

THE HEBREW STUDENT.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1883.

No. 8.

THE HIGH-PLACES.

BY PROF. H. P. SMITH.

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

We need not stop on the etymology of the word **בָּמָה** as its meaning is abundantly certified by the passages in which it occurs.* Poetically it is used of heights—hills and mountains—in the proper sense of the term, e. g., 2 Sam. I., 19, (cf. v. 25):

“The pride of Israel was wounded on thy *heights*;
How are the heroes fallen!”

So of the heights as the fortresses of a country, whose possession determines who shall rule, Deut. xxxii., 13.

But in prose the word means, in by far the largest number of cases, *a high place, as a place of worship—a sanctuary*, whether of Jehovah or of other gods. The choice of such places for worship is perfectly natural as being (in the popular conception) nearer the heavens. Not to go outside the Bible, we find that the Canaanites chose such localities for their altars—as Baal Peor worshipped at the mountain called by his name. Every page of Jeremiah gives us evidence that the Israelites, so far at least as they worshipped false gods, chose elevated places.† Further, the altars of Jehovah were in many cases on heights.

* Gesenius assumes the root **בָּמָה** which is said to be equivalent to **בָּהָר**, but under **בָּהָר** we find no meaning that will account for our **בָּמָה**. In the Thesaurus, the same author supposes the word borrowed from some non-Semitic people. Besides the Hebrew, it occurs only in the Moabite stone. The Syriac *bim* is from the Greek.

† Compare Jer. II., 20; XIII., 27; XVII., 2 with 1 Kings, XIV., 23; 2 Kings, XVI., 4; XVII., 10. In all these cases, the place of worship is described as a **בְּעֵרָה**, generally in connection with **עַיִן רֵעִין**. That the worship is idolatrous, so far as these passages are concerned, seems to admit of no doubt.

Other testimony as to the veneration of hills and mountains presented by Baudissin in his essay

In the Patriarchal period, we find Abraham directed to "one of the mountains" in the land of Moriah (Gen. XXII., 2) as the place for the sacrifice of Isaac. Bethel where he built an altar (Gen. XII., 8), and where Jacob had his vision and afterwards built an altar (Gen. XXXV., 1), seems to have lain on a hill. Moses also built an altar in remembrance of the victory over Amalek, possibly on the same hill on which he had stood himself during the battle (Ex. XVII., 15). The same leader commanded the erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal (Deut. XXVII., 4-7), and the command was carried out by Joshua (Josh. VIII., 30). These instances are enough to show the general custom of choosing elevated places as places of worship. Not all of these are designated as *במות*; not any of them in fact is so designated. But testifying to the custom, they explain why *bama* (originally a hill) came to mean a place of worship generally.

The author of the book of Kings uses this word in its general sense, to include all places of worship aside from the Temple at Jerusalem. To get an adequate idea of these sanctuaries, we must go back to the times before the monarchy. In the period of the Judges, we find various places mentioned where at least occasional worship was offered. In some of these the presence of the Ark and the Tabernacle seems to be presupposed, in others it cannot be. The first instance is in connection with Bochim. The Tabernacle was established at Gilgal by Joshua and was still there according to Judg. II., 1. The account reads: "And the messenger of Jehovah (*מלאך-יהוה*) came up from Gilgal to Bochim" and recounted the mercies of God and the ingratitude of the people. "And it came to pass as the messenger of Jehovah spoke these words to all the children of Israel, that the people lifted up their voice and wept, and they called the name of that place Bochim, and they *sacrificed there to Jehovah.*" The question is whether the messenger of Jehovah was a man or an angel. If the former, this is a distinct case of sacrificing aside from the Tabernacle. If the latter, we are puzzled by his going up *from Gilgal*. Generally an angel is described as coming directly from heaven. If this were an angel, the event is parallel to the other instances of sacrifice in the period of the

"*Heilige Gewässer, Bäume und Höhen bei den Semiten*" (in his *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, II. 1878), may be mentioned. The proper names Bamoth Moab and Baal Hermon point in this direction; and we know from abundant ruins that Hermon was the site of numerous temples. Tacitus speaks of Carmel as a mountain and a god worshipped on the mountain. Sinai was a holy mountain to the heathen Nabataeans. The Syrians under Ben Hadad regarded the God of Israel as a "God of the hills" (1 Kings, xx., 23, 28). This does not, however, necessarily imply more than that the country of Israel was hilly.

Judges, the most of which are occasioned by a theophany or special divine appearance*.

After a theophany, Gideon builds an altar to Jehovah calling it Jehovah Shalom, "unto this day it is yet in Ophra," Judg. VI., 24. As an altar is for sacrifice, it is to be presumed that this one remained in use until the time the account was written. There is no evidence that the author means to identify this first altar spoken of, with the one connected with the [idolatrous] worship afterwards mentioned, Judg. VIII., 27. The altar of Gideon became a *bama*.†

The sacrifice offered by Manoah in the open field, was in connection with a theophany, but seems not to have established a precedent. We hear nothing further of the place or altar and cannot count this among the *bamoth* (Judg. XIII., 15—20). Jephtha, however, in making his agreement with the elders of Gilead spoke all his words "before Jehovah in Mizpah," which seems to indicate a sanctuary of some kind (Judg. XI., 11). Similar language is used in the account of the war against Benjamin. There the congregation came "to Jehovah" at Mizpah (the western place of this name of course). They inquired of God before each attack (Judg. XX., 18, 26), however, at Bethel where the Ark was (v. 27). At the same time, the regular place of worship seems to have been at Shiloh, for there was the yearly "feast of Jehovah" (XXI., 19). The account seems to indicate that in other cases than the well known disaster at Eben-Ezer, the Ark was carried from one place to another. It still remains a problem, however, why it was not carried to the army in the field, if it was once moved from Shiloh to Bethel.

The event just alluded to—the capture of the Ark by the Philistines—seems to have been followed by the destruction of the sanctuary at

* It is a question whether we may count among the *bamoth* Shechem, where Joshua delivered his farewell address (Josh. XXIV., 1, and verses 26, 27). Here the whole congregation stood "before Jehovah"; this phrase is used often of appearing before the Tabernacle, which however is not said to have been at Shechem during the life of Joshua. Further, Joshua "raised a great stone there under the oak which is in the Sanctuary of Jehovah," אשר במקדש יהוה. Later we find Shechem the seat of idolatrous worship only (Baal Berith), though the fact that Rehoboam chose it as the place of his coronation may indicate that it was regarded as a sanctuary. Joshua did not sacrifice there.

† This was actually a hill. It may be well to notice, however, that the word *bama* was applied to low lying places, as Jeremiah speaks of the *bamoth* of Tophet which as is well known was a valley, Jer. VII., 31. This verse speaks also of *building* בָּנוּ בְּכוֹתֵי הַתֵּיבֹת. From this and similar passages, it is inferred that small artificial hills or mounds were made on which or by which the altars were erected. This is then the reason why the *bama* may be overthrown. Is it not more likely, however, that the *bama*'s first came to designate the place of worship with its attendant buildings, and that these (the בְּכוֹתֵי הַתֵּיבֹת) are alluded to in the passages which speak of building or tearing down (בָּנוּ וְנִתְּנוּ) in 2 Kgs. XXIII., 8? In some cases the בְּכוֹתֵי הַתֵּיבֹת were evidently tents, as Ezek. XVI., 16; and these might easily be burnt, cf. 2 Kgs. XXIII., 15.

Shiloh. In the subsequent period, covered by the life of Samuel and the reign of Saul, we find the following data for our inquiry. In 1 Sam. VII., 4-13, Samuel gathers Israel at Mizpah. They draw water and pour it out "before Jehovah," fast that day and confess their sin. The Philistines hear and come against them. Samuel then takes a sucking lamb and offers it to Jehovah as a whole burnt-offering for Israel, and Jehovah answers him (verse 9). This Mizpah is the same to which the tribes came in the war against Benjamin as noticed above. After the deliverance there wrought, Samuel made it a habit to perform a yearly circuit as judge, returning to Ramah his home where he *built an altar* (VII., 17). It is probably here that we are to locate the interview of Saul with the Seer narrated in chapter IX. The passage is difficult; but we gather from it that it was customary to sacrifice on the *bama*, and that the people had just finished the sacrificial meal when Saul appeared.* Whatever may be thought of this Samuel promises Saul in chapter X. to come down to Saul to Gilgal and there "to offer burnt-offerings, to sacrifice sacrifices of peace-offerings." He also tells Saul that he will meet men going up "to God at Bethel, one bearing three kids"—we should naturally suppose for sacrifice. In the same connection, we find the phrase "Gibea of God" (X., 5), which has been interpreted as making Gibea also a place of worship. At any rate there was there a company of prophets and a *bama*. The next mention of sacrifices is at Gilgal (XI., 15) whither the people came to make Saul king.

Gilgal also is the scene of Saul's rejection (1 Sam. XIII., 8-14), or at least of his rebuke. After waiting for Samuel to come to the camp, he became impatient, especially as he saw his troops scattering from him. He therefore had the offerings brought and sacrificed. Samuel arrived directly afterwards and, when informed what had been done, he said: "Thou hast done foolishly, thou hast not kept the commandment of Jehovah thy God which he commanded thee. For now Jehovah had established thy kingdom forever: but now thy kingdom shall not endure." The question arises, What had Saul done that was wrong? Some suppose he had trespassed upon the priestly prerogatives in sacrificing in person. But nothing of this kind is indicated in the account itself, and it would in fact be possible to suppose with *Keil* that

* Samuel had been with the people and had given instructions to have a piece laid aside (for Saul). He had then gone back to the town and on the way met Saul, whom he brought with him. On the *bama* here, was a building with a *לשכה*. It might be remarked by the way that in X., 18 *הבית* seems to be an error for *הבית*.

a priest was present in the camp. The language of Samuel points to the disobedience of a special injunction laid upon Saul—"the commandment of Jehovah thy God which he commanded thee." If it had been a violation of the ritual law the words would have been "which he commanded Israel" or "which he commanded us." We find no indication in the text that the sacrifice was considered by Samuel to be wrong in itself. Similarly, we find no condemnation of Saul's building of an altar (XIV., 35), but the simple announcement "this was the first of his building an altar to Jehovah," as if he had afterwards built others.

Samuel took with him a calf to Bethlehem, on occasion of the anointing of David, and sacrificed it, inviting the elders of the city (1 Sam. XVI., 1-5). The clan of David were accustomed to hold a yearly sacrifice in the same place (XX., 6). The Tabernacle had now been set up at Nob (XXI.).

One of the first acts of David's reign after he was fully established at Jerusalem, seems to have been to bring up the long neglected Ark from Kirjath Jearim (2 Sam. VI.). The fact that so much of the history now centres in the new capital, leaves us in comparative ignorance of the rest of the country. But the occasional glimpses we get, show that worship is still carried on at other sanctuaries. Absalom asked permission of David to pay a vow to Jehovah at Hebron (2 Sam. xv., 7-9, cf. v. 12), without exciting surprise or suspicion on his father's part. David in his flight came to the top of Olivet "where they were accustomed to worship God" (2 Sam. xv., 32). David himself erected an altar at the threshing-floor of Arauna the Jebusite. This, however, was in consequence of his vision of the angel of destruction, and moreover by divine command (2 Sam. XXIV., 18).

The book of Kings opens with the attempt of Adonijah to secure the throne. In company with Joab and Ebiathar the Priest, he went down to the Stone of the Serpent near En Rogel and sacrificed sheep and oxen and fatlings (1 Kings I., 7, 9).* Soon after comes the well known apology (III., 2): "Only the people were sacrificing on the *bamoth* for a house was not yet built to the name of Jehovah until those days. And Solomon loved Jehovah to walk in the statutes of David his father—only he sacrificed and burnt incense on the *bamoth*. And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice for there was the great

* As one is tempted to translate פָּסַח by *slay* in this passage, it is perhaps worth while to notice that so cautious an interpreter as *Keil* understands the text to speak of a solemn sacrificial meal, such as usually accompanied a coronation. Compare the case of Absalom at Hebron noticed above. It is a question moreover whether the verb ever means simply to *slay*.

bama; a thousand burnt-offerings he sacrificed on that altar." It is evident from this passage that the *bamoth* were something of long standing. The people were accustomed to sacrifice—מִזְבְּחִים on them, and kept it up as did the king himself noticeably at Gibeon. It is not certain that the writer means to imply that the Pentateuch allowed a multiplicity of altars until the time when the temple should be built. His language may be taken simply to state that the people had *more* excuse at this period than after the building of the temple.* However that may be, we hear of no effort by Solomon even after the building of the temple, to put a stop to the popular custom; and no intimation is given that any one denounced it as in itself sinful. We find, indeed, that the *bamoth* became the seat of a corrupted (syncretistic) worship. In his later days, Solomon built *bamoth* (or a *bama*) to Chemosh and to Molech on the Mount of Olives (1 Kings XI., 7). This however need not be reckoned here, as it was done under the influence of his wives and for their especial benefit. Nor will we lay stress upon the idolatrous worship of Jeroboam I. of Israel, although it is altogether likely that he chose historic sanctuaries in which to locate his new images. (He is said, in 1 Kings XII., 31, to have made a *beth-bamoth* by the way.) But in the reign of Rehoboam, Judah also "built for themselves *bamoth* and *mazzeboth* and *asherim* on every high hill and under every green tree, and the *qadesh* was in the land." This points to Canaanitish influences. In itself this verse (1 Kings XIV., 23) might indicate that the *bamoth* also were an innovation. But aside from the history already traced, we have in the conduct of Asa evidence to the contrary. He is expressly described as a good king, who did right in the eyes of Jehovah like David his father, (xv., 11-14); and he reformed the worship. "He sent away the *qadeshim* from the land and removed the sticks (גְּלוֹלִים) evidently meaning the pillars and asheras) which his fathers had made. He removed his mother Maacah from her position as גְּבִירָה, because she had made an idol for an ashera; and Asa cut down her idol and burnt it in the Kedron valley." Yet in spite of all this, although he went so far "the *bamoth* were not removed" (v. 14). If Asa had tried to remove them and had been prevented by the people, it seems as though different language would have been used.†

* We are informed in the second book of Chronicles (i., 3) that the Tabernacle was at Gibeon. It is difficult to see, however, how Solomon would be justified by this fact, so long as the Ark was absent. Moreover the language in Kings implies that Solomon visited more than one of the *bamoth*.

† The parallel passage in Chronicles is usually interpreted to mean this (2 Chron. XIV., 2).

Very similar language to what we find here, is used in regard to other good kings of Judah. Jehoshaphat "walked in all the way of Asa his father, he did not turn from it, in doing what was right in the eyes of Jehovah,—only the *bamoth* were not removed, the people still sacrificed and burnt incense at the *bamoth*." (1 Kings, XXII, 43). So Jehoash "did what was right in the eyes of Jehovah all his days, as Jehoiada the Priest taught him—only the *bamoth* were not removed,* the people still sacrificed, etc." (2 Kgs. XII., 3, 4). The extraordinary thing here (if there be any one thing here more extraordinary than the others) is of course that the young king even under the influence of the High priest made no effort (so far as we are informed) to do away with the high places. The same language is used of Amaziah (2 Kgs. XIV., 3, 4), of Azariah (Uzziah) and of Jotham (XV., 4 and 34). On the other hand it is counted against Ahaz that he "sacrificed and burnt incense on the *bamoth* and on the hills and under every green tree." The specific character of this language seems to indicate that he did more than to make use of the traditional *bamoth*. Worship in the groves was especially associated with violations of morality and of Jehovah's law.

In the Northern kingdom, the rulers generally "walked in the ways of Jeroboam ben Nebat," so that no very certain conclusions can be drawn as to the attitude of the true worshipers of Jehovah towards the high places. Elijah seems nowhere to rebuke the people for deserting the Temple at Jerusalem; and, for the scene of his conflict with Baal's priests, he chose the broken altar on Carmel. He complains also at Horeb "thine altars have they broken down," where we might perhaps expect "they have forsaken Zion" (1 Kgs. XVIII. and XIX., 10).

The first attempt to do away altogether with the *bamoth* was made by Hezekiah. "He removed the *bamoth* and broke in pieces the *mazzeboth* and cut down the *asherah* and cut in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses made, for until those days the children of Israel were burning incense to it" (2 Kings XVIII., 4, 5). The reform did not take deep root, for Manasseh "built again the *bamoth*, which Hezekiah had destroyed;" at the same time, he added idolatry to this, even building additional altars in the Temple. Amon walked in the way of his father. But Josiah walked in the way of David. The most important event of his reign is the recovery of the book of the Tora. Its effect is well known. The king stamped out idolatry of every kind. "And

* The formula in the cases quoted is the same—the *bamoth* did not remove רַק הַבְּמוֹת לֹא קָרוּ.

he brought the priests from the cities of Judah and defiled the *bamoth* where the priests had burned incense from Geba to Beer Sheba, and he pulled down the *bamoth* of the gates which were at the door of Joshua, Sheik of the city, at the left as one enters the city gate. Only the priests of the *bamoth* did not go up to the altar of Jehovah in Jerusalem, but they ate unleavened cakes among their brethren" (2 Kgs. XXIII., 8, 9). This sentence is noticeable as informing us that [artificial] *bamoth* were erected in the city gates, as also that no one seems to have disputed the claims of the priests of the *bamoth* to be true priests of Jehovah, though they were not allowed to exercise their function in the Temple. The zeal of Josiah extended over what had been the Northern kingdom where also he destroyed the *bamoth*, whose priests had a fate very different from that of those in Judah as just mentioned. This is the last that we hear of these sanctuaries in the book of Kings. The successors of Josiah are however described as men who did evil; and we may readily infer that the old abuses returned under these weaklings: as in fact the book of Jeremiah shows that idolatry was rife. After the captivity, no one thought of any sanctuary outside of Jerusalem except the Samaritans with their rival temple on Gerizim.

The object of this paper is simply to call attention to the problems in Old Testament inquiry suggested by the history of the *bamoth* thus briefly sketched. They may be stated as follows:

1. What is the attitude of the author of the book of Samuel towards the Ark and the Tabernacle? Does he find the worship on the various high places regular or justified *ad interim* by the capture of the Ark?

2. How can we account for the action of Samuel, Solomon, Elijah and the very best men among the kings of Judah before Hezekiah in regard to the *bamoth*? Did they have access to the Tora in its written form and if so how did they understand its prohibitions?

The provisions of the Pentateuch itself are not perfectly clear or at least not perfectly agreed upon. In the first body of laws given at Sinai in immediate connection with the Decalogue, we find the now well known verse (Ex. XX., 24): "An altar of earth shalt thou make for me and shalt sacrifice on it thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep and thy cattle: *in every place* where I make my name remembered I will come to thee and bless thee—בְּכֹל-הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכֶּיר—אֶת-שְׁמִי אֲבוֹא אֵלָיָהּ וּבֵרַכְתִּיךָ. The natural interpretation of this language certainly seems to allow a multiplicity of altars. It has been

said* that the law does not contemplate "coexisting sanctuaries in Canaan, but altars successively reared at different places in the wilderness." If so it is difficult to account for the כל, or to understand why the purpose of the writer would not have been served by saying בַּמְקוֹם. The noun is used collectively as in the expression כָּל-הָאָדָם (Num., XVI., 32), which must mean *all the men*. Still the other passages in which this phrase is found, do actually refer to places visited in succession, and the altar of the earth, of this place, would then be "the wooden frame described Ex. XXVII., 1. ff.", filled with earth. Nothing is said about the earth in the description of the altar, and the next verse (Ex. XX., 25), which allows an altar of stones, is still a riddle. But we may let that pass; the verse would not be perhaps more than permissive at any rate, and we are thrown upon the more positive language of the other books. This is most distinct in Deuteronomy, as e. g. "Thou shalt not do so [like the Canaanites] to Jehovah thy God; but the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose from all thy tribes..... shall ye seek, and thou shalt come thither; And ye shall bring thither your burnt-offerings and your sacrifices, etc." (XII., 4-6; the same exhortation is repeated in the same chapter, verse 11, and elsewhere). This would seem definite enough, and it is evident that it was regarded by the later Hebrews as forbidding sacrifice elsewhere than at the one central altar. The apology offered by the book of Kings already noticed, has this language for its basis as had the reform of Josiah in all probability. Even though the Book of the Law in 2 Kings XXII. means the whole Pentateuch, the impression made on Josiah's mind must have been by the language in Deuteronomy. The legislation in Leviticus and Numbers has sometimes been supposed not to require unity of sanctuary. This however is a mistake. The description of the Tabernacle stamps it as the one sanctuary for the whole people. The offerings must be brought to *the* Tabernacle, offered on *the* altar, be presented by Aaron *the* Priest. In Leviticus (ch. XVII.) it is even forbidden to slaughter animals anywhere except at the door of the Tabernacle, probably to prevent sacrifice anywhere except upon the one altar. It is doubtful, however, whether we can count this prohibition as establishing the unity of sanctuary as a legal requirement for *all time*. It may have been intended to regulate the slaughter of cattle in the wilderness, and the prohibition is removed in Deuteronomy. The impression of the whole legislation remains the same—that the

* By Prof. Green (Moses and the Prophets, p. 74 and p. 311).

Tabernacle was intended to be the single legitimate place of worship for the whole people even after their settlement in Canaan. It is so understood in the book of Joshua, where the tribes west of the Jordan rebuked the Reubenites and Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh because they had built an altar—"to rebel against Jehovah our God" (XXII., 19). So had the trans-Jordanic people understood the law and had built the altar as a monument simply.

3. The attitude of the book of Kings as compared with the book of Chronicles,—is it the same on this point? This is part of the general problem of the harmony of the two books.

4. Finally, what was the attitude of the Prophets especially of the Northern kingdom towards the *bamoth* as opposed to a single sanctuary? From the time of Jeremiah all is plain. Isaiah also is in general easily understood, though it might be suspected that he, a resident of Jerusalem, would naturally emphasize the Temple. In regard to the other early prophets, however, we must think that the last word has not been spoken. An examination of their utterances lies beyond the scope of this paper.

THE RELATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO THE NEW.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST.

Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.

Christianity is the great goal toward which the development of revelation in all its earlier stages had been tending. From the beginning, Israel felt a sense of the relative character of its religion. It maintained this sense unimpaired through the best periods of its national life. It lost it only when, in the post-canonical age, Jehovism degenerated into a narrow and exclusive Judaism. The religion of the Old Testament is throughout a promise only, a shadow, a type. Its conscientious and purest endeavors are toward something higher and better than itself. Christ is its Alpha and Omega, the ruling idea of its entire movement. Apart from Christ it has no meaning. Only in the light of Christ can it be rightly understood.

It is needful that we emphasize this truth. He who loses sight of it will wrong the religion of the New Testament, no less than that of the Old. The New has its historical foundation in the Old; and the Old reaches its deepest meaning in the New. Between the two there exists *an inward organic unity*.

This indeed has often been denied. In all periods of the Church's

history, some have attempted to divorce the New from the Old, and have refused to admit any other than an external connection. In the Patristic age, while the Ebionites regarded Christianity as only a higher form of Judaism, which aimed to realize the popular idea of the Messiah, the Gnostics viewed it as standing in irrepressible conflict with the Old Testament. In the eyes of Marcion, the chief representative of this tendency, the religion of the New Testament had worth only as it broke away from the traditional bonds of the Old. In the Reformation age, Socinus, while acknowledging a certain historical value in the earlier Scriptures, ascribed to them no higher dogmatic and religious importance than other Protestants ascribed to the Apocrypha. And in modern times the same disposition has often manifested itself, to deny the internal and indissoluble tie between the religion of Israel and the religion of Christ. Schleiermacher, especially, was so deeply impressed with what is new and absolute in the New Testament revelations that he failed to see the necessity of its historical mediation in the Old. In manifest injustice to the Mosaic religion, which he confounds too much with the later Judaism, he maintains that Christianity stands in no closer internal relation to it than to the pagan religions of Greece and Rome.

But it is becoming more and more evident continually, through a profounder study of the Bible, that the religion of the Old Testament is not indifferent to that of the New, and that the religion of the New is inwardly bound to that of the Old. They form an organic whole, pervaded by the presence of the same spirit of revelation. The attitude which Christ assumed toward the Old Testament was not one of hostility. He indeed opposed the degenerate Judaism of His age; but it is hardly necessary to say that the Judaism of the scribes is not identical with the Jehovism of the Prophets. The one, with its dead literalism and false national hopes, takes its rise only when the other begins to fall into decay. So far from placing Himself in antagonism to the true religion of the Old Testament, Jesus stood forth rather as its defender against those who, professing to be its friends, were yet in reality its most destructive foes. He lived in the Old Testament. His spirit was in large measure nourished by communion with its saints. He felt no disharmony between it and Himself. On the contrary, He saw in it a progressive movement of which He was Himself the predestined goal. The pious Israelite, in becoming a disciple of Christ, knew that he was not, as in this case a heathen would be, disloyal to the religion of his fathers. Jesus was no revolutionist; He was not even a reformer:

He was a fulfiller, in whom the Old Economy reached its appointed end. And the Israelite, in attaching himself to His person, felt an inward conviction that he was acting in obedience to the spirit of his earlier religion.

But while it is necessary to insist strongly on the internal unity of the two Testaments, it is equally necessary to observe clearly the broad *difference* between them. Here, as elsewhere, unity is one thing, uniformity quite another. The old religion cannot be elevated to the plane of the new; the new is not simply a higher stage of the old. Mosaism may give birth to Prophetism as a higher development of Old Testament religion; but neither Mosaism nor Prophetism can give birth to Christianity. The religion of the New Testament does not spring genetically from that of the Old. It is a new creation in the person of Christ, the absolute revelation of the eternal Word; and while this revelation is mediated by all the preceding stages of Old Testament history, and thus stands in strictest continuity with the earlier revelation to the people of Israel, it is the manifestation of something new and not merely the further unfolding of something old. There is a dividing line between the Old and the New, which must be carefully maintained.

This, it must be confessed, has not always been done. While the early Church happily escaped the dangerous error of opposing the New Testament to the Old, it was not so happy in avoiding the no less dangerous error of confounding the one with the other. This is true especially of the Alexandrine School, which saw only a difference of degree between the Law and the Gospel, and ascribed to the prophets in general the same high illumination which it ascribed to the Apostles. But even Augustine, and with him the other Fathers of the Church, failed to distinguish the two economies rightly from a theoretical point of view. Nor were the reformers more successful. Amid all the difference of external forms, they discerned no difference in doctrine, but regarded the dogmatic faith of the Old Testament as identical with that of the New Testament. And in the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century there was a complete identification, from the after effects of which we are still suffering.

The source of this error is not difficult to trace. It lay in a one-sided intellectualistic conception of revelation, as essentially, almost exclusively, a communication of doctrinal truth to the understanding; and since the truth of revelation can only be one, the older divines sought and supposed they found the theoretical teachings of the New

Testament, everywhere in the pages of the Old. The one was for them as rich a repository of *dicta probantia*, for the peculiar dogmas of Christianity, and quite as available, as the other. The mystery of the Trinity was as fully disclosed to Moses as to John. The saints of the Old Testament, the patriarchs and prophets, had at least the grand outlines of the Christian salvation before their vision; and though its full meaning was not perfectly clear to their minds, they stood, in an intellectual point of view, at no great disadvantage behind the Christian believer. In a word, for the theologians of an early age, as indeed, for many of this, almost the only distinction between the Old Economy and the New was this: that to believers standing in the former, salvation was something still future in fact, though, as foreshadowed by types and announced by prophecy, present to thought; while on the other hand, in the Christian Economy, salvation has actually been brought to pass, and believers, standing in this economy, possess in reality what the pious in Israel could only long for as an object of prophetic vision.

It is evident, however, to one who has a right conception of the historical character of revelation, that this is not the relation which the religion of the Old Testament sustains to that of the New. Such an abstractly supernaturalistic view wrongs the whole idea of salvation. It will not allow the divine to come into true union with the human. It ignores the natural in the vain dream of thus honoring the supernatural. Old Testament history ceases to be truly historical, and is transformed into a divine play. Patriarchs and prophets become mere automata in the hand of God, and with no independent life, they think, speak and act only as they are magically touched by a foreign power. Inspired men are regarded as the passive organs of the Holy Ghost; and from this point of view, it is not surprising that the rich treasury of New Testament truth, should be supposed to have been fully opened to Old Testament saints.

But if we would determine the organic relation of the two Testaments aright, it needs to be clearly understood that the word of revelation, as a communication of divine truth, cannot be sundered from the history of revelation, as a communication of divine life. It is a mistake to suppose that revelation is for the theoretical understanding simply; it is for man in the totality of his being, and consists in the gradual and progressive self-manifestation and self-communication of God, in order that man, and through him the creation in general, at the head of which man stands, may be filled and glorified with the

divine life, and that thus he may reach the perfection of his existence in God, and God may be all in all. Revelation is possible in a fallen world only in the form of redemption. In revelation, God comes into history more and more fully, until in the incarnation He reveals the fullness of His life in the bosom of the world's life, that he may redeem it from sin and glorify it in Himself. In Christ, therefore, we have the absolute revelation, for which all antecedent revelation served merely as a preparation, by educating man to apprehend by faith the glorious mystery of the Word made flesh.

The preparation, however, was necessary as well as real. The incarnation could be no abrupt, sudden phenomenon. As such it would have been magical, not historical. An actual entrance of God into history for the purposes of salvation could be effected only by conforming to the law of all history, the law of gradual progressive development. And in truth, this is the form which the religion of the Old Testament assumed. It is one life flowing in unbroken continuity from Abraham to Christ; yet, like all life, unfolding itself in a series of stages, in which the truth of each lower stage comes to an ever fuller and clearer expression in the higher stages, and in which each higher stage is adumbrated, and at the same time mediated from the beginning by the lower. Starting in the individual, it widens into the family, and then into the nation, to become at last a universal possession in Christ. It first takes the form of Promise, then of Law, and finally, in Prophetism, it looks to the breaking up of an old order of things, and the advent of a new.

In the very nature of the case, the religion of the Old Testament and that of the New must be inwardly conjoined. In both there is the presence of the same spirit, and together they constitute the one true religion, in which there are, indeed, stages of development, but no fundamental contradictions. United by one central principle, the formal side of which is revelation and the material side redemption, their aim is not primarily theoretical, to furnish the human mind with a knowledge of God, but practical, to bring salvation from God to man. And since knowledge and life are everywhere inwardly related, the doctrinal apprehension of salvation is necessarily conditioned by the actual history of salvation. There are stages of progress in the one as well as in the other; and if we fail to recognize this fact, we shall fail to comprehend the relation of the Old Testament to the New.

Salvation, not doctrine, is the grand aim of revealed religion. But the religion of the Old Testament, even in the highest stage of its

development, was incapable of bringing the true salvation. Promise might awaken the hope of it; the discipline of the Mosaic Law might generate the sense of its need; prophecy might point to its certain advent; but neither promise, nor law, nor prophecy could do more than prepare the way for its actual accomplishment. In this regard the religion of the Old Testament was only a shadow and type, not the reality itself. It was the religion of a salvation that was really coming in the divinely guided history of Israel, but which had not yet actually come; a religion in which the divine was mirrored in holy, yet external, symbolical and transient forms, in which the perfect life was as yet only an ideal hovering before the pious mind in the form of law; in which God and man, heaven and earth, were seeking to come, but never really came, into a living and abiding union.

Christianity, on the other hand, is the religion of a salvation, fully brought to pass; in which the divine is not enshrined in holy symbols, but personally incarnate in human form; which confronts the trembling sinner not as a threatening law, but as a life-giving power; in which God and man, heaven and earth, are really and forever one in Christ;—it is the religion of the incarnation, of the eternal reconciliation of all antitheses, and of the final glorification of all existence.

It is in this light that we must study the Old Testament records. Without its guidance we shall assuredly go astray. If, on the one hand, we ignore the teleological character of the Old Testament revelation, we shall be exposed to the danger of rationalism; for we shall be affrighted by the manifold difficulties of a critical, dogmatic and ethical kind, and fail to see that these lie on the surface only and do not touch the inner life. If, on the other hand, we lose sight of its historical character, we shall be betrayed into that exaggerated view of the Old Testament, which lifts it up well nigh to the level of the New. A forced exegesis will become necessary, and we shall read into the inspired record our own arbitrary conceits.

"*Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet, Novum in Vetere latet,*" is indeed true in the sense that the Old is the undeveloped germ, the New the ripened fruit. There is no New Testament doctrine that is entirely new and whose roots do not strike far back into the Old. On the other hand, there is no Old Testament doctrine that is peculiar to the Old and that does not assume a higher form in the New. It is not true, however, that New Testament doctrine in its New Testament form was present to the minds of Old Testament saints. Such an assertion would be at variance with historical fact.

NOTES FROM ABROAD.

BY REV. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph. D.,

Leipzig, Germany.

Dr. Justus Olshausen, the Hebrew grammarian, is dead.

Hormuzd Rassam has returned to England, bringing with him some 12,000 inscriptions, the result of his excavations in Babylonia. These with the temple records and fragments of the Babylonian royal library which we possess, and the 60,000 contract tablets, chiefly from the archives of the great Babylonian banking house of Egibi, covering the period from 680 to 330 B. C., ought, when fully worked over, to make us tolerably familiar with the history, religion and social life of Assyria's powerful rival. For the pre-Semitic civilization of southern Babylonia, the excavations of M. de Sarzec, French vice-consul at Bassora, have yielded important results, although the work of decipherment has not yet been satisfactorily accomplished.

In Luthardt's *Zeitschrift* for December, 1882, C. I. Bredenkampf, *Privat-Docent* at Erlangen, suggests a plausible amendment of the Massoretic pointing of Gen. xx., 17. The verse now reads: "So Abraham prayed unto God; and God healed Abimelech [i. e. did not kill him. cf. v. 7], and his wife, and his maidservants [concubines(?)], and they bare" (וילדו). Verse 18 is generally regarded by commentators as a gloss to explain וילדו [for a similar gloss, cf. John v., 4], and is, therefore of no value as a proof of the original pointing of וילדו. Bredenkampf would point וילדו, defectively written for וילדיו, and translate: "Abimelech, and his wife, and his concubines, and his children," omitting v. 18 altogether. It is more natural and makes better sense, but is supported by no external evidence.

I noticed before the appearance of a fourth revised edition of Prof. A. Dillmann's commentary on Genesis. It is, I presume, known to your readers that this is only part of that author's work on the Hexateuch, two volumes of which (I. Genesis, II. Exodus and Leviticus) are now complete. Prof. Dillmann is at present working on Numbers and Deuteronomy, and Joshua is to follow. Partly this and other work, and partly lack of funds for such a purpose have prevented him from completing his publication of the Æthiopic version of the Old Testament (*Biblia Veteris Testamenti Æthiopica*). Vol. I (*Octateuchus Æthiopicus*), including Genesis — Ruth, appeared in 1853 (W. Vogel, Leipzig, 4to). Of vol. II. *fasciculi* 1 and 2 (Samuel and Kings)

were published at Leipzig at the cost of the *Deutsche Morgenlandische Gesellschaft* in 1861 and 1871 respectively. Prof. Dillmann hopes shortly, perhaps this year, to give to the public through the aid of the same learned society Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther (Tom. II. fasc. 3). There will still remain to be published three volumes, containing the Prophets, Hagiographa (exclusive of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ruth), and the Apocrypha, of which latter Enoch and the Book of Jubilees have been published separately. Prof. Dillmann is, I believe, acknowledged to be the first of Ethiopic scholars, and it is earnestly to be hoped that he may be enabled to complete the important work of publishing the ancient Ethiopic version of the Old Testament scriptures. The *British and Foreign Bible Society* will not assist because Geez (Ethiopic) is a dead language. Either some learned society must furnish the requisite funds, or sufficient subscribers must be found to defray the expense of publication.

The revised and enlarged 2d edition of Prof. Schrader's KAT. (*Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. Von Eberhard Schrader. Mit einem Beitrage von Dr. Paul Haupt. Giessen: F. Richterische Buchhandlung, 1883*), lies before me. The books of the Bible are here taken up in their order and commented upon by chapter and verse Assyriologically, in regard to history, geography, mythology, etymology, chronology, or whatever the passage in question suggests. (So at Nahum III., 8—10, he quotes the Assyrian account of the destruction of Thebes by Sardanapalus (Ashurbanihabal), and argues that with this event fresh before him the prophet is proclaiming the overthrow of Nineveh even as it had overthrown Thebes. He accordingly dates the prophecy about 660 B. C.) In this way the majority of the Biblical books come in for some notice, Genesis having by far the most space, and Isaiah coming next. In addition to this there are a chronological excursus and two glossaries, which together constitute the fullest Assyrian dictionary yet published, and a map by Kiepert. Dr. Haupt's excursus on the cuneiform narrative of the flood, with accompanying glossary, has also appeared separately. As usual with German books there is small pretence of indexing in our sense of the word. The Assyrian and Babylonian texts are given only in transcription. The author has the advantage of a very comprehensive knowledge, as also certain faults which ordinarily accompany such knowledge, notably a certain carelessness in some matters of detail. Prof. Schrader's past record is interesting. Prof. of Theology and Semitic languages he published at Zurich in 1869 his much revised edi-

tion of DeWette's Introduction to the Old Testament, a still standard work. As professor of Theology at Giessen (he is now in the philosophical faculty in Berlin) he began to turn his attention to the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions. In 1872 appeared the first edition of KAT., the first important book on the Semitic cuneiform inscriptions in the German Language. In the same year appeared ABK. (*Die ass.-bab. Keilinschriften*), and in 1878 KGF. (*Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*). There are also several minor works. Scarcely middle-aged, he is the patriarch of German Assyriology, other Assyriologists being either his scholars or his scholars' scholars. On his work rest the Assyrian-Babylonian portions of Duncker's *Geschichte des Alterthums*, and Leopold von Ranke's *Universal History*, as also of the new editions of Gesenius' *Dictionary*, and Dillmann's *Genesis*. Besides Assyrian-Babylonian and Summerian-Akkadian, Prof. Schrader lectures on Syriac, Biblical Aramaic (Chaldaic) and Ethiopic. His doctor's thesis was, if I mistake not, on Ethiopic, and both he and Haupt, also a good Ethiopic scholar, lay much stress on the close connection of Assyrian and Ethiopic.

The revival last year of the old superstition that the Jews use Christian blood in their paschal ceremonies has called forth two books, one in Berlin, and one in Vienna, disproving the charge on Christian evidence. A curious commentary on the times.

Dr. Aug. Wuensche has translated into German the Midrash *Schemot Rabba*, the haggadic interpretation of the 2nd book of Moses Cap. II., 3, as commentary to: "And when she could no longer conceal him," we read: "Why? Because the Egyptians went into every house where they thought a child was born, and took a little Egyptian child with them and made it cry outside before the house, so that the Israelitish child when it heard it might cry, too. That is written also Cant. II., 15: Take us foxes, little foxes." This is a sober passage from a sober part of the work. After chapter X. it becomes mystical and allegorical, and devotes a great deal of attention to the interpretation of the hidden meanings of the individual letters.

(*Der Midrasch Schemot Rabba, das ist die haggadische Auslegung des zweiten Buches Mosis, zum ersten Male ins Deutsche uebertragen von Lic. Dr. Aug. Wuensche. Otto Schulze, Leipzig, 1882.*)

ELIJAH, THE GREAT PROPHET REFORMER.

[From Gelkic's Hours with the Bible.]

On the prophets rested the hope of the future. The degraded priesthood that had supplanted that of Aaron had entirely lost position and independence. Unfortunately, the times which had tried others put the prophets also to a test which too many of them failed to stand. The fierceness of Jezebel terrified not a few into silence. Many fled to the security of the desert or the hills, and large numbers were won over to an outward conformity to Baal worship, or, at least, to a politic and unworthy complaisance towards power. From Ahab's reign there appear "false prophets;" men who, to get quiet, or honor, or pay, used their high gifts to flatter and serve the great, by prophesying what they fancied would please. Henceforward the pure and noble among the order had to contend, with ever-increasing earnestness, against this corruption and debasement of some of its members, and were too often persecuted by them.

Still, amidst this reign of terror, there were some faithful Abdiels who clung to the religion of their fathers, and among these, but high above them all, towered Elijah, "the grandest and most romantic character that Israel ever produced."

He had the greatness of soul to stand up singly, face to face with the whole power of the kingdom, on behalf of Jehovah. Appearing and disappearing like an apparition, his life depending on his rapid flight after delivering his message, no dangers kept him back from any point where duty demanded his presence. He shows how one man, strong in the support of God and the right, can by fearless courage and absorbing zeal change the whole course of history in his time; resist and overthrow the most crushing tyranny over conscience, and bring in a new victorious epoch. He was an anticipation of Athanasius in his grand attitude of standing "alone against the world," and he was the conqueror in the struggle.

The abruptness of his introduction adds to the interest of his story. Nothing is told us of his parentage or birthplace, beyond the words "Elijah, the Tishbite, of the inhabitants of Gilead;" but where Tishbeh was is as yet altogether uncertain. His whole character, however, and his appearance and habits of life, point to his being a Gileadite, though it seems impossible to believe with Graetz that he was not an Israelite, but belonged to one of the old native races. Gilead was a land of chase and pasture, of tent villages and mountain castles; with a population of wandering, half-civilized, fierce shepherds, ready at all times to repel the attacks of the desert tribes, or to go out on a foray against them. Many of these Arab traits are seen in the notices of Elijah. Apparently tall, he must have been sinewy and thin from his simple fare, his hard life, the rapidity of his movements, and his powers of physical endurance. His hair hung long and thick down his back, for he was a Nazarite. It would seem, indeed, that the prophets as a rule took this vow.—His dress was a simple tunic, held round him by a belt of hide, which he tightened when, like a Bedouin, he wished to run for a long distance. Over this he commonly wore, like the peasants of Palestine now, a mantle or cape of sheepskin with the wool on it, or of coarse camel's hair cloth, which, as already noticed, became the special characteristic of prophets. In this mantle he at times hid his face when under strong emotion, and he used it, rolled up like a

staff, to smite the waters of Jordan when about to pass over them. On one occasion we find him bowing himself on the ground, with his face between his knees, perhaps in prayer, though the usual attitude in devotion was to stand.

The immense influence of Elijah during his life is seen in the place he held in the memory of after generations in Israel. He takes rank along with Samuel and Moses; not like the former, as the apostle of a system yet undeveloped; or as the founder of a religion, like the latter; but as the restorer of the old when it was almost driven from the earth. The prophet Malachi portrays him as the announcer of the great and terrible day of Jehovah. His reappearance was constantly expected as the precursor of the Messiah. So continually was he in the thoughts of the people of New Testament times that both John the Baptist and our Lord were supposed to be no other than he. The son of Sirach calls him a fire, and says that his word burned like a torch, and that it was he who was to gather together again the tribes of Israel from the great dispersion. The Jews believe that he appeared often to wise and good Rabbis, generally under the form of an Arab merchant. At the circumcision of Jewish children, a seat is always left vacant for him. After the wine cup of each passover is drunk, the youngest child of a Jewish family opens the door, and all rise and look towards it, thinking that Elijah then enters. His final coming, it is believed, will be three days before that of the Messiah, and on each of the three days he will proclaim peace, happiness, and salvation, in a voice that will be heard over all the earth. So firm, indeed, was the conviction of this in the days of the Talmud, that when goods were found which no owner claimed, the common saying was, Put them by till Elijah comes.

Like every great enthusiastic soul, that of Elijah kindled others by his words and example. He quickened the religious life of the nation, as Samuel had done in his day. Thus, the sect of the Rechabites seems to have owed its origin to him—a body of faithful servants of God collected by Jonadab, the son of Rechab, who retired from the strife and persecution of the times, to worship Jehovah in seclusion from the temptations and trials of the world. The hope of the future, they fancied, lay in a strict return to the simplicity and strictness of the past, and they therefore bound themselves to live in tents. They chose the lonely wilderness of the Southern Jordan for their home; and adopted in their fulness the vows of Nazarites. Abstaining from wine and the grape, they confined themselves for food to the products of the desert, and formally bound themselves to have neither tilled land, nor vineyards, nor fixed dwellings.

But the most striking result of the appearance of Elijah was the impulse he gave to prophetic activity. The communities of sons, or disciples, of the prophets, of which there is no mention from the earlier years of David, appear again in the fullest vigor, cherishing the ancient faith in the calm and seclusion of their settlements. Among these there were not wanting such as Micaiah, to stand up boldly, like Elijah, before the world, for the truth. The honored servant of Elijah, Elisha, the son of Shaphat, especially takes a grand place as the champion of Jehovah, and, after him, generations of his order showed, in their zeal and incorruptible loyalty to God, how deeply the example of the Tishbite had stirred them.

Yet the work of Elijah, with all its glory, was marked by the imperfection of the dispensation to which he belonged. The defender of a national theocracy, he

burst on his age as a minister of judgment against unrighteousness: his sternness like that of the storm; his words lightning and tempest. All his acts show him, like a fire, consuming the ungodly; an embodiment of the avenging justice of Jehovah in an evil day. Glowing zeal, dauntlessness of soul, and unbending severity are his leading traits, though he showed the gentlest sympathy in the relations of private life. As the great and strong wind, and the earthquake and fire, rent the mountains and broke in pieces the rocks, before Jehovah—the awful precursors of the still small voice, for which they prepared the way—Elijah came to open the path for the kingdom of God, and bring about a state of things in which its gentle message of love could be proclaimed amongst men. He was not so much the foreshadowing image of our Divine Master as a contrast to His Spirit. The Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them. The wish of His disciples to call down fire from heaven, as Elijah had done, to consume those who refused to receive Him, evoked only a rebuke from Jesus Christ.

✦ EDITORIAL NOTES. ✦

Renewal.—Now that *one year* has passed since THE HEBREW STUDENT began its work, it is time for many of our subscribers to renew their subscriptions. They will receive in due time blanks, which they are requested to fill out and return. We hope that *all* will feel inclined to do this. The second year in the history of a paper or periodical is perhaps even more critical than the first, and it is natural for us to look forward with some interest to the issue of the undertaking. Although many have suggested that the price be raised, it is to remain at the same rate, *one dollar per year*, in order that no one may feel unable to take it. To furnish the journal at this price, however, it is *necessary* that many new names be added to the list. With so low a subscription price, it is, of course, impossible to offer premiums, or to allow much discount to those who act as agents. We, therefore, ask each one of our subscribers, of whose interest in our success we feel confident, not only to forward promptly his own name for the coming year, but also to secure, if possible, the name of some neighboring minister or teacher, or of some layman who is interested in such studies. It would not be difficult for each one to do this. Is there any reason why he should not do it? *Will he not do it*, and thereby give substantial aid to the cause whose interests the journal is intended to subserve? It need not be said that everything depends upon the interest which our friends exhibit in this matter. **If** it were the purpose in this work to make it a financial success merely, it would ill become us to ask such a favor, but we ask it because we feel that the undertaking is one which deserves the support of every Christian minister and scholar, and because we know that unless help of this nature is given, and that, too, in large measure, it will be impossible to realize what could reasonably be expected, in the way of improvement and growth. Who will send a list of *twenty* new subscribers? Who will send *ten*? How many will send *at least one*? We believe there are many to whom this appeal will not come in vain.

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.—For the following notice we are indebted to the kindness of the Secretary of the Society, Prof. Gardiner. The fact that the notice has not been inserted earlier will in no way detract from its interest:

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis held its sixteenth semi-annual meeting in the chapel of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, on the 28th of December last. Twenty-four of the members were present, and some of the papers read and the discussions upon them were of unusual interest. The hour devoted to short exegetical notes, which do not appear upon the programme or in the publications, continues to be a valuable feature. One important paper "On the argument *e silentio*" in reference to the Mosaic law, by Rev. Dr. Briggs, was, at the author's request, deferred to the next meeting. It was decided that this meeting shall be held in Middletown, Conn., during the first week in June. It was resolved to publish a selection of the papers read in 1882, as far as the funds will allow, in a second number of the "Journal." This number, which embraces most of the papers, has been delayed by the difficulty of obtaining sufficient Syriac type, but is now in press and may be expected to appear in the latter part of April. Several new members were elected.

The paper which elicited most discussion (continuing altogether about four hours) was by Prof. Francis Brown "On the Testimony of the New Testament books." Other papers were by the Rev. E. R. Craven, D. D., "On 1 Tim. iv., 1-5;" by Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph. D., "On the Syriac Apocalypse;" by Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D. D., "On כָּרַח in Josh. xvii., 15, 18 and Ezek. xxi., xxiii., 47;" and by Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph. D., "On Hand uplifting as a religious ceremony." The proposed paper by Rev. Henry Furguson "On the date of the book of Jonah" was withdrawn. The meeting on the whole was a very interesting and profitable one.

Ethiopic.—There are few Ethiopic scholars in America. Little or no attention has been given to the study of this language. It is closely allied to the Hebrew, but is said to be simpler and less copious. It has not been a spoken language since the fourteenth century. The entire Bible was translated into Ethiopic about 400 A. D., when Christianity was first introduced. There are besides several religious and historical works. The translation of the Bible was made from the Septuagint and not from the original Hebrew, and is therefore of less value. Editions of individual books of the Bible have been published at various times, but no effort was made to publish the whole Bible until Prof. Dillmann undertook it. It would seem from an item in "Notes from Abroad," that it is uncertain whether he will be able to finish this work. Since the work has progressed so far, it would be a great loss not to have it completed. Besides, it would probably be quite difficult to find another man as competent to carry out the work as Professor Dillmann. It is said to be necessary either that some society undertake the task of publishing it, or that a sufficient number of subscriptions be obtained to defray the expense. There is every reason why such an undertaking should be encouraged. Are there not persons in our country who will lend their aid to this work by subscribing for it? Are there not libraries in which a copy of it should be placed? It would give us great pleasure to forward direct to Prof. Dillmann the names of any who may desire to help him by subscribing for a copy of his Ethiopic Bible.

The High-Places.—One of the most interesting, as well as important, questions of Higher Criticism is that of the Bāmôth or *High-Places*. That there are difficul-

ties in reconciling the facts in the case with the common view of pentateuchal history is confessed by all. But the first thing is to ascertain these facts; and we think that they are presented clearly and fairly by Prof. Smith in his article published in this number. His aim is only to make a statement of the case, and the questions involved. It is a problem well deserving study. We would urge those who have not done so, to read in connection with this, the chapter entitled "The Worship in High Places," in Prof. Green's "Moses and the Prophets." Nowhere else is there to be found so satisfactory an explanation of the conduct of Samuel in this particular. Whether or not the explanation is sufficient, is, of course, the question.

The General Interest in the Critical Questions.—There is a very deep interest felt at present in subjects which heretofore have been entirely given over to the hands of scholars. This interest is wide-spread. Two queries arise: (1) Why is this the case? (2) Will it long continue?

The fact itself may be accounted for partly because to-day Christian people in general show a more lively interest in everything that pertains to their religion. It is also true that at no previous time have those who professed Christianity, attained to the same degree of scholarship and intellectual activity. There are more Christian scholars among the ministers and laymen of our day than ever before,—let us hope, however, that the number may yet be increased. But the chief reason why these questions of "criticism" have excited such general interest is found in the fact of their fundamental significance. It is not too much to say that everything is involved, since everything rests upon that most fundamental of all doctrines—Inspiration. If the conclusions even of the most radical critics can be shown to be consistent with a correct theory of Inspiration it really matters not what they may be. But if the result is to be the denial of Inspiration and the placing of the Old Testament Scriptures upon a plane with other ancient writings, then what?

Will this agitation continue long? There are some who think that it is a matter of recent growth, and that within a short time it will wear itself out, and the whole question will be dismissed from the mind. Similar discussions concerning the New Testament and Homer are cited as parallels. The term "Higher Criticism" is supposed to be a new one, invented for the purpose of throwing discredit upon "Lower Criticism," which is understood to refer to the traditional way of viewing these questions. This may be true, but facts seem to point in a different direction. Ever since the publication of Eichhorn's "Introduction to the Old Testament" (1780), that, which he denominated *Higher Criticism*, otherwise known as *Literary Criticism*, in distinction from *Lower* or *Textual Criticism*, has been fighting its way for recognition. Nor is it even yet universally recognized. There are many who still refuse to allow the Bible to be investigated from the human stand-point, who still refuse to notice the *human* element in Scripture. The study of the Science of Old Testament Introduction, although it dates far back, is but begun, and we may look forward to many years of painful discussion. The questions that have been started are numerous, and the data for settling them, scarce. New material is constantly being found, which must be systematized before it can be used to ad-

vantage. It is not to be expected, therefore, that a year or a decade, or a century will see the matter settled.

→BOOK NOTICES←

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

GESENIUS' DICTIONARY.

At the Oriental Congress held in Berlin in September of 1881, Prof. Volck of Dorpat announced the publication of a ninth edition of Gesenius' dictionary (*Handwoerterbuch zum Alten Testament*) from himself and his colleague, Prof. Muehlau. After excusing the shortcomings of the eighth edition (1878) on the ground of the insufficiency of the time allotted to the editors for their work, he promised for the new edition a complete revision of all the material, etymological, exegetical and archæological, as well as a new introductory treatise on the sources of Hebrew lexicography, or at least a complete revision of the original treatise of Gesenius, bearing date 1823 and prefixed to every edition since. This announcement occasioned a brief debate on the faults of the eighth edition. The general charges made were that sufficient attention had not been paid by the editors to recent exegetical work, with the exception of that of Prof. Franz Delitzsch, that the comparison of Arabic and other Semitic tongues was rather mechanical than scientific, and the varied usage of the same word by different writers was not clearly defined. Prof. Volck waived his right to answer these complaints, and promised for the new edition all that care and toil could do.

The first half of the work (through עֲרָב) has been for some little time before the public, and the second half, originally promised for the autumn of 1882, will soon be out. In spite of promises our indulgence is craved once more. The last edition was all gone, and the publisher (Vogel, Leipzig) could not wait, therefore the work had to be prematurely hurried through the press.

The co-workers on this edition are essentially the same as on the last. The eighth edition was the first to make use of the etymological work of Prof. Fleischer of Leipzig, the greatest Arabic scholar in Germany, if not in the world. In the ninth edition his assistance is more direct and extensive. Prof. Franz Delitzsch, whose name is a synonym for Hebrew scholarship, has taken an active part in the preparation of this edition, as he did also in the last. Prof. Schrader of Berlin placed at the disposal of the editors the proof sheets of his new edition of KAT. In addition to this, Prof. Strack of Berlin lent his private, annotated copy of the eighth edition to the editors, which may account for an occasional reference to Prof. Dillmann's commentaries, as also to Ryssel's work in the last edition (1876) of Fuerst's *Woerterbuch*, these two means of assistance having been especially emphasized by Prof. Strack in his remarks on the eighth edition in the Oriental Congress. It is said that a certain distinguished Assyriologist was also

asked to co-operate, but that his corrections were too numerous for the editors to accept, wherefore his co-operation ceased. Be this as it may, Assyrian is still but feebly represented. Ethiopic also, is not strong, although an improvement on the eighth edition, and the writing of Ethiopic words is inconsistent, sometimes Ethiopic characters being used, and sometimes Roman.

To commence with the general changes which have been made—and it must be said that the corrections and improvements are more numerous than we had been led to expect, both from the shortness of the time allotted to the work, and from the dissatisfaction expressed by Assyriologists—one important improvement has been a revision of the references to Bible passages. It is also no small convenience to have those words to which a complete list of references is given marked by a cross; it indicates *ἀπαξ λεγόμενα* and seldom occurring words at once, and frequently saves reference to a concordance. Another general change is the substitution of *Gen., Ex., etc.*, for *1 M., 2 M., etc.* This seemed at first sight intended to indicate the disbelief of the editors in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but in answer to an inquiry on the subject we have been assured that it is in no sense *tendenziöses*. Another general change, not in all cases consistently carried out, is the substitution of the name *Aramaic* for *Chaldaic*, and frequently for *Syriac* also. A change more important than either of the two latter, is the addition of a considerable number of new references to articles in magazines and encyclopædias, as also to recent books, conspicuous among the latter being Prof. Schrader's *KAT.*, and Prof. Frdr. Delitzsch's *Wo lag das Paradies?* In the case of geographical names especially, the last mentioned work seems to have been faithfully used. In spite of all these changes, the bulk of the dictionary has been slightly decreased.

So much in general. It may be well to notice a few particulars, which will serve to give an idea of the compass and character of those changes which cannot be described under general heads.

The former explanation of אֲבִרָהִם as *father of many* by reference to the lexicographical Arabic word, *ruhām*, has been abandoned, and Dillmann's explanation of אֲבִרָהִם as a mere variant, an older or dialectic form, of אֲבִרָהִם, adopted.

אֲסַנְפַר is in the new edition explained (according to Lenormant) as Assurbanipal (Sardanapalus), but this explanation is curiously added, without punctuation even, to the former interpretation, "proper name of an Assyrian king or satrap."

Under גִּירְוֹן the concluding sentence of the old article, as to the effect that it is impossible to reconcile the geographical statements regarding the rivers of Paradise contained in Gen. II. with the present condition of the earth's surface, is omitted, and in its stead considerably increasing the bulk of the article, a summary of Prof. Frdr. Delitzsch's views appears with apparent approval on the part of the editors. According to this גִּירְוֹן is the Arachtu [Assyrian name], Gughâna [aboriginal, or non-Semitic name] of the cuneiform inscriptions, the "Babylonian Nile," modern *Schatt-en-Nil*, a canal branching off from the Euphrates on the east at a point near Babylon, and rejoining the same stream on the border between middle and southern Babylon. The פִּישׁוֹן is the Pallakopas canal, on the Arabian or western side of the Euphrates, on which lay the city Ur, while Erech was on

the גִּזְרֵן. Eden would then lie in Babylonia, between the point where the Euphrates and Tigris, at present, converge most closely and a point somewhat south of Babylon. The מִישַׁר mentioned in Gen. II., 13, was northern [and middle] Babylonia, or Melucha. The name Melucha was applied to Ethiopia also, because the Ethiopians bore a name the same as or similar to that of the inhabitants of Melucha proper, the Kassu, or more properly Kasdu, i. e. מִישַׁר.*

In the article on אַרְפַּכְשָׁד the old explanation that it is identical with Ἀρπαχίτις, seems still to be preferred, but reference is made to *Wo lag das Paradies?* as containing another etymology, which, however, is not given. Delitzsch (and Oppert) deny the possibility of identifying Ἀρπαχίτις of the Greeks, Arapha of the cuneiform inscriptions, with אַרְפַּכְשָׁד. Pointing out that in Gen. x., 22 side by side with Assur as a son of Shem, we should expect Babylonia, Delitzsch suggests that אַרְפַּכְשָׁד is Babylonia under the form *Arba-kisadi*, or *land of the four sides*, i. e. *four quarters of the heavens*. In support of this suggestion he brings forward the important rôle which the four quarters of the heavens played in Babylon, so that a chief title of the kings was "king of the four quarters of the heavens," while the land itself appears, once at least, as "the land of the four quarters of the heavens." With this he compares also the name *Arba-ilu* (Arbela), *city of the four gods*. On the other side, as he himself admits, we should in this case expect the word *kibru*, rather than its synonym *kisadu*.

חַרַּץ was explained in the eighth edition as a *burned, dry spot*, from חָרַר; it is now explained as from (sic) the Assyrian *harranu*, *road*.

For חַתָּן (not used in Qäl, in Hithpäl to form a marriage connection) both editions give the primary signification of the root as *cut*, but whereas the eighth edition starting from the passive form חִתְּנָה, *bridegroom, son-in-law*, explained the secondary sense as *cut into another family*, hence the use of Hithpäl, and the meaning of the forms חַתָּן, *father-in-law*, and חַתְּנָה, *mother-in-law*, the ninth edition, starting from the active forms חִתְּנָה and חַתָּן, gives the secondary sense as *decide, determine*, as a father and mother determine with respect to their children, hence also *betroth*, and so *son-in-law* or *bridegroom* as *the betrothed one*. In this case Hithpäl seems to be a denominative, and not a direct formation from Qäl.

Having illustrated somewhat the nature of the changes which have been made, we will also endeavor in the same manner to illustrate the changes which have not been made. The article on the word אַמְרָה, *ell* or *cubit*, is the same which has appeared in every edition. Now even admitting the connection of this word with אִמָּה, *mother*, which we very much doubt, that connection as shown from the vocal-

* We do not understand the attitude towards *Wo lag das Paradies?* of conservative critics. Rev. Dr. C. H. H. Wright, of Belfast, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, for example, accepted the author's conclusions as to the site of Paradise, and seemed to regard the book as a conservative argument. To us its tendency seems directly the opposite of conservative. If Prof. Delitzsch's identification of the site of Paradise be correct, then the intimate knowledge of Babylonia displayed in Gen. II., as well as the choice of Babylonia as the starting point of the human race, would be a strong argument for the exilic origin of the Jahvistic narrative. Compare also Rev. A. H. Sayce in the article on Babylonia in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: "Indeed, the Jehovistic version of the flood story in Genesis agrees not only in details, but even in phraseology with that which forms the eleventh lay of the great Babylonian epic."

ization, cannot be one of direct derivation of the former from the latter. Assyrian *ummu*, *mother*, Arabic *um* or *im*, Syriac *emo*, and Ethiopic *em* all show an impure vowel from which the pure vowel of אִמָּה could scarcely be derived, although, of course, both might come from the same root. The explanation according to which it is the *mother of the arm, forearm*, and then *ell* or *cubit*, is a pure piece of rabbinism, a mere play of fancy. The explanation given under No. 3 of the same article of הָאִמָּה in 2 S. VIII., 1, *mother-city, metropolis*, is also forced and unnatural, especially in view of the play on the meaning of the word אִמָּה in the following verse. No. 3 should be omitted entirely, and the אִמָּה of 2 S. VIII., 1 be referred as a proper name to No. 5.

The article on the adverb אֲרִרְדָּא, Ezra VII., 23, with its statement that it is of Persian origin "like a number of Chaldaean adverbs," remains unchanged. Early editions ascribe the names of the months, with much else, to the Persian, but the progress of Assyriology has led to the abandonment of these Persian etymologies one after another. Both the eighth and ninth editions have corrected most of these errors, and therefore it is all the more surprising to find such a statement as this. The etymology of the word is not altogether clear. The explanation in Gesenius is that it is formed from the Persian *durust* by prefixing an א prosthetic. Compare with this Prof. Frdr. Delitzsch's explanation in Baer's new edition of the books of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah. He suggests a combination of two roots, אָרַר, denoting *first* or *highest*, and אָרַד (contained in the form אֲרִדָּא, Dan. II., 5, 8), which he supposes to mean *firm*, so that the compound would mean literally *exceedingly firm*. This explanation of אֲרִרְדָּא seems also to be preferred by the editors of Gesenius to the older and more usual one of *gone out*, which would connect it with אָזַל by an interchange of ל and ד without analogy.

To turn to the articles on the letters of the alphabet. In the article on ב instead of the examples adduced from Greek and modern European languages of the interchange of *b* and *m*, space might have been found to support the interchange of ב and פ, of which mention is made, by a comparison of the Assyrian, where these two mutes interchange so readily that the same sign may serve for either. So also in the article on ג, which has been somewhat improved in the new edition, the interchange of ג, כ and ק could be best supported by a reference to Assyrian, where the three are largely interchangeable. The articles on י and ח have been rewritten. In the case of the former, a comparison of the Mesha and Silvah inscriptions has finally forced the editors to retract the statement of the eighth edition that in all the older alphabets the essential part of the letter י was a perpendicular stroke representing something like a spit. In those inscriptions that letter consists of two horizontal strokes connected in the middle by a perpendicular one; but this general form is so common in other inscriptions also that it is difficult to see how the now omitted statement could ever have been made, excepting as the result of a preconceived theory. Among the changes in the article on ח is a parenthesis to the effect that the Assyrian distinguishes two sounds in that letter (when initial). The statement of the former edition that the Hebrew distinguishes two sounds corresponding to the Arabic has been

modified away. In the ten articles on letters of the alphabet there is only one reference to the Assyrian, and that the statement as a fact of a still somewhat doubtful and rather fine theory. There are two references, under η and א , to Ethiopic, while Arabic and Aramaic are compared in almost every case. The same undue preponderance of the two latter languages in comparison with the former, is evident if we take such common words as אב and אם , *father* and *mother*, where the Arabic and Aramaic forms are compared, but the Assyrian (*abu, ummu*) and Ethiopic (*ab, em*) are omitted.*

There are still two or three general heads on which we must take exception to the etymological part of the present work. The theory of biliteral roots has been carried too far on insufficient data. For example the word אב , *young shoot, young green*, is referred to the non-existent verb form אבב , the root of which is given as אב , probably related to הב , and like this onomatopoeic, with the original signification *breathe*, and then *sprout, shoot*. The form אנבה (with suff.) meaning *fruit*, which occurs in the book of Daniel, is referred to a non-existent *status absolutus* אב , the double ב there latent being supposed to be resolved into נב . Now the אנבה seems in reality to be borrowed from the Assyrian *inbu, fruit*, consequently the whole explanation given in Gesenius falls to the ground. The נ in אנבה is not due to the resolution of a double ב , but the daghesh in the suffixed forms of אב , *green shoot* is due to the assimilation of an original נ . We have then instead of אנב, אבב , which can scarcely be explained as אב or הב . We do not object to the general principle that Semitic roots were biliteral before they were trilateral; but we do object to any attempt to determine the original two letters, whether by comparison with the Hamitic tongues or from Semitic alone, which does not take into account all the languages of the Semitic family. What is true with reference to the ground form is also true with reference to the ground sense. To explain words or forms by a comparison of one or two Semitic languages only, is as unsound as it would be to explain Latin words and forms by a reference to Greek and Celtic, without any reference to Sanskrit, Zend, &c. While acknowledging the great importance of Arabic in the study of Hebrew etymology, we are inclined to think that Assyrian is still more important; both by its greater antiquity and by its closer linguistic connection with the Hebrew, not to speak of the intimate relations into which the two languages were brought by the Babylonian captivity. On the other hand it must be allowed that Assyriology is not thoroughly equipped for comprehensive etymological comparison. Much is still uncertain, and contradiction follows contradiction from the pens of Assyrian scholars, too many of whom have an unfortunate habit of confusing facts and hypotheses in their writings.

Another complaint, not original with us, and applicable to Hebrew lexicography

* The general opinion at present seems to be that the Phœnician characters are descended from the hieratic forms of the Egyptian hieroglyphics (cf. e. g. Dr. Julius Euting's table of Semitic characters in Dr. S. I. Curtiss' translation of Prof. Bickell's *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*; also remarks on p. 9 ss. of same work). But in the case of at least two of the ten letters under consideration, the resemblance to the Assyrian characters is far more striking than any of the resemblances to the hieroglyphics: viz. א (a-leph ox;) and the Assyrian character meaning alpu ox; ב (beth house) and Assyrian *ab* (betu house). In both these cases the forms are almost identical.

in general, is that everything must be explained. This is peculiarly true as regards proper names. In the eighth edition אֶפְרַיִם was explained as *fortress* and a connection with an Arabic root *akad* suggested. The ninth edition has omitted this explanation, recognizing the non-Semitic character of the name, but it retains the similar explanation of חֶמְתַּי as *fortress*. Is it absolutely certain that חֶמְתַּי was a Semitic city, and that the name is a Semitic name? In a dictionary the greatest care should be taken to indicate any uncertainty which may exist; this would, moreover, vastly increase the value of the certainties. Take again the names of the twelve tribes! The popular traditional etymologies are given as scientific facts. Such popular etymologies of ancient or foreign names have no value which should entitle them to rank as ascertained facts in a dictionary.*

In spite of the grave faults which we have noticed in the ninth edition of Gesenius' dictionary, so far as it has appeared, and the haste and frequent patchiness of the revision, it is, nevertheless, a very valuable book, to the best of our knowledge superior to any Hebrew lexicon in existence. It is also no inconsiderable improvement over the eighth edition, although not all that was promised. With the second part will appear the introduction, register, &c., of which we purpose speaking in a future article, which article, as well as the present, will, we hope, be of some use to those who possess Robinson's or Tregelles' translations, and not only to those who use German editions.

JNO. P. PETERS.

* It is pretty generally admitted that the Hebrews learned Hebrew first in Canaan, but we do not remember to have seen the consequences of this applied with reference to ancient names antedating the conquest. Were they translated?—in which case we may seek the etymology of their forms in Hebrew—or were they retained and merely in course of time externally hebraized? If the latter be the case, we must abandon the attempt to explain these words from the Hebrew alone, which involves of necessity the rejection of the popular etymologies occasionally occurring in the Bible, and resort to a comparative method. And we must also further acknowledge that we are unable to do more than give general, that is root, explanations.

✦ SEMITIC ✦ AND ✦ OLD ✦ TESTAMENT ✦ BIBLIOGRAPHY. ✦

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- STANLEY, DEAN, Sinai and Palestine, in Connection with their History. New and revised edition. New York: *A. C. Armstrong & Son*. 8vo, 640 pp. \$2.50
- BAILEY, G. S., The Word and Works of God. Philadelphia: *American Baptist Publication Society*. 12mo, 255 pp. \$1.00
- ROBERTS, ALEX., D. D., Old Testament Revision: a hand-book for English readers. New York: *Scribner and Welford*. 16mo, 280 pp. \$1.40.
- HARRIS, J. A., Principles of Agnosticism applied to Evidences. New York: *T. Whittaker*. 12mo, 128 pp. \$.75

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- ECKER, J., Prof. Dr. Bickell's "Carmina Veteris Testamenti metrico." Der neueste Versuch e. hebr. Metrik, beleuchtet. Muenster: *Theissing*. gr. 8, 25 S. M. 50
- CASSEL, P., Das Bisthum von Jerusalem. Nach e. Vortrage. Berlin: *Kuehl*. gr. 8, 19 S. M. 50
- BRUGSCH, H., Thesaurus Inscriptiorum Ægyptiacurum. Altægyptische Inschriften, gesammelt, verglichen, uebertragen, erklart und autographiert. 1 Abthl. Astronom. u. astrolog. Inschriften altægypt. Denkmaler. Leipzig: *Heinrichs*, 4to, vii, 194 S. M.50
- FOSTER, C., The Story of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, including the Historical Connection between the Old and New Testaments. *Griffin*, 8vo, 694 pp. 6s.
- ZIEGLER, L., Bruchstuecke e. vorhieronymianischen Uebersetzung d. Pentateuch, aus e. Palimpseste der K. Hof- u. Staatsbibliothek zu Muenchen zum ersten Male veroeffentlicht. gr. 4, vi., xxx., 88 S. M.15.
- GRANT, P. W., The Great Memorial Name; or, The Self-revelation of Jehovah as the God of Redemption. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. 8vo, 438 pp. . . . 6s.
- WATKINS, J. W., History of Egypt. London: *Hagger*. 4to, Pts. 1-10. Each, 1s.
- BUTTAFOCO, D. de, Etude historique sur l'origine des Egyptiens. Bastia: *Olivieri*. 8vo, 15 pp.
- HUTTON, C. F., Unconscious Testimony; or, The Silent Witness of the Hebrew to the Historical Scriptures. London: *Kegan Paul and Co*. 12mo, 100 pp. 2s 6d.

RECENT ARTICLES.

- BROWN, PROF. FRANCIS, The New Testament and the Pentateuch. *The Independent*, Feb. 8, 22, Mar. 9, 1883, pp. 163-'4, 228-'9, 292-'3.
- PICK, REV. B., PH. D., The Present State of The Old Testament Criticism. *The Independent*, Feb. 15, 1883, p. 201.
- HIGHER CRITICISM, The. *Presbyterian Banner*, Feb. 14, 21, 28, March 7, 14, 1883. pp. 1, 4, 4, 4, 4.

- MOSES, Authorship of. *Herald and Presbyter*, Feb. 21, 1883, p. 4.
- HIGHER CRITICISM, The, Assumptions and Axioms of. *The Presbyterian Journal*, Feb. 22, Mar. 1, 1883, pp. 4, 4.
- COLLINS, REV. CHAS. T., False Jewish Messiahs. *The Advance*, Mar. 1, 1883, pp. 133-4.
- KRONER, DR., Reduplicirte hebr. Wortgebilde m. Wiederholung zweier Wurzel-laute. *Juedisches Litbl.*, XXI., 4, pp. 15, 16.
- ANALEKTEN. I., Die biblischen Namen. *Juedisches Litbl.*, XII., 6, p. 23.
- KAYSER, F., Ueber die theologische Lehre der alten Ägypter. *Der Katholik*, Dez. 1882, S. 616-27.
- VUILLEUMIER, H., La critique du Pentateuque dans sa phase actuelle. *Revue de theol. et de philos.*, Nov., 1882, p. 594-613.
- STERN, L., Critische Anmerkungen zu der boheirischen Uebersetzung der Proverbia Salomonis. *Ztschr. f. Ägypt. Sprache u. Alterthumskunde*, Jan., 1883, S. 191-202.
- BACHER, PROF. DR. W., Abulwalid Ibn Gauah und die neuhebraeische Poesie. *Ztschr. d. deutsch. Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft*, XXXVI, Heft 3 u. 4, S. 401-9.
- FUERST, DR., Askara oder Schem hammephorasch, das ausdruecklich ausgesprochene Tetragrammeton. *Ztschr. d. deutsch. Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft*, XXXVI, Heft 3 u. 4, S. 410-16.
- GUTHE, II., Die Siloahinschrift. *Ztschr. d. deutsch. Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft*, XXXVI, Heft 3 u. 4, S. 725-50.
- SIEGFRIED, CARL, Midrasches zu Hieronymus u. Pseudo-Hieronymus. *Ztschr. f. protestantische Theol.*, Heft 2, 1883, S. 346-52.
- STADE, DR. BERNHARD, Bemerkungen zu Micah IV., 5. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft. 1883, S. 1-16.
- PRAETORIUS, FRANZ, Ueber den Ursprung des Dagesch-forse conjunctivum. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 17-31.
- SIEGFRIED, CARL, Die hebraeischen Worterklaerungen des Josephus. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 32-51.
- PRAETORIUS, FRANZ, Das Imperfectum יקטול. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 52-5.
- BUDE, KARL, Gen. XLVIII., 7 und die benachbarten Abschnitte. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 56-88.
- HOFFMANN, G., Versuche zu Amos. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 87-126.
- WUENSCHIE, DR. AUG., Der Midrash Kohelet und Cicero's Cato Major. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 120-27.
- STADE, DR. BERNHARD, Der Text des Berichtes ueber Salomos Bauten (1 Kgs. v.-vii.) *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 129-77.
- ADLER, DR. S., Der Versoehnungsstag in der Bibel, sein Ursprung und seine Bedeutung. *Ztschr. f. die alttest. Wissenschaft*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 178-85.
- ZOECKLER, O., Die biblische Literatur des vergangenen Jahres. A. Altes Testament. *Ztschr. f. kirch. Wissenschaft u. kirch. Leben*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 1-3.
- WINTER, F. J., Zur Lehre der Heilig. Schrift. *Ztschr. f. kirch. Wissenschaft u. kirch. Leben*, Heft 1, 1883, S. 49-53.

- GOODWIN, PROF. H. M., The Bible as a Book of Education. *The New Englander*, March, 1883. pp. 252-72.
- FROTHINGHAM, O. B., [Biblical] Criticism and Christianity. *North American Review*, April, 1883.

REVIEWS.

- LENORMANT, FRANCOIS, The Beginnings of History. [Am. Ed.] *The New Englander*, March, 1883, pp. 273-74.
- GRAETZ, PROF. DR. H., Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen nebst Text und Uebersetzung. By Dr. Rosenthal: *Jued. Litbl.*, XII, 5-7.
- BUDGE, E. A., The history of Esarhadden. By H. Pognon: *Revue historique*, jan.-fevr.
- FONTANE, M., Les Egyptes, de 5000 a 715 ar. By J. C.: *Saturday Review*, Jan. 20.
- SCHOLZ, A., Commentar zum Buche d. Propheten Hoseas. By Schaefer: *Lit. Rundschau*, 2, 1883.
- SMEND, R., Die Listen d. Buecher Esra u. Nehemia. By H. L. Strack: *Theol. Litbl.*, 4, 1883.
- STERN, J., Lichtstrahlen aus dem Talmud. By H. L. Strack: *Lit. Centralbl.*, 4, 1883.
- EWALD, G. H. A., Commentary on the Book of Job. Translated by J. F. Smith. *The Athenæum*, Feb. 3, 1883.
- WAHRMUND, A., Babylonierthum, Judenthum und Christenthum. By E. Nestle: *Lit. Centralbl.*, 52, 1882.
- CRONMEYER, E., Predigten ueber die zehn Gebote. By F. R. Fay: *Theol. Litztg.*, Sp. 68-9.
- EBERS, GEORGE, Egypt; Descriptive, Historical, and Picturesque. Translated by Clara Bell. *Independent*, Feb. 8, 1883, pp. 170, 171.
- BACHER, W., Abraham Ibn als Grammatiker. By J. Barth: *Deutsche Litztg.*, 2, 1883.
- KAULEN, F., Assyrien u. Babylonien. By A. Kobler: *Ztschr. f. kath. Theol.* VII, 1; and A. Rohling: *Lit. Rundschau*, 1.
- KAUTZSCH, E., Uebungsbuch zu Gesenius-Kautzsch' hebraeischer Grammatik. By E. Nestle: *Lit. Centralbl.* 2.
- KEIL, C. F., Biblischer Commentar ueber den Propheten Ezechiel, 2te Auflage. By H. L. Strack: *Theol. Litbl.* 1.
- KNABENBAUER, J., Erklaerung des Propheten Isaias. By G. Bickell: *Ztschr. f. kath. Theol.* VII, 1, S. 147-155: *Theol. Litbl.*
- REUSS, E., Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments. By P. H. Wicksteed: *Modern Review*, Jan. 1883, pp. 1-23; A. Hilgenfeld: *Ztschr. f. Wissen. Theol.* XXVI, 2; and Wuensche: *Jued. Litbl.*, XII, 8.
- BAER, S., Liber Proverbiorum, Praefatus est edendi operis adjutor Franciscus Delitzsch. By E. Kautzsch: *Theol. Litztg.*, 2, 1883, Sp. 25, 26.
- Libri Danielis, Ezrae et Nehemiae. Cum praefatione Francisci Delitzsch et glossis Babylonice Friderici Delitzsch. By E. Kautzsch: *Theol. Litztg.*, 2, 1883, Sp. 26-29.