Talmud coincides with the New Testament are particularly interesting. We commend to our readers the idea of tracing out as many of these as the articles upon the Talmud which we are publishing furnish material for doing. We call special attention to the Jewish conception of "this age" and "the coming age," meaning the periods before Messiah's coming and after it respectively, as being the same forms of expression which we find in the New Testament for the Ante-Messianic and the Messianic ages. Many of the symbols of the Book of Revelation such as the tree of life, water of life, two resurrections, the circumstances attending the millenium and the special manifestation of satanic power at its close, are seen to be ideas common in Jewish theology which are appropriated and adapted to the writer's use. Who can fail to see in the use and meanings of the words Paradise, Hades and Gehenna in the New Testament the same conceptions which constantly appear in Jewish contemporary literature? But to us the most interesting coincidence is that between the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah and that which is reflected in the New Testament. In Jewish thought the Messiah was to be a temporal prince who was to reign in royal splendor in Jerusalem. This was precisely the conception which the disciples brought with them from their early training. If this was to be Messiah's reign, how hard would it be for them to believe that he was to live a life of suffering and to die on the cross. In the Talmud the same difficulty is found and is solved by the doctrine of two Messiahs. We know very well how great a difficulty the saying of Jesus that he must die, made in the disciples' minds and how disappointed they were when their Master was crucified. Then it was that they transferred their unfulfilled hopes to the second coming of Jesus and trusted that, at that time, he would establish the kingdom which he had failed to found while here. The whole New Testament period exhibits to us the gradual correction of the too worldly conceptions of Messiah's kingdom which prevail in the Talmud and above which it was not strange that the disciples could only gradually rise, even under the guidance of the spiritual truth of Jesus and of Paul.

Is there anything in a Divine example? The Israelites were selected by God as the instrument through which to work out salvation for the world. He found them in the depths of idolatry, practising polygamy, though having been slaves, holding others in slavery,

and, in short, so degraded and debased as sometimes to lead us to wonder at the divine wisdom manifested in choosing such a nation. Did he, for whom all things were possible, at once put away these evils? Did he abolish polygamy and slavery, give the Israelites a moral code as rigid in all respects as that of the nineteenth century and judge them by it? The Jews in the time of the Christ had come to worship the letter of the Scriptures. A thick crust of tradition had settled down upon the sacred record and all but concealed its contents from view. Most fantastic views were held as to the origin and character of many of the books. A crude and absurd method of exegesis prevailed. Did Jesus, first of all, announce that the commonly accepted views were wholly false? Did he introduce each discourse by an attack upon the literary and theological conceptions of his times? Did he proceed to establish entirely new methods of exegesis. Did he advocate a religion altogether at variance with that of the people whom he addressed? Or did he not rather take out of Judaism what was true and build upon it? Did he not rather show them that the new religion which he taught was but a higher form, a fulfillment of that which they already believed? Did he not accommodate himself, in some degree, to the circumstances which surrounded him? These are divine examples. Is there a better guide? Are there not many phases of the religious and intellectual work of to-day, to which this principle of accommodation is applicable?

WHEN Muhammad described heaven to his followers, he frequently referred to it as a place "beneath which rivers flow." In a land where rivers abound, this would signify little; but to an Arab whose home was in the desert, whose most precious possession was water, it had an important signification. A land of rivers would in itself be heaven to an Arab. The description was therefore in accordance with the principle of *contrast*. That the Hebrew prophets noted and employed this principle is seen from scores of cases. An examination of Isaiah, chs. 2, 3, 4, will sufficiently illustrate the point. (1) Having first threatened devastation and want (3:25,26; 4:1) the prophet announces (4:2) a future dispensation characterized by *harvest blessings*; (2) in contrast with the present corruption, degradation and filth (2:6-8), the characteristic of the people of this new dispensation will be *holiness*, the filth having been removed (4:3,4); (3) God has, at the time of speaking, rejected and abandoned his

people (2:5), but in this new period he will *manifest his presence* (4:5) by symbols similar to those employed at the coming forth from Egypt; (4) it is true that God is about to deliver Israel up to destruction, but in that Messianic age he will *protect* them (4:6) from all harm. The most natural interpretation of this passage, therefore, furnishes a description of the Messianic time, every feature of which is in direct contrast with what precedes. Nor is this true only of the particular Messianic passage referred to. A comparison with the historical setting in each case will show that it also holds true of every such passage in Isaiah 1-12. Is there not here a great principle which has not hitherto been sufficiently emphasized? If true of Isaiah 1-12, may it not be found still elsewhere? Such a principle is only in accord with the historical connection which, it would seem, must exist in the case of all prophecy.

IN the investigation of any subject *the point of view* is all important. Especially is this true of critical inquiries into the meaning, the form, the trustworthiness of Scripture. This point of view may be hostile. Then discrepancies in detail multiply and the whole is soon discredited. It may be an indifferent and negative stand-point. Then the results are likely to be indefinite, lifeless, inconclusive. The true way in which to attain to positive, helpful, constructive issues in biblical criticism is to enter upon all investigations from the *believing* point of view. Such a position of belief in the historical character and credibility of the Word of God *as a whole* is free to proceed confidently and fruitfully to a candid, critical inquiry into details. Cautious but not fearful, clear-eyed without assertive omniscience, patient and hopeful, this critical spirit will accomplish great things in the study of the Bible.

WEBER ON THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE TALMUD.*

BY PROF. GEORGE B. STEVENS, D. D.,

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

II. THE REDEMPTION OF ISRAEL BY THE MESSIAH.

a. THE MESSIAH.

The name of the Messiah is a part of what God created before the world. He is an essential part of the divine plan. His coming is the object of Israel's faith, hope and unceasing prayer.

The conditions of Messiah's appearing are faith and good works. He will not come until the nation fulfills these. One authority declares that if all Israel should repent for a single day, redemption by the Messiah would follow. Another conditions his coming upon a better Sabbath-observance, declaring that if Israel would keep two Sabbaths as they ought to be observed, that Messiah would come; and even that he would come if one were perfectly observed.

It is said that the world-age will embrace six periods, corresponding to the six days of the week, and then follows the eternal Sabbath. One mode of division reckons the period before any law was given as covering the first two periods; that from Abraham's teaching of the Torah in Haran to Messiah's coming embraces the third and fourth, and the fifth and sixth are to be included in the Messianic period. The beginning of the Messianic age was sometimes more exactly reckoned. It was to commence in the year 172 after the destruction of the Temple because that event occurred 3828 years after the creation. When this prediction was unfulfilled other times were set and men were told that if, in a certain year, they could buy a field for one denarius, they should not do it, for in that year the Messiah would come, and why should they lose even so small a sum? Others maintained that the time of his coming was a secret which could not be determined.

There should be signs and portents of Messiah's coming in the Gentile world and Israel. These are the so-called "pains of the Messiah" and remind one of what is said in Matt. 24:4 sq. These are, oppositions and Sunderings of kingdoms, plagues, hunger, contagions and confusions of every sort. And, finally, just preceding his coming, there were to be earthquakes and other dreadful natural phenomena. The nation of Israel would be deeply sunken in immorality and disobedience; city would be divided against city; the son would revile his father, the daughter would rise up against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; those of the same household were to become enemies; truth and honor could not be found; false Messiahs would appear and the law would be despised. At the close of this wretched period, the Messiah should come and fulfill the hope of Israel.

b. ELIAS, THE FORERUNNER OF THE MESSIAH.

There is an obvious antinomy between the two foregoing representations of

* Continued from September number.

the antecedents of Messiah's coming, in that one represents his coming as dependent upon repentance and good works, and the other pictures the period immediately preceding as one of the deepest moral degradation. A solution of this contradiction is found in the doctrine concerning the mission and work of Elias.

Elias comes before the Messiah according to Mal. 3:23 (cf. Matt. 17:10,11). His mission will be preparatory for Messiah's coming. According to some he will show each family to what stem, race and house it belongs; others say that he will unite those who are not of pure descent (*fili spurii*) to the congregation of Israel. But the main emphasis is laid upon the reformatory character of his work (cf. Mk. 9:12). He will settle all disputes and adjust all the various interpretations of the law. But his greatest work will be to lead the nation to repentance (cf. Luke 1:16,17). He will rebuke the people for their sins, but will proclaim peace for the obedient in Zion.

In this way the antinomy, above alluded to, is solved. Elias rescues the people from their degradation and prepares them for the Messiah's appearance. It is noticeable that other prophets are sometimes associated with Elias in his work. Three ancient prophets, it is said, will rise from the dead in order to support the Messiah in his work. They are Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, who is called in II. Maccabees 15:14 "the prophet," the "lover of his brethren," who prays for his people and for the holy city (cf. John 1:21,25; 7:40, where "the prophet" probably refers to Jeremiah, also Matt. 16:13 sq.).

c. THE ENTRANCE OF THE MESSIAH INTO THE WORLD.

The Messiah exists before his entrance into the world. It was God's will from eternity to create the Messiah and to send him into the world. His "name," the purpose and plan of his existence, is, therefore, eternal, but he exists eternally only in an ideal sense. Only the later Jewish theology emphasizes the *real* pre-existence of the Messiah before the creation. The transition from his ideal pre-existence to his earthly appearance is to be accomplished by his birth in David's line. He is to be a Son of David in the same sense as his other descendants. The Jewish theology does not rise above the idea of the purely human idea of the Messiah. He is, however, exalted in rank above all the ancient worthies. He shall sit at God's right hand (cf. Ps. 110:1), and Abraham, sitting on the left, shall say: "Lord, the son of my son (David) sits at thy right hand and I at thy left," but the Lord will comfort him by the answer, "The son of thy son does sit at my right hand and I sit at thy right hand." The Messiah is exalted above the angels also, yet not in such a way as involves the ascription to him of a supernatural character.

d. THE SECRET DEVELOPMENT AND ACTIVITY OF THE MESSIAH.

The Jewish theology represents the Messiah as appearing as an unknown person who in secrecy and silence has been preparing for his work. As Moses grew up in Pharaoh's house without the king's knowledge, so shall the Messiah dwell for a time in the chief city of the nation unobserved. During this period he is to ripen and to grow equal to his work. His main preparation is in the study of the law as it is to be his chief Messianic work to teach the same. The law which he thus learns he will scrupulously keep. He will be as "full of commandments as a mill." He will also endure disciplinary sufferings, since they are needful to make him a just man. It is never maintained that the Messiah is to be sinless. He sins and repents and by penitence and obedience to the law at

length becomes a perfectly just man. He will be full of benevolence. He will sit at the gates of Rome among the poor, the sick and the wounded and minister to them.

The official name of the Messiah is Redeemer (Goel). As Moses led Israel out of Egypt, so shall the Messiah lead the nation out of its miseries by bringing its scattered people together and establishing them in their own land. The Messiah shall restore the holy state and city, establish Israel supreme over the nations and renew the spiritual life of the people by reinstating the law. Thus will the glory lost in Adam's fall be restored,—a glory which shall prefigure the eternal glory of the just.

In this account of the Messiah's mission no mention is made of sufferings and death. The sufferings which are prophetically pictured in such passages as Isaiah 53 are referred to Messiah's sympathetic suffering and intercession in behalf of the people. The statement (Is. 53:6) that "Jehovah hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all" is understood to mean that it was Jehovah's good pleasure to forgive all our sins for his sake. The language of the chapter generally is either weakened or applied to some other object than the Messiah. The notion of substitutionary, penal suffering is not a part of the Messianic idea in Jewish theology. The sufferings which he endures are a part of the experience by which his moral perfection is wrought out.

The great end of his work is the redemption of Israel from foreign domination, the establishment of a dominion over the nations and a thorough reorganization and moral renovation of the nation upon the basis of devotion to the law. All this he accomplishes, not by an atoning suffering and death, but by the power of his personal righteousness. This power he attains by self-discipline, obedience and sympathetic suffering and serving and for this work he prepares and sanctifies himself before his emergence into public.

e. JOSEPH'S SON AS A PREPARATORY MESSIAH.

The contradiction between the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah and the conception presented in such passages as Isa. 53, is sometimes resolved by the doctrine of a Messiah, called the Son of Joseph, or, by some, the Son of Ephraim, who shall precede the great Messiah, the Son of David, and atone by suffering and death for the sins of the people. He is a Messiah of lower dignity and in him are fulfilled the prophecies which declare that the Servant of Jehovah will suffer and die. He prepares the way for the great Messianic king to whom he is subordinate as Aaron was to Moses. He will assemble the ten tribes in Egypt and Assyria and conduct them into the Holy Land; others represent Galilee as the place of assembling.

These later conceptions were occasioned by the appeal of Christians to Isa. 53. The suffering Messiah there described could not be successfully adjusted to the current Jewish conception and the polemic must invent some idea corresponding more closely to the prophetic description. The subordinate Messiah, Joseph's son, should die in the service of the people and his death should have an atoning significance. He comes not for his own sake but for the sake of the greater Messiah, David's son, who has an immortal life. Thus the redemptive work proper is transferred to this secondary Messiah. It remains to David's son to carry forward and complete the work of salvation.

f. THE REDEMPTION OF ISRAEL AND THE FIRST RESURRECTION.

"In relation to Moses, the Messiah is second; in comparison with all other helpers he is the *great Redeemer*." His redemption signifies primarily deliverance from servitude to other peoples of which the deliverance of the nation from Egypt by Moses stands as the historic type. The Messiah, after his first appearance, will withdraw for a time (45 days), into retirement, according to most, into the wilderness of Judea. This will be a period of sifting for the people who, during this time, will eat the food of the poor, humble itself and thus prepare for the coming redemption.

As a condition precedent to the Messianic deliverance the power of Rome (commonly called the "Kingdom of Edom") must be overthrown. The Roman and the Messianic kingdoms are incompatible, and the latter cannot be established until the former is destroyed. At the time of Messiah's coming this power will have reached its worst stage of cruelty and oppression. It will hasten its own downfall by making Israel's yoke harder than ever; and the great Roman oppressor in whom all this wickedness shall then culminate shall the Messiah destroy "by the word of his mouth and the breath of his lips."

When the Roman power shall have been overthrown, then will Messiah gather together the outcasts of Israel, uniting (according to most representations) the ten tribes with Judah and Benjamin. This, however, is a disputed point, some maintaining that the ten tribes were driven out never to be restored to their place in this world, but that they will be gathered into the perfected Israel in the next life. The common representation is otherwise, however. Says one Rabbi: "The winds shall strive with each other. The north wind shall say: I will bring back the outcasts. The south wind shall say: I will fetch them."

Even from the world of the dead shall the participants in the Messianic reign be brought. Those who are bound in Gehinnom shall see the light of the Messiah and shall rejoice to see him and say: "He will lead us out of our darkness." Thus shall the circumcised, the true children of the covenant, be gathered from their dispersion, while those from the caverns of Sheol arise, re clothed in their former bodies, to participate in the glorious kingdom which Messiah shall establish in the holy land. This resurrection of the circumcised shall take place in the holy land. The bodies of those who were buried in other lands shall be rolled along beneath the earth or shall pass through subterranean passages so as to rise in the holy land. This process is painful; therefore Israelites desire to be buried in their own country in order to spare themselves this experience. Moses was buried in a foreign land in order to assure other Jews that they shall be raised up. His resurrection will be certain and will be the guaranty of theirs.

At this resurrection the Almighty will sound a trumpet seven times, at each blast of which a part of the process of reuniting the decomposed or scattered body and the reuniting of the soul with it, takes place. A portion of the body remains undestroyed and becomes the nucleus for the revived body. Each person rises in the clothes in which he was buried, hence the care concerning burial garments. Each has the same appearance, even such defects as lameness and blindness (for identification), but these are healed immediately after resurrection. This resurrection applies to Israel only and is to a renewed and glorified earthly life, but not to an absolutely immortal one. The body does not however return again to dust and corruption.

"Thus is the congregation of Israel restored to its true condition. From the diaspora the living return, and from their graves the dead arise, in order to enjoy in the holy land the promised glory of the Messianic age."

OLD TESTAMENT WORD-STUDIES: 2. CONSTITUENT PARTS OF MAN.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL, D. D.,

New London, Conn.

The complexity of man's constitution has been recognized from the earliest times. The most obvious line of division falls between the material and spiritual parts of his organization. Each of these comprises subdivisions more or less numerous and subtle according to the observer's intuition and skill in discriminating psychological phenomena. Among the Hebrews, as among all the nations of antiquity, this line of demarcation, however sharply drawn at first sight, exhibits a tendency to disappear the moment we undertake to separate rigidly between the material and spiritual. This tendency springs from the constant association of spiritual states and emotions with certain parts of the material organism, and from the evolution of higher psychological significations from words used primarily in a physiological or material sense. Moreover, in words belonging to the vocabulary of common life we cannot hope to find the nice discriminations of a scientific terminology.

Rû(ă)h spirit.

The primary signification of *rû(ă)h* is wind, the sensible movement of the air in all gradations of velocity, from the gentle zephyr at the "cool of the day," Gen. 3:8, to the terrific tempest that rends the mountains, 1 Kgs. 19:11. Hebrew seems to have had no word for air, the atmosphere at rest, since in this condition it was not perceptible. That wind was identical with the *breath* of men and animals was soon apparent, and although the latter received the specific name *n'shâmā(h)*, yet it continued very frequently to be called simply *rû(ă)h*. The latter designates the breath of beasts, Eccl. 9:13, of mankind, Job 10:12, and of Jehovah, 2 Sam. 22:16. When a living being dies it ceases to breathe, i. e. it *expires*. It was natural that a superficial observer, perceiving this close connection between breath and life, would leap to the conclusion that the invisible breath of life was somehow identical with wind, the invisible breath of nature. *Rû(ă)h* became thus the general designation of the principle of life which man shares in common with all creatures who possess the *rû(ă)h ḥăyyîm*,—in Gen. 7:22 tautologically described as the "breath of the spirit of lives." But in man, as distinguished from the brute, this principle of life was also recognized as intelligent spirit, the seat of sensation, passion, unrest, anxiety, courage, as well as of will, determination, knowledge, wisdom, and skill. From this view of man as intelligent *rû(ă)h* the word passed easily into a designation of that omnipotent, intelligent energy, the *rû(ă)h Elohim*, which creates and sustains the visible universe. It was in a "sound of gentle stillness," as of a whispering wind, that

Jehovah revealed himself to Elijah, 1 Kgs. 19:12; in a soft breathing, a rû(ă)h, that the divine presence was manifested to Eliphaz, Job 4:15; but at the beginning of the Christian dispensation it appeared as a mighty rushing πνεῦμα, Acts 2:2, the intensity of its energy breaking forth, like an electric storm, in visible flames of fire. In all these meanings the primary conception is that of an invisible force which is known only by its effects.

Rû(ă)h became in this way a designation of spirituality in its largest form. In the Divine Spirit, the "fountain of lives," m^eqôr hăy yîm, Ps. 36:10, is the original source of every human spirit, and therefore the psalmist (31:6) commits his rû(ă)h, his inmost life, to Jehovah in the full conviction that in so doing he will not lose it, but recover it in wondrous depth and power.

Nĕphĕsh soul.

In biblical language nĕphĕsh is frequently employed in the same sense as rû(ă)h. As a psychological term it rests on the same physical phenomenon of respiration, being derived from a verb meaning *to breathe* (niph.), to recover one's breath after protracted exertion, hence *to be refreshed*, Ex. 23:16. The nĕphĕsh as to its origin and powers is conceived of as standing on a lower plane than the rû(ă)h, being always associated with its earthly investiture, and never, except in a few anthropopathic expressions, Jer. 51:14, Amos 6:8, rising into the realm of pure spirit. "The souls of animals arise, like plants, from the earth, as a consequence of the divine word of power, Gen. 1:24. Thus the creating Spirit which entered at the beginning, 1:2, into matter, rules in them; their connection with the divine spring of life is through the medium of the common terrestrial creation. But the *human soul* does not spring from the earth; it is created *by a special act of divine inbreathing*, see 2:7 in connection with 1:26." (Oehler.) The nĕphĕsh is the animal life, the ψυχή, which springs into existence when the rû(ă)h enters the material organism. "Man is not rû(ă)h, but *has* it,—he is soul." The soul is therefore the center of individuality, so that "my soul," "thy soul," "his soul," etc., become stereotyped expressions for man's inmost personal life, his very self, his ego. Rû(ă)h is never so used, since it is the universal principle of life which underlies and conditions the nĕphĕsh, and not, like the latter, the individualized form which the principle of life assumes. Hence in the enumeration of a family, tribe, or people, persons are often spoken of as souls, Gen. 14:21; Exod. 1:7; Num. 31:35,—an expression that survives in popular usage to the present time. Indeed, it was even possible to speak of corpses as "dead souls," Num. 6:6; 9:10, i. e. as persons with whom the idea of individuality was still associated after the rû(ă)h had been withdrawn.

A marked characteristic of the Priest Code, though not exclusively confined to it, is the employment of nĕphĕsh in the sense of a morally responsible person—"if a soul touch any unclean thing," "if a soul commit trespass," etc. This usage which does not occur in the Book of the Covenant, Exod. 20-23, seems to be owing to the individual application, rather than the universal authority, of the levitical legislation. The same sense seems to attach to the word in Ezek. 18:4, 27, "the soul [i. e. the person] that sinneth, it [he] shall die," "he shall save his soul [himself] alive." It is not probable that the word nĕphĕsh is here employed in the technical modern sense of soul. However true it is that cherished sin involves man's spiritual nature in eternal loss and ruin, this does not seem to be the

thought in the prophet's mind, except inferentially. He is speaking rather of the temporal consequences of sin to the person who commits it.

The soul, like the spirit, is also swayed by strong desires and passions, but these not infrequently emphasize some form of selfishness or greed, Pss. 10:3; 41:3. The essence of sin lies in the self-determination of the individual *nēphēsh* toward earthly relations, in opposition to the divine will and authority, "their soul abhorred my statutes," Lev. 26:43.

The soul of man does not any more than that of the animal possess in itself the reason of an undying life, Ps. 22:29(30). The pledge of its immortality lies in its unbroken union with the Divine Spirit which is individualized in it; "Thou wilt not leave my *nēphēsh* in Sheol," Ps. 16:10. The natural immortality of the soul appears much more prominently in the New Testament than in the Old, where the whole subject of a future life is purposely involved in much obscurity. For the Mosaic dispensation aimed to train men to obedience by means of temporal rewards and penalties rather than by the prospect of post-mortem blessedness.

It does not follow because scriptural language distinguishes between *rû(ă)h* and *nēphēsh* that they are distinct and separable entities, and that man possesses a tripartite nature, body, soul and spirit. These latter terms are rather to be understood as descriptive of man's higher nature contemplated as a unity, but as facing in the one case toward the spiritual world above, and in the other toward the material world beneath.

N'shāmā(h) breath.

The specific term for breath is *n'shāmā(h)*. It occurs only twenty-four times, whereas *nēphēsh* occurs 729, and *rû(ă)h* 376 times. The breath blown on the hands produces a sensation of coolness, and therefore the breath of Jehovah, far more powerful than that of man, is metaphorically described as a freezing wind, Job 37:10. A rapid breathing is a sign of violent passion, as of anger, hence in the breath of Eloah, Job 4:9, or in the blast of the breath of Jehovah's nostrils, 2 Sam. 22:16, the Hebrew poet discerns a punitive agency which overwhelms the wicked in swift and irresistible destruction. As the function of respiration was connected with the power of life in man, so this divine breath, conceived of anthropopathically, was associated with the self-existent and infinite life of Jehovah. The transmission of this "breath of lives," Gen. 2:7, into the nostrils of man communicated to him a portion of the divine principle of life, so that in virtue of it he becomes a partaker of the divine being. On the other hand, should El fix his heart, i. e. his thought, upon himself, rather than on man, and gather back to himself his *rû(ă)h* and his *n'shāmā(h)*, then all flesh would inevitably sink back into its original dust, Job 34:14. The *n'shāmā(h)* of man is also as a lamp or candle which is lighted by Jehovah, Prov. 20:27, and human nature is like a vast cavern into whose darkest recesses this light shines. By its means its intricacies can be explored alike to their mysterious origin in the creative power of God, and to their terminus in the clear light of the eternal world. But when this relation between the divine spirit and the human is ignored, the light in man's nature is extinguished, and having no other source of light, he gropes in hopeless darkness. His life in all its relations becomes to him a series of insoluble enigmas and contradictions.

Bāsār flesh.

Bāsār is the material, external part of man, the corporeal investiture of the immortal and invisible spirit. The LXX. renders it by *σάρξ* 138, *κρέας* 79, and *σώμα* 16 times. In these several renderings *κρέας* is that from which the thought of organism is most distant, *σάρξ* stands midway between the two, while *σώμα* designates the perfect instrument of the soul in which the idea of organism is predominant. The bāsār as a living organism is dependent for its existence on its union with the spirit. In itself it is frail and corruptible, exhibiting a constant tendency to dissolve and return to the 'ād hāmāh out of which it was constructed. From such dissolution it is withheld by the renewing and vivifying power of the rū(ā)h. This perishable nature of the bāsār was seen to be a characteristic of all animate creatures, and hence the word soon passed into a broader signification which, ignoring the distinction between bāsār and nēphēs h, included every form of animal life as well as that of man. Kōl-bāsār, all flesh, denotes all living creatures viewed from the side of their transitory, perishable existence, Gen. 6:13,19; 7:15; Num. 16:22; Ps. 136:25, etc. From this comprehensive meaning it passes into one more restricted, including only the human race, Gen. 6:12; Deut. 5:26; Ps. 145:21; Isa. 40:6. Contrasted with the omnipotence and eternity of God who is absolute spirit, man is only bāsār, flesh, a weak mortal, constantly falling away, Gen. 6:3; Job 10:4; Ps. 78:39. It is the same thought as that emphasized when man is called 'ād hām and 'nōsh, the earth-begotten, and the frail one. A still further limitation of the phrase kōl-bāsār occurs in Joel 2:28; 3:1, where the prophet sees the approaching dispensation accompanied by an effusion of the Spirit upon all flesh. This does not mean the entire race of mankind, *πάσα σάρξ*, John 17:2, but the church of the Messianic age, still conceived of as comprehended within the national limits of Israel. In the old theocracy the Holy Spirit had been given to individuals here and there, enduing them with wisdom and prophetic insight. But in that new Israel the Spirit would come down like rain on all flesh, i. e. on all the people without distinction of age, rank, or condition. The same limitation appears in Jer. 12:12 and Ezek. 20:48.

The Old Testament nowhere teaches that the bāsār, the sensuous part of man's being, is also the seat of sin. It is indeed deeply tainted by sin and enthralled by its power, Gen. 6:12, but the ethical idea of flesh as essentially sinful, and as antagonizing the higher life of the spirit by an illegitimate lusting after sensual and earthly things, is foreign to the Old Testament, and belongs to the fully developed Pauline theology of the New.

Lēbh or Lēbhābh heart.

Lēbhābh, which frequently occurs in place of lēbh, seems to be only a strengthened form of the latter word, and to be used with no discernible difference of meaning. In its physical sense it denotes the central bodily organ, 2 Sam. 18:14; 2 Kgs. 9:24, through which the blood flows, and hence the center of physical life, for the blood was looked on as the vehicle of life, Lev. 17:11. Gliding almost at once into metonymical significations, it becomes one of the most interesting words in the entire Hebrew vocabulary. From the Hebrew it passes with its wealth of meaning into the New Testament, whose writers give it, if possible, a yet richer expansion. In a semi-physical sense it designates the seat of bodily life, Ps.

22:26(27). While on the one hand the whole heart faints through sickness, Isa. 1:5, on the other it is strengthened by food and drink, Gen. 18:5; Jud. 19:5.

The profoundest importance attaches to this word when it is employed in connection with the spiritual nature of man. The external relations of man's nature are described, as we have already seen, by the words *rû*(*š*)*h* and *nē-phēsh*, the former standing for its spiritual and eternal relations, and the latter for the earthly and temporal. There is still another point of view from which it may be studied, viz., in its internal structure and relations. In Hebrew thought the whole interior of this nature, with its innumerable feelings, affections and emotions, its faculties of memory and imagination, its thinking and reasoning powers, its capacities of knowledge and wisdom, its resolutions, plans and purposes, its hopes and fears, its moral and spiritual determinations, in a word, the entire emotional, intellectual, and ethical activity of man is included in this comprehensive word *lēbh*. It is conceived of as an unfathomed and, to man, unfathomable abyss, Ps. 64:6, a dark and mysterious realm filled with undefined thoughts and purposes, with blind desires and passions, driven restlessly to and fro, like disembodied shades, and making their presence known only as they rise into consciousness, or emerge into the actual doings and experiences of the outward world. Pious men are sometimes allowed to fall into temptation, that they may learn the unsuspected contents of their own hearts, 2 Chron. 32:31. By the introduction of sin the *lēbh* becomes wholly corrupted, so that all the imagination of its thoughts is only evil continually, Gen. 6:5. Out of its dismal depths go forth deceptions, Neh. 6:8, hypocrisies, Job 36:13, and wicked works, Ps. 58:2(3). None but God is able to search the secrets of the heart, i. e. explore this inner realm of the spirit, 1 Chron. 28:29; Ps. 44:21(22), and he alone is able to cleanse it from its evil and impure contents, Ps. 51:10(12). So thoroughly is the natural heart corrupted, that this purifying process amounts virtually to the creation of a new heart, Ezek. 18:31. The outward appearance does not always correspond to the inner state of the heart, Prov. 13:14; hence God, who judges every man justly, determines his moral worth by a scrutiny of the heart, 1 Sam. 16:7; Jer. 20:12. The affections and tendencies of the heart determine human destiny, for out of it are the issues of life, Prov. 4:23. (On the Biblical Doctrine of the Heart, see Oehler's O. T. Theology, § 71, and "The Hidden Heart," by Tayler Lewis, *Princeton Rev.*, March, 1883.)

K'layōth kidneys, reins.

This word occurs only twenty-six times in the Old Testament, and throughout the Pentateuch is uniformly rendered kidneys. In its fourteen occurrences in the poetical and prophetic books it is, with one exception, Isa. 34:6, rendered reins, LXX. νεφρός, Vulg. *ren*. Indeed, wherever the reference is to animals it is translated *kidneys*, but *reins* when it refers to man. In the former case it is used in its strict physiological sense, in the latter by metonymy for a part or side of man's spiritual nature. Five times it is associated with *lēbh*, being with it the subject of divine inspection and examination. It is commonly taken as the seat of the tenderer emotions, such as kindness, pity, and benevolence; but its exact psychological equivalent is very obscure. Rev. J. G. Lansing in the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Feb., 1884, starting from a consideration of the physiological functions of the kidneys, argues with much force that the *k'layōth* stand specifically for the *conscience*. In view of the fact that the O. T. writers, with the

whole ancient world, referred the function of thought to the heart rather than to the brain, it seems hardly safe to ascribe to the ancients such accurate knowledge of physiological processes as this definition assumes. Moreover it is open to question whether O. T. writers ever conceived of the conscience as a distinct moral power, or vaguely included it in the moral determinations of the heart.

PIEPENTRING'S OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.*

BY J. B. REYNOLDS, B. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

The possibilities in the field of Old Testament theology have not been so much exhausted but that we may look with high expectations upon any new contributions to the subject. With this view we shall not be disappointed in the work before us. It brings not a little new material and contains many improvements in the mode of presenting the results of the author's studies.

The method is declared to be exegetical and historical. The writer criticises with justice, we think, many of the previous works on Old Testament theology as mere presentations of religious ideas and customs without taking count of their successive development. He, therefore, aims "so far as possible to indicate the historic development of each particular subject," leaving to those works which narrate the history of Israel the burden of giving a general view of its religion.

Therefore, in accordance with his central purpose, the work is divided into three periods. The first extends from Moses to the commencement of the eighth century and is distinguished by the preponderating influence exercised by traditional ideas and usages, modified only in part by early prophetism. The second, reaching from the appearance of the earliest prophetic books to the end of the exile, is marked by the great influence of prophetism, arrived at the summit of its power. The third, from the exile to the first century before the Christian era, is characterized by the extraordinary influence of the written law and of sacerdotalism.

In arranging the literature of these periods the extreme results of the higher criticism are accepted. That part of the Pentateuch commonly called the Jehovistic document is placed in the first period. Deuteronomy is supposed to have been written in the seventh century, while the Elohist document is claimed not to have been written till the fifth century. Isaiah is distributed in small portions from the end of the ninth century to the middle of the sixth. Ecclesiastes and Esther are thought to have been written towards the end of the third century, while Daniel is assigned to a date somewhere between 167 and 164. The question of the date of the authorship of the several books is, however, not discussed, the author merely giving "the results which seem certain or probable." Though there is room for much difference of opinion as to the time to which many books are allotted, it is certainly to be regarded as a virtue that the author thus clearly defines at the outset the literary basis of his work.

*Théologie de l'Ancien Testament par Ch. Piepentring, pasteur de l'église réformée de Strasbourg. Paris: *Librairie Fischbacher*, 33 rue de Seine. New York: *B. Westermann & Co.*

The main body of the work is constructive, only a very little space being given to the discussion of the critical questions at present under dispute. The principle is constantly insisted upon that the biblical writings are not in any proper sense theological. It is held that metaphysical distinctions were entirely unknown even by the later writers and that in attempting to draw up a scheme of biblical theology this fact must constantly be borne in mind. This claim is, of course, not a new one, but the writer adheres to it with much greater consistency than many who have stoutly asserted it. It is also claimed that the significance of certain religious ceremonies must be differently regarded at different periods. The law being not a sudden communication, but a gradual growth, it is held that the rites of temple service only reached their final condition and meaning after many changes and under varying influences. Many of these are thought to have been gained from older Semitic or Egyptian religions. Many of the services and feasts, it is asserted, were derived from the early celebrations at seed-time and harvest. It is only at a later date that they are understood to have assumed a theocratic significance. For example, we are told that "the feast of the passover and of unleavened bread, considered in the Old Testament as one and the same feast, is surely a combination of two different feasts, the one agricultural and the other theocratic." It is probable that originally this feast had also an astronomical sense, that it was the feast of the spring time, found among most of the nations of antiquity. This last character of the feast of the passover has been already completely effaced in Hebrew literature, though its agricultural character still appears in certain passages, especially Lev. 23:9-14. "Here the offering of the first fruits of the harvest is united with the passover, and this offering is placed in close relationship with the feast which should be celebrated seven weeks later, at the end of the harvest."

The Sabbath is conceived to be essentially a day of repose, but it is held that this idea could not have been given to the day till the Israelites had ceased to be wandering shepherds and became an agricultural people. The humanitarian side of the Sabbath is thought to be emphasized in all the documents. "Its principle purpose is to furnish rest to the slaves and the domestic animals. Even in Deuteronomy we find the same point of view. The Sabbath is there associated with the remembrance of the deliverance from slavery in Egypt. But the evident thought of the Deuteronomist is this: Israel ought to remember that he was a slave in Egypt and was delivered by Jehovah and that therefore he ought also on that day to give rest to his slaves as well as to himself."

The main literature of the second period is thought to be prophecy. Here are considered the names and character of God, also the prophetic idea of man and sin. It seems to us that in some cases the writer has failed carefully to follow out his own principle of the historic growth of religious ideas. The prophets whose writings extended through three centuries are treated almost as contemporaries. The author's treatment of the origin of sin will be found very unsatisfactory to many. As to the story of the Fall, he claims that the "principal purpose of the narrative consists in showing the origin not of sin, of moral evil, but of physical evil, of the evils of life, and in proving that God is not the cause of these evils, but that they are brought about by the sin of man." He also quotes with approval the idea of Bruch, that the author of the account of the Fall is influenced by the double thought that physical evil is a result of sin and that sin is connected with civilization; and that he has kept those two ideas in experience which tells

that the infant is happy so long as he continues in a state of ignorance and of innocence, whereas the development of spirit and of life give birth to instincts and inordinate desires, which occasion the majority of misfortunes. It is therefore concluded that the explanation of the origin of sin is not furnished us in Genesis. The only solution offered to the question is the following: "The Old Testament attributes generally to man freedom of choice between good and evil. Our author attributes this freedom also to the first pair. So he could not think of explaining the origin of sin, the possibility of sin being given with the freedom of man." "The account of the Fall simply declares the point of entrance of sin into the heart of man. It is in this sense that the writer explains the origin of sin, but not so if it is meant by that term the source or the first cause of sin. He does not push the question back to that cause. He confines himself to the exterior circumstances which become to the first pair the occasion of sin in calling them to make use of their liberty." "The Old Testament in general does not speak of a change which has occurred in the moral nature of man in consequence of the sin of Adam, since, outside of that narrative, there is never question in regard to the fall of Adam or of a fall of humanity, but that man is considered free to do good and avoid evil."

In the third section the writer considers Judaism which seems to him to be strongly contrasted in its purpose with prophecy, which lays the greatest importance on moral life, subordinating to it all external practices of religion, while the former dwells almost wholly upon ritual services and external worship. It is thought to represent the formalistic tendency. The growth of this idea as conceived in the mind of the writer is carefully traced out, and what seems to him the elaboration of the former simple ceremonies described.

In literary form this work is certainly to be most highly commended. The statements of the writer are clear and distinct and each subject is treated as briefly as possible, though without such condensation as to obscure the thought. In this respect it is certainly greatly in advance of other works on the subject. As to the results reached, it might seem that M. Piepenring was a skeptical rationalist. But this is certainly far from being the case. The divine as well as the human elements are positively asserted in the history of the kingdom of Israel, and in conclusion the belief is expressed that such recognition of the human element which exists in the Old Testament will but lead to a stronger conviction of the divine power which was working in the life of the Hebrew nation. Certainly the spirit of the writer is quite different from that of many critical authorities. His evident aim is constructive, and to many the book will seem to present at least some helpful suggestions to the settlement of the questions which are receiving so much attention at the present day.

THE ASSYRIAN KING, AŠURBANIPAL.

BY DEAN A. WALKER, B. A.,

New Haven, Conn.

Of all the great empires that in turn held sway over the human race before the beginning of the Christian era, none exceeded in duration of power and splendor of achievement the great empire of Assyria. Egypt may show a longer line of dynasties reaching further back into the dawn of history; but her soil was often invaded by foreign armies, and Hyksos, Ethiopian, Assyrian and Grecian conquerors interrupted the line of succession of her native rulers. Alexander's empire covered a wider territory, but as a unit continued only through the life-time of its founder. Babylonia, by whose hand Assyria fell, enjoyed her power but fifty years, and the empire of the Medes and Persians that followed filled out only two hundred years.

In contrast to these short-lived or intermittent powers, the Assyrian empire had an uninterrupted autonomy of more than six hundred years, through which the succession of its kings may be directly traced; while the unknown beginnings of its history as an independent power may cover as much again. It was not, like Alexander's empire, the creature of a day or of one man, but like the republic of Rome, it rose from small beginnings with gradual increase of power and spread of territory till it overshadowed the earth and well fitted the description of the prophet Ezekiel (Ezek. 31:3-9), "Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs. The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field. Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees of the field and his boughs were multiplied and his branches became long, because of the multitude of waters, when he shot forth. All the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his branches dwelt all great nations. Thus was he fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches; for his foot was by great waters. The cedars in the garden of God, the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the chestnut trees were not like his branches; nor any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in his beauty. I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches; so that all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him."

The highest point of Assyrian power was reached near the close of the empire under the dynasty of the Sargonides, a dynasty founded indeed by a usurper, but Assyrian in every feature, numbering, in direct line, five kings, the first four of whom were fine representatives of the ancient Assyrian character. The glory of this dynasty reached its height in the reign of the subject of this paper, Ašurbanipal, the son of Esarhaddon, grandson of Sennacherib, and great-grandson of Sargon.

Ašurbanipal was king of a warlike nation and descended from a family of warriors, and inherited in full the warlike disposition of his ancestors. Sargon, the founder of the dynasty, was a usurper, who had made good his claim to the throne merely by his ability to hold it and on the principle that might makes right. Of his ancestry we know nothing. He himself in his inscriptions gives us no clue to his origin, though it was the custom of Assyrian kings to begin their records with a statement of their descent and a tribute of praise to their ancestors. Sargon was probably an officer of the army risen from the ranks by virtue of his military ability. The long absence of his king, Šalmaneser IV., at that time engaged with ill success in the sieges of Samaria and Tyre, and the consequent discontent of the people and laxity of government at the capital, invited a revolution. Sargon seized the opportunity to make himself king and was accepted by the army and people. After an active reign of seventeen years, he was succeeded by his son, Sennacherib, who with equal energy enlarged and strengthened the dominion of Assyria, till he was assassinated by his two eldest sons, Adrammelech and Sharezer, as recorded in 2 Kgs. 19:37 and Isa. 37:38. Their ambition to rule in his stead was frustrated by a younger son, Esarhaddon, who with a portion of the army was guarding the frontier of Armenia. Recognized by his troops as king, Esarhaddon drove the assassins into Armenia and took the throne, which he held for thirteen years. His reign was marked by the same vigorous policy as those of his predecessors, till, becoming afflicted with an incurable disease, he abdicated in favor of his eldest son, Ašurbanipal, reserving for himself only the province of Babylonia. The crowning of Ašurbanipal by his father is placed in the year 670 B. C., but his accession to the sole command of the empire took place on the death of his father, two years later. Dating from 668 B. C., his reign covered a period of forty-two years, the longest reign in Assyrian history and one exceeded by few in the history of other nations, either ancient or modern.

Ašurbanipal had had a thorough military training in the numerous campaigns of his father, and at the very outset of his reign, his education was put to the test. One of the signal events of his father's reign had been the conquest of Egypt, and its division into twenty districts. These were placed, some under Assyrian officers, and others under native Egyptian princes, who had sworn allegiance to the conqueror. But now Tirhakah, the Ethiopian, taking advantage of the illness of Esarhaddon, by whom he had been driven out of Egypt, returned at the end of two years and soon again made himself master of the entire valley of the Nile except a small corner of the delta. In this spot, well protected by its numerous canals, the Assyrian governors were able to hold their ground while a message was carried post-haste to Ašurbanipal at Nineveh. The king's response was prompt and efficient. A strong Assyrian force was sent under command of the Tartan, which quickly drove Tirhakah out of Egypt and reorganized the country on the former plan.

Before this was accomplished, however, the Egyptian governors who had had command of some of the cities, questioning whether, after all, their lot would be any better under an Assyrian than under an Ethiopian master, and fearing lest he might, as soon as he should be more firmly established, replace them by Assyrian governors, made ready in secret for an insurrection, and invited Tirhakah to return and take the throne, promising to secure for him the possession of Lower Egypt. The plot, however, was discovered by the Assyrian officers, and two of the ringleaders, Necho and Saretikdari, were taken and sent to Nineveh in chains.

There they sued for pardon and Ašurbanipal, either from motives of policy or because his cruelty of disposition, afterward shown, was not yet developed, not only forgave them, but even appointed Necho head of the vassal kings, to rule Egypt in the name of Assyria.

On the death of Tirhakah, which occurred soon after, the war was renewed by Tirhakah's step-son and successor, Urdamani, a youth of great vigor, who in a short time had captured Memphis and driven Necho and the Assyrian forces into the delta. At this critical moment, the tardy arrival of troops from Nineveh enabled the Egyptian princes to take the offensive. This second Egyptian campaign was attended with equally successful results. Memphis and Thebes were retaken and Urdamani was driven out of Egypt. The city of Amen was pillaged and two of its obelisks, with a large amount of other booty, were sent as trophies to Nineveh. Governors were again placed over the districts of Egypt and among them, probably, was Psammetichus, the son of Necho, whose reign the Egyptians were accustomed to consider as beginning on the expulsion of Tirhakah.

Somewhere in the first half of his reign, Ašurbanipal conducted two other lesser expeditions, the dates of which cannot be exactly determined though they are represented in a cylinder inscription as occurring on his return from his Egyptian campaigns.* The first was against the city of Tyre, which had revolted and held out against a siege with some obstinacy. On the fall of Tyre, the smaller Phœnician cities that had joined in the revolt were quickly taken. Baal, king of Tyre, was pardoned and reinstated on his throne. Yakinlu, king of Aradus, on seeing that he must fall into the hands of the Assyrians, committed suicide. His eight sons were taken in the city. The eldest was pardoned and appointed to succeed his father, while the other seven were put to death. Ašurbanipal next directed his march to Cilicia, where a small insurrection had broken out. This was easily quelled, and, in token of submission, the Cilician king, whose family was already connected by marriage with the royal house of Assyria, was required to send his daughter to the royal harem at Nineveh. In this expedition Ašurbanipal crossed the Taurus range and penetrated to regions never before reached by Assyrian arms.

About this time there occurred an event very flattering to the pride of the Assyrian monarch. Gyges, the wealthy and powerful monarch of Lydia, who is described in Ašurbanipal's inscriptions as "of a country beyond the sea, whose name the kings, his fathers, had not even heard of," sent an embassy, bringing as a present two Cimmerian chieftains. The ambassadors were charged to say that Gyges having, on a former occasion when hard pressed by his enemies, been told in a dream of the might and glory of Ašurbanipal and the great god Ašur, and having sent to do them homage, had signally defeated his enemies. He now sent these two chieftains as a present in token of his gratitude for this divine assistance. Ašurbanipal was not the man to lose such an opportunity as this. He accepted the present as tribute, kindly acknowledged Gyges as a vassal, imposed a further tribute and sent a small body of Assyrian troops to make good his defence

* A discussion of the chronology of these events and of the relative value on this point of the various inscriptions recording them would require more space than can here be given to it. The principal sources for the history are the inscription K 2675 and the cylinder inscriptions A and B and R^m I. But the three latter sources seem to follow, at least for the events before the Elamitic war, a geographical rather than a chronological order. We have here followed the cylinder inscriptions.

against the hordes of the Cimmerians, with, perhaps, the further purpose of holding Gyges to his allegiance. He had thus extended his authority to the furthest limits of Asia Minor, far beyond that of his father, Esarhaddon.

A short and unimportant campaign followed for the punishment of the city of Karbat, a city on the frontier of Elam, whose troops had made an inroad into the territory of Babylonia. The city was taken and its inhabitants were deported to Egypt, in accordance with a well settled policy of the Assyrian kings in their treatment of rebellious towns.

The Assyrian arms were next turned to the north, against the Minni, a brave and warlike people inhabiting the mountains in the region of Lake Van. The expedition was one of great difficulty owing to the nature of the ground to be traversed. The Minni had strongholds in the mountains difficult of access and easy to defend. But the Assyrians were not less skilled in the storming of walled fortresses than they were valorous in the open field. The king, Akhsheri, fled from his capital to one of his castles, but there he was assassinated by his attendants and his body was thrown to the Assyrians from the wall. His son, Vahalli, then surrendered and sent to Nineveh his eldest son as a hostage and his daughter as a concubine, and agreed to pay in addition to the regular rate of tribute thirty horses.

Ašurbanipal had now directed* campaigns with marked success in the southwestern, north-western and north-eastern corners of his empire, and in the two latter had added large territories to his dominion. But these campaigns had been of short duration and easily won. He now was to meet a danger that at one time threatened to lose for him all the ground he had gained, if not to deprive him of his empire itself. The war, or rather series of wars, which now followed covered a period of twelve years. But again the energy of the Assyrian monarch, backed by well disciplined troops, was too much for the combined forces of his enemies, and the war resulted in their complete overthrow and the annexation of all Elam to the Assyrian domain.

During the reign of Esarhaddon, the relations of Elam and Assyria had been peaceful and even friendly, and so continued when Ašurbanipal ascended the throne. The latter, during a time of famine in Elam, had even assisted Urtaki, the Elamite king, with supplies of corn, and had offered asylum in Assyrian territory to certain tribes who had fled to avoid the famine. But when the famine was passed, forgetting these favors, and instigated probably by Assyria's sworn enemy, the Chaldean, Mardukšunibni, Urtaki collected his troops and fell upon Babylonia, where, since the death of Esarhaddon, Sa'ul-mughina, a younger brother of Ašurbanipal, had been ruling as viceroy. Sa'ul-mughina appealed to Ašurbanipal for aid, and on the approach of the Assyrian troops, the Elamites withdrew. They were overtaken, however, and defeated, and Urtaki with difficulty escaped to Susa, where about a year later he and his chief captain in despair committed suicide.

Ašurbanipal had not intended any further efforts in this direction; but the death of Urtaki led to domestic complications in Elam that invited Assyrian

* The cylinder inscriptions represent Ašurbanipal as conducting his campaigns in person; but K 2675, the oldest and most reliable source, does not bear this out. In the campaign against the Minni, even Cylinder B says that he sent his troops, but later uses the first person singular. These later inscriptions seem to have been written expressly to exalt the prowess of the king and accordingly ascribe to him what was in fact done by his generals. The only campaign in which it is quite certain that the king actually took part is the last campaign against Elam.

interference. Urtaki himself had gained the throne by driving into exile the former occupant, his elder brother, Ummanaldas, whom he had subsequently caused to be put to death. Now, on the death of Urtaki, a third brother, Temin-umman, disregarding the claims both of the two sons of Ummanaldas and of the three sons of Urtaki, seized the throne and proceeded to put to death his brothers' sons. But his five nephews, being forewarned of his intentions, fled with sixty members of the royal family and attendants to the court of Ašurbanipal, leaving, however, a considerable body of sympathizers in Elam. Ašurbanipal was quite ready to take up their cause, while on the other side, Temin-umman strengthened himself by alliances with several foreign princes, including two of the descendants of the famous Merodach-baladan, whose territories lay along the Persian Gulf, and several important Arabian chieftains. The war resulted in the total defeat of the Elamites and their allies, and cost Temin-umman his head, while excessive punishments were inflicted on the chiefs who had assisted him. Elam was then divided into two provinces to be ruled by two of the sons of Urtaki. The eastern province was assigned to Tamarit; and the western, with Susa as its capital, to Ummanigaš.

The close of this foreign war was quickly followed by a dangerous civil outbreak. Sa'ul-mughina, the viceroy of Babylonia, to whom a life of dependence was becoming irksome, resolved to throw off his brother's yoke and declare himself king of Babylonia in his own right. By a free use of the rich treasures of Babylonian temples, he induced Ummanigaš, now ruler of western Elam, to forget his indebtedness to Ašurbanipal and join him in his revolt. The cruel punishments inflicted by Ašurbanipal on the hostile chiefs at the close of the previous war made it easy for Sa'ul-mughina to find sympathizers among other neighboring peoples, and he enlisted in his cause a powerful Arabian tribe and one of Merodach-baladan's grandsons, Nebobelšumi. With every prospect of success, he was prepared to advance into Assyria, when his plans were defeated by a disturbance in another quarter. The weakness of the forces retained by Ummanigaš at Susa tempted Tamarit, ruler of eastern Elam, to make himself master of the western province also, and accordingly he surprised Susa and put Ummanigaš to death. He was disposed, however, to continue the policy of Ummanigaš, and went to assist Sa'ul-mughina in his revolt. In his absence, a mountain chieftain, Indabigaš by name, came down upon Susa and occupied Tamarit's throne. The army of Elam in Babylonia refused to assist Tamarit to regain his throne and returned home in a body. Tamarit fled into concealment, and later made his way to Nineveh. Sa'ul-mughina, thus abandoned by his strongest allies, was obliged to assume the defensive. But his walled towns fell one by one, till finally Babylon itself was taken. Before opening the gates, however, the populace, maddened by the pangs of hunger, had seized Sa'ul-mughina and burned him alive. Many of the nobles who had taken part in the insurrection were put to death, while those for whom this was not the first offence were mutilated and their limbs cast to the beasts of prey. Nebobelšumi, however, escaped and found refuge with the mountain chieftain Indabigaš at Susa.

It was probably about this time that the subject provinces in the west were lost to the Assyrian empire. Psammetichus, the son of Necho, who after his father's death at Memphis had been appointed a governor in the Delta, seized the opportunity presented by the engagement of all the Assyrian forces in Babylonia and Elam to renounce his allegiance, and invited Gyges to do the same. The lat-

ter, whose friendly embassy and gifts had been received by Ašurbanipal as an act of submission, and who had been required to send tribute, though his country had never been actually invaded by Assyrian arms, was quite ready to do so, and also sent aid to Psammetichus. These forces, believed to be the Ionians and Carians mentioned by Herodotus, were of great assistance to Psammetichus, and Egypt under the dynasty then established, known as the twenty-sixth Saite dynasty, began a long and prosperous independence. It would perhaps have been better for Gyges to have kept his troops at home; for shortly after this, his country was overrun by a horde of barbarians, supposed to be the Cimmerians, on whose defeat he was congratulating himself when he sent his second embassy to Ašurbanipal. Gyges himself lost his life and was succeeded by his son Ardys. Lenormant thinks this invasion of the Cimmerians was made by invitation of Ašurbanipal. However that may be, Ašurbanipal seems to have made no effort to retain possession of Egypt. To hold it thus far had already necessitated three campaigns, and he seems to have regarded further efforts as futile, owing to the distance of Egypt and the present occupation of all his forces in Babylonia. He refused to be distracted from the work in hand. If it was his intention to take up the Egyptian affair when the war in Elam should be finished, he probably found when that time came that Psammetichus was too firmly established to make the attempt practicable.

On the death of Sa'ul-mughina and the punishment of the Arabian chieftains, a peace of several years followed. Ašurbanipal demanded of Indabigaš the surrender of Nebobelšumi, but did not trouble himself to enforce the request by arms. Internal troubles in Elam, however, soon again invited Ašurbanipal's interference. Indabigaš was slain by Ummanaldas, chief of his bowmen, who seized the throne but had to maintain it against numerous other claimants. As a pretext for war, Ašurbanipal renewed his demand for the person of Nebobelšumi, and when this pretext was made void by the suicide of the refugee, who found that he was to be given up, Ašurbanipal did not wait for other excuse, but overran the country. Ummanaldas succeeded in maintaining himself in the mountains of eastern Elam, but western Elam was taken and placed under the authority of Tammarit, who as mentioned above, had been a refugee at the court of Ašurbanipal since the inroad of Indabigaš. But he had not held this position long, before he was discovered to be plotting to make himself independent of Assyria. He was seized and sent in chains to Nineveh. A second attempt by Ummanaldas to possess himself of the whole territory was followed by the subjugation of both divisions. The entire country was devastated and its cities were spoiled. The crowning act of this long series of wars was the complete subjugation of all Elam and its organization as a province of the Assyrian empire, ruled by Assyrian officers. In a battle near Damascus, Ašurbanipal severely chastised the Arabian chiefs who had assisted Sa'ul-mughina, after which the country seems to have enjoyed peace till his death.

[To be concluded in November number.]

SYNOPSIS OF IMPORTANT ARTICLES.

The Muslim's Faith.*—The common conception of Muhammadanism erroneous. In order to gain the reverent submission of two hundred millions Islam must have had some great truths to teach. These were (1) belief in a God, "a real, living, personal God, the Creator, the Sustainer, and the Governor of the whole human race." Rationalism is foreign to Islam; the incarnation is not a strange thing, and the trinity was declaimed against only as Muhammad understood it. (2) Belief in a *divine revelation* made "in many portions and in divers manners." Not only, however, was the *Torah* revealed to Moses, the *Psalms* to David, the *Evangel* to Jesus and the *Koran* to Muhammad, but Muhammad is the "seal of the prophets" to the abrogation of all other religious dispensations." (3) Belief in a *future life*, in which all men shall be rewarded or punished for the things done in the body. It is and always will be a question, how far the sensual character of heaven was to be taken literally, but the hell of the Koran is one of literal fire. (4) Belief in *salvation by faith*, defined by theologians as "the confession of the lips, and the confidence of the heart." Yet every inducement was held out to lead men to the performance of good deeds. The moral code was definite and very strict. (5) Belief in a *sacrifice*, the great central feast of Islam being a day of sacrifice, a witness, though unconscious that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." The missing link in the Muslim's creed is the crucifixion of Christ. (6) Belief in *prayer*; five times a day he adores God and seeks forgiveness and guidance; these prayers formal perhaps, but not more so than those of millions of so-called Christians. And there is scarcely a sentence in the whole liturgy which a Christian might not utter. It is a matter for thankfulness that in a day when prayer is scoffed at, Islam teaches its reality to so many millions. (7) Belief in the *absolute predestination* of good and evil. "From the beginning God created one family for Paradise and another for hell. Hence the fatalism which enervates and demoralizes the social and national life of all Muslim people." (8) Belief in the *second coming of Christ*, not taught definitely in the Koran, but referred to frequently in the Traditions. (9) Belief in the *need of divine grace*; a prayer recited forty times a day begins, "Guide thou us in the straight path, the path of those to whom thou art gracious." In dealings with Muhammadans, use should be made of the great truths which they already possess. Here is a basis upon which a superstructure may be erected. The method of attack is wrong and will prove futile. It is not the method employed either by Christ or by the Apostles. Muhammadanism has failed to regenerate men; so does Judaism. Both have failed simply because they were not Christianity.

A clear, and direct presentation of facts little known and less appreciated. If it is a true one, and the author is an authority, the suggestions which he makes concerning one of the great problems of the age would seem to be of a most practical character.

* Rev. Thomas Patrick Hughes, M. R. A. S., Lebanon Springs, New York. *The Andover Review*, July 1888. Pp. 23-35.

The Higher Criticism in its Theological Bearings.*—The higher criticism is modern in its origin. While scholars of former days concerned themselves with the text of Scripture, questions are now being discussed as to the composition, the credibility, the integrity and literary form of the biblical writings. The issue of these modern investigations has left the New Testament practically whole and unharmed. But the case is different with the Old Testament and especially with the Pentateuch. The critical scholars of the Old Testament to-day are practically unanimous in maintaining the composite character of the Pentateuch. It is probably a compilation of at least four separate documents all subsequent to the time of Moses. This theory being accepted, what are the results to theology? Are they inconsistent with the Christian faith? While some conceptions of the Old Testament will be altered or destroyed, its essential character as a book of infallible moral and religious teaching will remain. In support of this it is to be noted (1) that though not written by Moses, it is no forgery unworthy of credit, for the book as a whole does not claim to have been written by Moses. Nor, indeed, was there in those days any notion of literary ownership, and it was not regarded as dishonorable to put one's own words into the mouth of another. It was never done in order to deceive. (2) This theory does not impeach the veracity of Christ, for He did not claim to be omniscient, and in many things he was willing to work in harmony with the views of his age. His authority does not decide the question; for it in this case becomes simply the authority of that generation of the Jews that crucified Him. (3) This theory leaves the history just as credible as does the traditional view; for both must allow the use of earlier documents by the author or authors. The Pentateuch, though written late in the life of the nation, is in entire harmony with the earlier historical books, and indeed, on this hypothesis, is more fully brought into accord with them. Tradition among ancient peoples was a valuable method of transmitting the knowledge of events. Among the Hebrews, especially, it was largely free from myth and legend. (4) But this theory does alter the traditional conception of the course of religious life and thought in Israel. They did not receive their entire law, theology and ritual at the beginning. Not a gloriously complete divine revelation followed by a thousand years of apostasy, but a growing apprehension and appropriation of the Jehovah who dwelt among them, is the view which this theory constrains us to adopt. It was this profound consciousness of the divine presence with them that distinguished Israel as a people. God was in the life of Israel in a higher and more intensive form than in other nations. (5) The law then does not point directly to Christ, but only as first it sprang out of the soil of national life. Yet all this national life was Messianic. The entire history of Israel is typical of Christ and therefore all parts of its literature and life find their fullness in Him. Thus the new view is not found necessarily fatal to the Christian faith. It is a theory about the Bible. Christianity neither stands nor falls with any theory of the Bible.

The article will generally be regarded as taking ground which the evangelical rank and file are not ready to accept. It is a phase of the question worthy of careful consideration. The tone and spirit are very liberal, yet entirely constructive.

The Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry.†—(1) Hebrew poetry has the qualities of all true poetry,—noble thought, expressed rhythmically, impressively, imagina-

* By Rev. Wm. Rupp, D. D., *Reformed Quarterly Review*. July, 1888. Pp. 344-377.

† By John H. Thomas in *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, July, 1888. Pp. 261-274.

tively. The poetic nature was characteristic of the Hebrew people throughout their history. (2) That so much of the divine revelation is written in poetry is explained by the fact that the human heart is most easily and deeply stirred by great thoughts rhythmically expressed.

The characteristics of Hebrew poetry are (1) chiefly and universally, its religious purpose; (2) the absence of any consciousness of art; (3) unity; (4) the total absence of any use of, or approach toward, fiction; (5) directness, simplicity and sincerity; (6) the use of the bolder figures of speech; (7) joyousness; (8) the employment of imagery drawn from the natural scenery of Palestine, from domestic life, from Hebrew history; (9) artistic form; (10) sublimity.

A presentation, in some respects hardly up to the times; but comprehensive and helpful.

The Unchangeable Word.*—Progress in knowledge involving the passing away of much that seemed to be established, is the characteristic of the present age. But the truths that were originally written in the Word of God are unalterably the same. The Bible when it came from the hand of God was perfect. This is argued (1) from the fact that the same God inspired the whole of it. It is as complete and perfect as its divine author. It is substantiated (2) by the attributes of God. He is unchangeable and perfect, and the revelation he has given cannot be less than complete and established forever. This is proved also (3) by the great object for which the Scriptures were written—to proclaim to all ages the one everlasting gospel. This gospel based on universal human needs is unalterable and cannot be amended or improved. Practical inferences follow:—(1) All the great doctrines of the Bible are fixed, whether or not man comprehends them. (2) The moral law as laid down in the Bible is forever the same and is forever binding on men.

A staunch and hearty upholding of the most conservative views relating to the Bible. It is reassuring, in these days of so many interrogations, to read such an article.

A Revised Text of the Hebrew Bible.†—The Revised Version of the English Bible is very unsatisfactory because it adheres to the massoretic text and fails to give any adequate recognition of the critical scholarship of the last two hundred years. This massoretic text has no real claim to be considered an accurate transcript of the original manuscripts. Critical scholars for three centuries and more have been comparing and emending this imperfect text on the established principles of textual criticism. Examples of these changes are found in Gen. 1:1, where for *shamaim* (heavens) is to be read *maim* (waters); also in Judges 3:8, where for *aram* the correct reading is *edom*; in Deut. 33:2, where the translation of the corrected text is "and came from Meribah-Kadesh." Other changes desirable are to remove passages which are out of place, to their rightful positions, to restore the ancient order of the O. T. Books, to give the prophetic writings their proper chronological order and assign them to their right authors, and to perform a similar service for the Psalms. A text thus amended and altered, the result of twenty-five years of close critical study, has been prepared by Prof. Graetz of Breslau, and now awaits publication. The cost of publishing such a work will be great, and it is hoped that American men of wealth and scholarship will feel it an honor to aid in this enterprise.

* By T. W. Hooper D. D. in *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, July, 1888. Pp. 208-216.

† By A. W. Thayer in *Unitarian Review*, July 1888. Pp. 58-60.

Without a doubt the results of such work deserve publication; and yet it is to be feared that Professor Graetz, if one may judge from his emendations already suggested, e. g. in his commentary on the Psalms, is too hasty in his conclusions to make the publication as desirable as it would otherwise be.

Views of the Babylonians concerning Life after Death.*—(1) Investigators of this subject have been Hincks (1854), Talbot (1871), W. St. Chad Boscawen, and Jeremias (*Die Babylonisch-Assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode* (1887). (2) Sources of information: (a) the story of the Descent of Istar to Hades, (translated by Mr. Adler in this article); (b) the Nimrod-Epic, in which Nimrod, who has lost a friend, resolves to seek out his ancestor, who has been deified, in order to obtain the resurrection of his friend and immortality for himself; but (c) the prayers handed down contain no indication of any longing after immortality. The rewards offered are "earthly prosperity, long life, and undying progeny." Punishments are also earthly, viz., sickness, disease, destruction of progeny, sudden death. (3) Assyrians practiced burial, the denial of which was a great misfortune. Where they buried is a question. Lower Chaldea, the original home, is thought to have been the burial-place of the entire Mesopotamian Empire. The expedition of the Royal Russian Museum (1886) examined ruins of Surghul and El-hibba, and found both places to be cities of the dead. The corpses were partly buried, partly incinerated. (4) Some information is given concerning the funeral ceremonies. (5) General conclusion: The Assyro-Babylonians believe in a future life. Reward and punishment, however, were as a rule awarded in the flesh. Death was the great leveler, and all went to the same place, a dark, damp, uncomfortable abode. This was denied those who were not properly buried. For a few favorites of the gods, a happier fate was reserved. They were translated to the isles of the blessed and seem to have continued enjoying the same sort of existence they had in the upper world. This, however, was exceptional. Resurrection was known, but was vested largely in the hands of Allat, the queen of the under-world, though the other gods were continually endeavoring to break her spell.

The information contained in this article is valuable; the style and spirit are admirable. Perhaps too much space is given to the translations, but these are, after all, the most important.

* By Cyrus Adler, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. *The Andover Review*, July, 1888. Pp. 92-101.

→BOOKS: NOTICES.←

SWETE'S SEPTUAGINT.*

The question of an Old Testament text is, with scholars, both tantalizing and important; tantalizing because of the apparent impossibility of securing within the present generation anything at all complete or satisfactory, important because so long as the text is confessedly so imperfect, critical results in many lines are unattainable. This is the great problem; but one of the many sub-problems, of less importance only because it is a sub-problem, is that which relates to the text of the Septuagint, which, as agreed by all, is the most valuable help in determining the Hebrew text. Before any work of much value can be done upon the latter, the text of the former must be settled.

The great primary editions of the Septuagint have been 1) that of the Complutensian Polyglott (1514-1517), 2) that of the Aldine press, but a few months later, 3) the Roman or Sixtine edition of 1587, and based on the Codex Vaticanus, and 4) the Alexandrian, issued by the Oxford Press 1707-1720. Of secondary editions special value is assigned by our edition to the work of Holmes and Parsons (1798-1827) not for the value of its text, but for the textual notes, and to the various editions of Tischendorf (1850, 1856, 1860, 1869, 1875, 1880, 1887, the last two under Nestle).

The present edition is a smaller or manual edition issued with as little delay as possible, a more complete edition being intended to follow. The former "confines itself to the variations of a few of the most important uncial codices already edited in letterpress or facsimile." In the latter, "it is proposed to give the variations of all the Greek uncial MSS., of select Greek cursive MSS., of the more important versions and of the quotations made by Philo and the earlier and more important ecclesiastical writers." This edition, containing the materials for a critical use of the Septuagint, is, of course, far superior to anything which has hitherto been offered the student both in quality and price. Tischendorf's, edition, up to this time the authority, like the American edition of Gesenius' Lexicon, is one which the author, if he were now living, would refuse to recognize as his own.

ABRAHAM: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.†

The fifteen chapters of the book take up the following subjects: 1) Abram's birth-place; 2) first call; 3) second call; 4) the promised land; 5) Egypt; 6) sep-

* THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK ACCORDING TO THE SEPTUAGINT, edited by the Syndics of the University Press, by Henry Barclay Swete, D. D., Honorary Fellow of Gonville and Caius College. Vol. 1 Genesis-IV Kings. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1887. 8vo. Pp. 1-827. New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, \$2.25.

† ABRAHAM: HIS LIFE AND TIMES. By Rev. William J. Deane, M. A., Rector of Ashen, Essex. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 12mo. Pp. 179. Price \$1.00.

aration; 7) Chedorlaomer; 8) the covenant; 9) Hagar—circumcision; 10) Sodom; 11) Gerar and Beersheba; 12) temptation; 13) Machpelah; 14) Isaac's marriage; 15) closing years—death. The writer has formally adopted no theory of the documents of Genesis, his chief authority. He understands the narrative of that book to have been derived from different sources and to have been worked up by a compiler into a consistent and fairly complete biography, and this with the hints obtained from later Scripture gives us a finished picture of the patriarch.

Partly because the biblical narrative itself is so full, and hence a biography of Abraham must consist largely of material already very familiar, partly because the outside sources, at this early period, are comparatively rare and unreliable and partly also because of the failure of the writer to build his work upon a scientific interpretation of the records given us in Genesis, this volume is not so valuable as some others of the series of which it is a part.

SOLOMON: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.*

This book is written by Canon Farrar, who is known as a prolific writer and profound biblical scholar. In it are all the characteristics which we would expect to find in a book written by its distinguished author. The influence which surrounded the childhood and youth of Solomon,—his accession to the throne,—the initial troubles of his reign,—his notable sacrifice and dream,—the splendor of his court,—the building of the temple—its plan and aspect,—the other buildings and cities which added to the glory of the kingdom, and the marvelously extended commerce which laid under contribution the products and wealth of the surrounding nations, are pictured with an artist's skill, and we are made to see "Solomon in all his glory."

The chapter on the decline of Solomon is the saddest and most instructive in the book. The depth of the decline is thus presented at the close of the chapter. "He changed the true Israel into a feeble Simulacrum of Egypt,—a pale reflex of Phœnicia. He stands out to kings as a conspicuous warning against the way in which they should not walk. He found a people free, he left them enslaved; he found them unburdened, he left them oppressed; he found them simple, he left them luxurious; he found them inclined to be faithful to one God, he left them indifferent to the abominations of heathendom which they saw practiced under the very shadow of his palace and his shrine; he found them occupying a unique position as providential witnesses to one saving truth, he left them a nation like other nations, only weaker in power and exhausted in resources."

The remainder of the book is mainly devoted to a careful consideration of the wisdom of Solomon and books attributed to him. He says, "If Solomon's authorship of the Song of Songs must be regarded as being in the highest degree dubious, it must now be looked upon as a certain result of advancing knowledge that he was not the author of Ecclesiastes." "In the Book of Proverbs, more probably by far than in the other books attributed to Solomon, we may possess some of his contributions to the thought of the world."

This book should be in the library of every thoughtful and devout student of the Bible.

* SOLOMON: HIS LIFE AND TIMES. By Rev. F. W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster; and Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 38 West Twenty-third Street.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE.*

The fifth and sixth volume of "The People's Bible," covering Joshua, Judges, are on our table. Twenty-five volumes are to complete what has been called "Parker's greatest work." The author treats the Bible as a book for the people, as a revelation from God to the human family in which all the members of the family have a common interest. In his view, on the very surface is found in history, prophecy and song, in gospels, epistles and apocalypse, that which meets the necessities of people of all classes. The alternative title, "Discourses upon Holy Scripture," better describes the contents of the book. The author is a London preacher with a representative congregation of the world's people before him. He and they together are going through their own Bible, seeking to grasp its grandest truths, to learn its greatest lessons, and to breathe in its pure and lofty spirit. The preacher, Dr. Parker, *may* be a skillful exegete, but results not processes are what he gives the people. The digging and blasting have been done in his study, if done at all; in his pulpit there is no sight of either pickax or hammer, or smell of powder. We see him only as one moving over a rich mineral region, lifting and exhibiting to the people who press around him, nuggets of precious ore, and discoursing eloquently on their value and use. Thus he goes through the Bible. Those who follow him will, with little effort on their part, find a certain profit and enjoyment, but not that profit and enjoyment which come from an examination of what lies beneath the surface. A great multitude of people, alas that it is so great, can enjoy and be profited by only such a treatment of the holy volume.

ELIJAH: HIS LIFE AND TIMES.†

This volume treats of one of the most critical periods in the history of the Jewish people, and the most remarkable prophet in that history until we come to "the days of him in whom all men recognized a second Elijah." The author gives us a graphic account of the state of Israel at the first appearance of Elijah. He shows us Israel wavering between the worship of the living God and that of Baal, and Elijah, the type of the prophet in all ages, witnessing for the truth. We see taking place the mighty changes caused by Elijah's bold and fearless testimony to the existence of the true God. Critical points and points in controversy are merely touched upon, but where any reference is made to opposing views it is with a commendable spirit of fairness. Whenever, in the course of the history, ethical or theological questions arise the author has treated them fully and clearly. The care given to the interpretation of difficult passages,—for example, those connected with the ascension of Elijah,—is especially noteworthy. He takes Elijah as the type of the Christian minister, and he seizes every opportunity, both in the life of Elijah and in the history of his times, to derive practical lessons which he presses home to the breasts of his readers. The style of both thought and expression is simple and perspicuous. The book is especially practical, and will commend itself to all classes of readers.

* THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture by Joseph Parker, Minister of the City Temple. Vols. V. and VI. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Per vol., \$1.50.

† ELIJAH: HIS LIFE AND TIMES. By Rev. W. Milligan, D. D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism, Aberdeen. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 12mo. Pp. 205. Price \$1.00.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL OF HEBREW.

The following persons have been enrolled as members of the Correspondence School during August and September: Mr. R. T. Campbell, Pawnee City, Neb.; Rev. C. E. Chandler, Columbus, O.; Mr. H. W. Dickerman, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. C. J. Dobson, Claremont, Ontario, Can.; Rev. J. H. Girdwood, Ceresco, Mich.; Mr. C. V. R. Hodge, Burlington, N. J.; Miss E. E. Howard, Charlottesville, Va.; Mr. J. A. Ingham, Hackettstown, N. J.; Mr. T. J. Kirkpatrick, Springfield, O.; E. S. Maxson, M. D., Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. T. McAulis, Broach, India; Prof. R. W. McGranahan, Coulterville, Pa.; Rev. W. P. McKee, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rev. B. W. Mebane, Dublin, Va.; Rev. J. R. Munro, Antigonish, N. S., Can.; Rev. D. F. Mustard, Walton, Kan.; Rev. R. F. Norton, E. Norwich, N. Y.; Prof. F. W. Phelps, Topeka, Kan.; Rev. J. J. Redditt, Scarborough, Ontario, Can.; Rev. J. W. Smith, Xenia, O.; Rev. S. B. Turrentine, King's Mountain, N. C.; Rev. B. C. Warren, Deal's Island, Md.; Mr. E. M. Wherry, Le Roy, N. Y.

It will be noticed that only about one-half of the persons in the above list are ministers. Of the other half nearly all are students who have not yet entered the theological seminary. This is an encouraging fact, as it is one of the indications of the growth of sentiment in favor of the acquisition of Hebrew as a preparation for the theological course. The still larger number who have begun the language in the Summer Schools this year furnish another indication of the same sort.

The graduates for the two months are Rev. W. P. Archibald, Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, Can.; Prof. Holmes Dysinger, Carthage, Ill.; Prof. D. S. Gage, Macon, Ill.; Prof. W. H. Long, Waco, Texas; Mr. J. K. McGillivray, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Rev. D. D. Owen, Pulaski, N. Y.; Rev. D. H. Patterson, Tuily, N. Y.; Rev. J. Wood Saunders, Deer Park, Ill.

Perfect papers have been received from Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., Atlanta, Ga., 2; Rev. J. P. Bowell, Maple Bay, Vancouver Island, 1; Rev. G. W. Davis, New Haven, Conn., 1; Mr. John A. Ingham, Hackettstown, N. J., 1; Rev. J. W. Smith, Xenia, Ohio, 1; Rev. J. J. Van Zanten, Holland, Mich., 1, and Mr. E. J. Young, Washington, D. C., 2.

It is an encouraging fact that more examination papers have been received and cor-

rected in each month this year than in the corresponding month of the previous year. The amount of work done is the real test of the success of the School, rather than the number of additions to the list of members.

The attention of the members of the School is called to the new Instruction Card, of which a copy has been sent to each student. Observe particularly the increase in the number of prizes offered to those sending in the largest number of examination papers from Dec. 1, 1888, to Nov. 30th, 1889. Those who are competing for the prizes offered this year should remember that less than two months remain in which to send in papers. A list of all who have forwarded forty or more examination papers during the year will be published in the January STUDENT.

To those students who have covered a considerable amount of Hebrew work it will be easy and very pleasant to take a cognate course in Arabic or Assyrian. These studies open a fresh field of research, involve new elements of linguistic acquisition, bring the student into an unexplored epoch of history, and furnish fresh incentives to Hebrew work itself. With the assistance of Mr. F. K. Sanders, M. A., a Scholar in Semitic languages in Yale University, the principal is able to offer courses in these languages, arranged upon the same plan and taught by the same methods as those of the Hebrew courses.

Five members of the Correspondence School have died within the past year. They are Prof. N. H. Ensley, of Rodney, Miss., formerly a professor in Washington, D. C., who will be remembered as one of the colored students by those who attended the Chicago Summer School of 1884; Rev. F. K. Leavell, of Baltimore, Md., one of the graduates of last year who took a very high rank in the School; Rev. Donald MacGregor, of Houston, Texas; Rev. L. R. McCormick, of Lowesville, S. C., and Rev. E. D. Simons, of New York City.

It may be announced that what is a branch of the Correspondence School of Hebrew, has been established in Tokio, Japan. This is the outgrowth of an interest in Hebrew work which is rapidly spreading, and of an appreciation of the practical efficiency of the correspondence system. Details of this new organization will be given later.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- The Sermon Bible: Genesis to 2 Samuel.* N. Y.: A. C. Armstrong and Son.....\$1.50.
Boudha. By Jules Claretie. Paris.....\$7.50.
The Inspiration of the Old Testament inductively considered. The 7th Congregational Union Lecture. By Alfred Cave. London: Congregational Union.
Jüdische Geschichte. I. Von ihren Anfängen bis zum Untergange d. Reiches Juda. By E. Krähe. Berlin: Oemigke.....M.4.50.
Der biblische Simeon der ägyptische Horus-Ra. By E. Wietzke. Wittenberg: Wunschmann.....M.1.40.
La Bible. Traduction nouvelle, II. Levitique, Nombres, Deuteronomie. Par E. Ledrain. Paris: Lemerre.....7.50ff.
Die Genesis, mit Unterscheidung der Quellschriften. By E. Kautzsch and A. Socin.
Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. Der Gott Israel's u. die Goetter der Heiden. By F. Baethgen. Berlin: Reuther.....M.10.
Die Zerstreung d. Volkes Israel. 3. Hft.: Der Thalrud. Berlin: Reuther.....M.1.80.
La Sainte Bible. Texte de la Vulgate, traduction française en regard, avec commentaires théologiques, etc. Le Deuteronomie. Le Nombres. Par Trochon et Bayle. Paris: Le thiellieux.
Introduction à la critique générale de l'ancien testament. De l'origine du Pentateuque. II By L'Abbe Martin. Paris: Maisonneuve.30f.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- Manly's Bible Doctrine of Inspiration.* By C. L. Diven in New Englander, August, 1888.
From the Red Sea to Mt. Sinai. By E. L. Wilson, in the Century, July, 1888.
The Way of the Philistines. By A. H. Sayce, in Independent, Aug. 2, 1888.
Delitzsch's New Genesis Commentary. Review. Ibid. June 14.
Was the Exodus-Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea? By Prof. J. A. Paine, Ph. D., in the Examiner, Aug. 16, 23, 30, 1888.
The Teaching of Bible History. By J. Sewall in Sunday School Times, July 7, 1888.
Sayce on Babylonian Religion. Review. Ibid. Stapfer's Palestine in the Time of Christ. Review. Ibid, July 14.
The Offerings of the O. T. By C. A. Briggs. Ibid, July 21.
Westminster Abbey Lectures on Job. Review. Ibid.
The Chokhma. By W. W. Davies. Ibid, Aug. 11.
Kittel's Geschichte der Hebraeer. Critique in Independent, July 19, 1888.
Prof. Delitzsch and the Jews. By B. Pick. Ibid.
An old Babylonian Letter. By T. G. Pinches. Ibid, Aug. 23.
The Book of Job: with reference to Chap. 19: 23-27. By Rev. W. B. Hutton in Expositor, Aug. 1888.
Delitzsch's Genesis. By Kautzsch in Theol. Ltztng, July 23, 1888.
Menz's Chrestomathia Targumica. By Baethgen. Ibid, Aug. 11.
Heiligstedt's Präparationen zum Propheten Jesaja. By Budde. Ibid.
Dalman's Der leidende und der sterbende Messias u.s.w. By Siegfried. Ibid.
The Lake of Moeris and the Patriarch Joseph. By F. C. Whitehouse in Camb. Antiq. Soc. Comn. xxviii. 1888.
The Name of "Moses." By A. H. Sayce in Academy, July 7, 1888.

- "Moshah and Masu."* The Name "Moses." By G. W. Collins and E. B. Birks. Ibid, July 14.
Notes on certain passages in Deutero-Isaiah. [40:19; 44:11; 45:14; 62:2]. By A. A. Bevan in The Jour. of Philol. XVII, 1888.
Ezechiel's Wetsagung wider Tyrus. Cap. 26, 27, 28. By C. H. Manohot in Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. 3. 1888.
Das Buch Daniel u. die assyriologische Forschung. 2. Das Mahl des Belsazar. By O. Andrea in Bew. d. Glaubens, July, 1888.
Die nordamerikanischen pentateuchkritischen Essays. By F. Delitzsch in Ztschr. f. kir. Wiss. u. Leb. 5. 1888.
Questions actuelles d'exegese et d'apologie biblique. III. Les objections contre l'origine Mosaicque du Pentateuque. By J. Brucker in Etudes rel. philos. et hist. July, 1888.
Micha Studien. I. Tegenwoordige stand van het Micha Vraagstuk. By J. W. Pont in Theol. Stud. 4. 1888.
The Pentateuchal Story of Creation. By Geo. D. Armstrong, D. D., in Presby. Quarterly, October, 1888.
Ewald's Old and New Testament Theology. By J. L. Girardeau. Ibid.
Ladd's What is the Bible. By S. M. Smith. Ibid.
Jeremias'. Die Babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode. By Budde in Theol. Ltzt., Sept. 8, 1888.
L'entrée des Israélites en Canaan et l'Egypte. By R. Chateanot in Rev. Chret. 8, 1888.
The Ten Tribes. By C. R. Conder in the Palestine Exploration Fund, July, 1888.
The Burial of Moses. By A. R. Thompson, D. D., in S. S. Times, Sept. 8, 1888.
The Ten Commandments as a covenant of Love. By H. C. Trumbull, D. D., in S. S. Times, Sept. 15, 22, 1888.
The Temples of Egypt. By Edw. L. Wilson in Scribner's Magazine, October, 1888.
The Song of Solomon. By A. H. Moment, D. D., in The Treasury, October, 1888.
The Text-Critical Value of the Septuagint. By Prof. G. H. Schodde in The Independent, Sept. 27, 1888.
Michael Heilprin: Life of a Hebrew Scholar. By J. W. Chadwick in Unitarian Review, September, 1888.
Drummond's Philo. Ibid.
The Pool of the Serpents. By Prof. J. A. Paine in Independent, Sept. 13, 1888.
Immanuel. Editorial. Ibid.
Moses' Idea of God. By E. M. Epstein in Christian Quarterly Review, October, 1888.
The Origin, Mission and Destiny of, and the Christian's Relation to, Civil Government, from the Old Testament. By David Lipscomb. Ibid.
Cheyne's Book of Psalms. By A. W. Benn. Ibid., Sept. 8; also in Athenaeum, Sept. 1.
Junior-right among the Canaanites. By O. Neubauer. Academy, Sept. 15.
Junior-right in Genesis. By J. Jacobs in Archæological Review, July, 1888.
Lenormant's Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient. Athenæum, Sept. 15.
The Monoliths of Cyprus. By S. P. Oliver, R. A. Ibid.
Idea of O. T. Priesthood fulfilled in the N. T. By Rev. Prof. W. Milligan, D. D., in The Expositor, September, 1888.
The Pentateuch: Egyptianity and authenticity. By G. Lansing, D. D. Ibid.
Die Essener. By R. Ohie in Jahrb. f. prot. Theol., July, 1888.
Dawson's Modern Science in Bible Lands. By W. Houghton in Academy, Sept. 1, 1888.