

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. VI.

SEPTEMBER, 1886.

No. 1.

WITH this number THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT enters upon its sixth volume. Few journals ever began under more inauspicious circumstances. Even its best friends doubted the possibility of its establishment. The difficulties in the way of its success have at times seemed altogether insuperable; yet, one by one, they have been overcome. Those who have so kindly rendered aid are gratefully remembered; without their assistance, the effort would long ago have failed. We may, however, now look forward, with reasonable assurance, to a more certain future. THE STUDENT has made for itself a place in the periodical literature of the day, and this place it will seek with each new volume to fill more worthily.

A LEADING characteristic of the numerous articles on the Revision has been their exceeding monotony and dullness. This holds true even of those which are to be regarded as the most valuable. Quite different in this respect from the great majority of such articles is that of Prof. Charles R. Brown in the July *Bibliotheca Sacra*, to be concluded in the October number. The writer, by an ingenious method, presents his material in a form which at once commends it to the attention of the reader. In order to perform his task exhaustively he limits himself to the Book of Genesis. He considers the text, the grammar, the lexicography and the English of the Revision, by indicating in one column the changes which the revisers have made and in a parallel column the changes which, in his opinion, they ought to have made. The article, with the material which it contains, the frankness of its criticism and the freshness of its presentation, deserves the special notice of all who are interested in Bible-translation. It furnishes a good specimen of what may be called solid work.

HOW many there are who suppose that with a slight knowledge of grammar, and a small vocabulary, one has all that is needed to do exegetical work. These even suppose that the translation of a given passage according to grammatical rules is its interpretation. Sight is lost of the fact that language, even when most carefully expressed, is ambiguous, and that to no two individuals does the same language convey the same thought. The following sentiment expressed by Dr. A. C. Kendrick in the course of his comment on a difficult passage (1 Cor. XV. 27), deserves careful consideration :

“We have thus far dealt with the facts and the logic of the matter. We have looked at the historical evidence, the nature of the usage and finally at the logical exigencies of the passage. We regard this latter evidence as decisive, both as to what the meaning of the passage is not and what it is. We have no right, indeed, to force our own meaning into an author's train of thought, but we have a right to draw his meaning out of it. We may rightly presume that he will lead us toward the goal toward which his footsteps are regularly tending. We may surely make logical consistency an important element in interpretation. Man is something more than a mere grammar-grinder. The lexicon is not the whole of exegesis. Logic and rhetoric—the law of thought and the law of passion—are mightier than grammar, and will ever furnish the most decisive elements in the interpretation of human speech. We can never rest in our exposition until the logical demands of the passage are satisfied. However seemingly encompassed in grammatical rules, it will refuse to lie still, but will arise and haunt us with the ghost of a murdered thought. When, on the contrary, the difficulties of thought have resolved themselves, we easily dispose, especially in an energetic and impassioned writer, of some difficulties of expression. We shall find the language easily yield to the demand of the thought.”

DOES the average minister make such use of his Bible, aside from his use of it for devotional purposes, as, in view of the character of the Book, and of the relation which it sustains to his profession, he ought to make? He goes to it every week, it is true, for a text or two; yet how comparatively seldom is it that the sermon preached grows out of the text itself. He prepares, of course, the current Sunday-school lesson, but here again the whole aim is a homiletical one. Now we grant freely that the minister must be a preacher, that in his work he must have in mind the practical application of the great truths of divine revelation. But, we believe, that minister errs most grievously both against himself, his people, and the cause of God, who studies his Bible exclusively from the homiletical stand-point, unless, perhaps, the word homiletical is to be used in a sense which it does not generally convey.

The difficulty, briefly stated, is this: Men study the Bible narrowly, not broadly; superficially, not deeply; for immediate, and not

for permanent results. The question *is*, What can I get out of this passage for my next sermon, or my next lecture? The question *ought to be*, What does this passage teach? What is its place in the great body of divine truth? Let the pastor, aside from his devotional study, his sermonizing, his preparation for the Bible-class, do a comprehensive, systematic Bible-work which looks not to immediate, but to permanent results,—a work, not, perhaps, at once practical, but which, in the end, will prove to have furnished a treasure-house of valuable material, available at any time and for all time.

THERE is a general sentiment that a student can *finish* his education only by going abroad. In some departments of study this feeling prevails more largely than in others. It is especially prevalent in reference to linguistic and exegetical study. Is there not danger that this idea may be carried too far? Is it really true that our own country affords no adequate opportunities for advanced work in these lines? One must at once concede the many general advantages of a trip abroad. But aside from the general profit gained, how is it? Will the student find in Europe better *teachers* than in America? There are on the continent hundreds of renowned lecturers and authors; but do they *teach*? Germany is full of original investigators who are all the time bringing to light new and valuable material; but is not all this published? Foreign universities, it is true, have libraries with which even our best American libraries compare but poorly; but these libraries are for the use of men who have already become specialists, not for those who are merely beginning to prepare themselves for the work of specialists.

In the departments referred to, *viz.*, the Semitic languages, and biblical exegesis, will not the embryonic specialist do well first to place himself in the hands of a Lyon, a Haupt, a Francis Brown, a Beecher, a Terry, or a Curtiss, and later, when he has exhausted the sources of supply in America, try a foreign university? The time has now gone by, if it ever existed, when a man *must* go abroad to study. The student can employ his time more profitably at home. Ample opportunities are offered him for work in every department. There will come a time in his life when a residence abroad will be of priceless value to him. This, however, will not be at the beginning of his work, but when, after having thoroughly grounded himself in the first stages of his subject, he is able to *stand alone*.

THE benefits of the Hebrew Summer Schools are indirect as well as direct. The direct benefits are received by those who engage in

these schools. But many who come into no contact with these schools, are also benefited by them. First, there has come about a remarkable change in the sentiment of students in theological seminaries. It is not more than ten years since in some of the foremost seminaries of the country it was thought no discredit for a man or for a class to fail in the Hebrew examination. To-day the sentiment is different. Again, some young men have been convinced of the importance of studying the Old Testament in the original, and have determined to attain some degree of proficiency in the language before entering a theological seminary. This persuasion, so far as due to the Hebrew Summer School, has been an indirect result. A direct result is that such men are enabled to accomplish their purpose. Another result has been the testimony called forth to the importance of the study. What stronger testimony could these men, both teachers and scholars, give to the importance of a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament than this laying aside the ordinary duties of life or the ordinary vacation pursuits and giving four weeks to Old Testament study? The Christian churches have been underestimating the importance of the Old Testament. If nothing more was done than to convince the churches that the Old Testament is worthy of earnest and devout study, the Hebrew Summer Schools will not have been in vain. Fourthly, such study has been kindled in regions which have received no direct impulse from these schools. Christian pastors are looking more and more into their English Old Testaments, they are taking down and dusting their Hebrew Bibles with a sigh that they did not have more favorable opportunities for the study of Hebrew in their earlier days; laymen are looking at their English Old Testaments with added respect, and occasionally determining to master the original, and even the Sunday-school scholar is beginning to feel that in the air is something new respecting the Old Testament. It would, of course, be unwarranted to attribute all these results to the Hebrew Summer Schools. The less conspicuous Correspondence School has had some share in the work. And besides, and above all this, in the ordering of God the Old Testament has come to the front in the theological world. The Hebrew Summer Schools, however, have had much to do in bringing the Old Testament to the front in this country; or to put the fact in another way, they have been a powerful instrument under God in the accomplishment of this work.

DIVISIONS OF THE DECALOGUE.

BY TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York.

The Ten Commandments stand alone in the sacred volume. Originally pronounced by God himself from Sinai amid blackness and tempest and lightning-flashes, they were afterwards inscribed by his own hand on tables of stone, and when these were dashed in pieces by Moses, on a fitting occasion they were renewed by their divine author in the same way as before. Afterwards they were laid up in the ark of the covenant beneath the mercy-seat in the most holy place. Their internal excellence corresponds to this outward honor bestowed upon them. They are at the same time the oldest and the best code of human duty. They are so complete and comprehensive as to leave nothing to desire. And they are justly called by Ewald the granite substratum of the whole Bible.

The name by which the Decalogue is most distinctly mentioned in the Pentateuch is that of the ten words (Exod. xxxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13; x. 4). Hence arise two questions, not without interest to the serious student. What are these ten words precisely? i. e., where do they begin and end, and how are they discriminated one from another? and how were they distributed on the two tables which first received them?

I. WHAT ARE THE TEN WORDS?

To most Protestants of our day this question seems to answer itself. All who have been trained in any of the Reformed churches have been accustomed from infancy to see in their catechisms and in tablets on church walls one and the same series of commandments, each of which in all cases bears the same numerical designation; and it does not occur to them that there is any other way of viewing the matter. Yet in fact there are, and there have been almost from the beginning, diverse methods of making out the number ten.

1. *The Talmudic.* This is found in the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel, or Pseudo-Jonathan, who lived in the fifth century of our era. It is contained also in the Talmud (*Makkoth*, xxiv. a). It was advocated by the learned Aben Ezra, in his *Commentary*, and by the still more learned Maimonides (*Sepher-Hammizroth*) and is now the common opinion of the Jews. According to it what is usually considered the preface to the whole, "I am Jehovah thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt" is made the first commandment, since these words, they say, imply the obligation to believe on God as the most perfect of all beings. Then they put verses 3-6 of the chapter into what they called the second command, including the recognition of God's unity and the prohibition of idol worship. The other eight precepts conform to the ordinary arrangement. It is somewhat remarkable that the chief peculiarity of this system—its use of the preface—is to be found in a treatise of Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) against Julian, in which he gives the second command as "Thou shalt have no strange gods beside me: thou shalt not make to thyself an idol." It was also maintained by the learned Peter Martyr in his *Loci Communes*. The obvious objections to this view are that verse 2 has in no respect or degree the form of a precept, and that it has

vastly more force when considered as a preliminary statement of a double import, first as giving the special ground for not accepting any other gods beside Jehovah, and secondly as furnishing the general presupposition of the law and the ground of its obligation, viz., the nature of God and his gracious dealing with men as their deliverer. Nor is there any reason for regarding verses 3-6 as one commandment. For they contain two points essentially distinct, viz., *whom* we are to worship, and *how* it is to be done. When Aaron made the golden calf at the foot of Sinai, and when Jeroboam instituted a similar bovine worship at Bethel and at Dan, the second command was violated but not the first, for it was Jehovah that was worshiped, though in a way that he abhorred. It was not until the great apostasy under Ahab and Jezebel that Jehovah was dethroned, and the object as well as the form of worship was overthrown by king and people running mad after Baal. Experience, therefore, as well as the nature of the case, shows that the verses following the preface contain two separate commandments which ought not to be confounded. It should be mentioned, however, that in the greater number of printed editions and manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible the commandments from the third to the tenth are separated by a *Pe* or a *Samech*, which are used to mark the smaller divisions of a passage, yet neither of these letters occurs in verses 2-6, which, of course, implies that these verses treat of but one subject. This fact, however, only shows how early the Jewish view of the matter originated.

2. *The Augustinian.* The great Latin father agreed with the Jews in confounding polytheism and idolatry, or as he said, "The command ('Thou shalt have no other gods but me') is more perfectly explained when images are forbidden to be worshiped." And he insisted that the prohibition of making or serving an idol was not a new precept, but simply an expansion or enforcement of the first injunction. But as he regarded the words, "I am the Lord thy God, etc.," as a preface, it was necessary in some way to make good the number ten. This he did by dividing the last command into two—one forbidding to covet our neighbor's wife, the other to covet his house, field, manservant, etc. (He follows the order given in Deut. v. 21.) He did this on the ground that the *cupido impurae voluptatis* is a distinct offense from the *cupido impuri lucri*. In this he was followed by Beda and by Peter Lombard, and the custom became common in the Latin communion. It was formally sanctioned by the Council of Trent and appears in their catechism, only that the division of the precept concerning coveting follows the order of Exodus and makes the ninth command to prohibit coveting our neighbor's house, and the tenth his wife and servant, etc. The same thing is done in Luther's *Kleiner Catechismus*. A peculiarity of this small catechism, which it shares with the small Tridentine catechism, has given rise to a very unjust aspersion on the Roman church. Both these catechisms give nearly all the commandments in a condensed or abridged form, and hence we read in both that the first command is, *Thou shalt have no other gods*, and the second is, *Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in vain*. Hence the late Dr. Ashbel Green in his *Lectures on the Shorter Catechism* (II. 259) says, "You are aware that the Papists dispense with the second commandment, because it manifestly prohibits their use of images." So Dr. A. A. Hodge, in his admirable commentary on the *Confession of Faith*, says of the Romish church that she "unites the first and second commandments together in order to make it appear that only the worship of false gods and images of them are forbidden, while the images of the true God and of

saints are not excluded from the instruments of worship" (p. 342). But I think it is clear that both these statements are incorrect. (1) The blending of the first command and the second into one was an old Jewish usage. (2) It was introduced into the Christian church by Augustine, certainly without any dogmatic aim. (3) The full text of both precepts is given in the larger symbols of the Roman church. (4) If the charge justly lies against the Romanists, it equally lies against the Lutherans, which is simply absurd. (5) An infelicitous abridgment of the Decalogue is not fairly regarded and treated as a designed and criminal mutilation of its substance. Rome has vulnerable points enough, and it is unwise to strike a blow where it can so easily be warded off. All that can justly be charged against the Romanists and Lutherans is not that they have mutilated the law of God, but that the form in which they state it in their shorter catechisms has the effect of concealing important parts of it from those who have access only to these catechisms. And while this is greatly to be regretted, it furnishes no ground for harsh and hostile criticisms, as if a deliberate purpose had been cherished to keep out of view integral portions of the great statute announced from Sinai.

That the tenth commandment cannot properly be divided seems to be self-evident. It is one and the same evil desire that is forbidden, however varied its objects. Augustine's distinction is wire-drawn and fallacious, for the *cupido* of the woman is condemned for precisely the same reason that the *cupido* of the house is, viz., because in each case that which is coveted belongs to another. A *cupido* which is wrong in its own nature is indeed condemned, but it is by another commandment. Besides, on two occasions Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans (VII. 7; XIII. 9), quotes this command, but in each case without an object attached, simply "Thou shalt not covet," which could hardly have been done, had he considered the command twofold.

3. *The Hellenistic.* This goes as far back as Josephus and Philo. The former (Ant. III. v. 5) says, "The first commandment teaches us that there is but one God, and that we ought to worship him only. The second commands us not to make the image of any living creature to worship it." And so he goes through the decade, ending with the words, "The tenth, that we must not admit of the desire of anything that is another's." The latter, in his treatise *De Decalogo*, makes substantially the same statement, following what appears to have been the received division of that day. Origen in his eighth Homily on Genesis notices the different views that were held on the subject, and says expressly that the words "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt" are not a part of the commandment. He also maintains that the first command is, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me," and the second, "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, etc.," and proceeds at some length to elaborate the distinction between them. And he urges that this distinction is necessary in order to maintain the number ten, showing that he knew nothing of the method of completing that number by dividing the prohibition of coveting into two parts. The same thing appears in a poem of Gregory Nazianzen (325-389) entitled *The Decalogue of Moses*, in which are found these lines.

These ten laws Moses formerly engraved on tables
Of stone; but do thou engrave them on thy heart.
Thou shalt not know another God, since worship belongs to me.
Thou shalt not make a vain statue, a lifeless image.

Thou shalt not call on the great God in vain.
 Keep all Sabbaths, the sublime and the shadowy.
 Happy he who renders to his parents due honor.
 Flee the crime of murder, and of a foreign
 Bed; evil minded theft, and witness
 False, and the desire of another's, the seed of death.

In this he was followed by Jerome (345-420) who calls him his master, and who, in his commentary on Ephes. VI. 2, cites Exod. XX. 4-6, calling these words the second commandment. So Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* VI.) states the teaching of the second word to be that men ought not to confer the august power of God upon things created and vain which human artificers have made, among which "He that is" is not to be ranked.

This arrangement of the Decalogue, under the overshadowing influence of Augustine, appears to have been quite forgotten in the Western church, but was revived by Calvin in his *Institutes*, 1536. From him it spread into all the Reformed churches, and accordingly is found in the English Book of Common Prayer, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster standards. It seems always to have maintained itself in the Greek church, and is now found in the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern church, drawn up by Mogilas in 1643, and in the Longer Catechism of the same church, prepared by Philaret and adopted by the Most Holy Synod in 1839. There can hardly be a doubt that this is the correct statement of the Ten Words of Moses. It is simple, natural and complete. It makes no superfluous division, nor does it confound and blend what ought to be distinguished. It gives this wonderful summary of human duty in a way befitting its origin and its excellence.

II. WHAT IS THE PROPER DISTRIBUTION OF THE TEN WORDS?

This is a question not so easily answered as the foregoing, inasmuch as there is really room for a wide difference of opinion. The fact that the Ten Words were originally written on two tables of stone suggested what indeed is apparent from the nature of the precepts themselves, that they were divided into two parts, one stating man's duty to God, the other his duty to his fellow men. This raised the question where the line should be drawn, to which three answers were given, one dividing the ten into three and seven, another into four and six, while a third made two pentads.

1. The plan of distributing them into *Three and Seven* was a conceit of Augustine's, after he had made the first two commandments into one. For thus bringing those that relate to piety into three, he said it was better to separate them from the remaining seven, "inasmuch as to persons who diligently look into the matter, those which appertain to God seem to insinuate the Trinity." Upon which Calvin appropriately says in his comment on Exodus xx. 12, "A frivolous reason is assigned by Augustine why they comprised the First Table in three commandments, viz., that believers might learn to worship God in the Trinity, and thus to adore God in three persons. By inconsiderately trifling with such subtleties men have exposed God's law to the mockeries of the ungodly." It is hard to believe that even to one person in a thousand a threefold division of the first table would suggest the thought of the Trinity, and still harder to believe that his faith in the doctrine would receive any increase of strength from such a suggestion.

2. The division into *Four and Six* was stoutly defended by Calvin, who insists that the first four precepts express the piety we owe to God and the last six the equity due to our neighbor. With him, therefore, the Second Table begins with the fifth command, "Honor thy father, etc." He refutes the course of those who would put this precept in the First Table as teaching a sort of natural piety, by appealing to the authority of our Lord who, he says, put an end to any dispute on the point, since in Matt. XIX. 19 he enumerates among the precepts of the Second Table this, that children should obey their parents. And to the objection made by some that the Apostle Paul, when in Rom. XIII. 9 he was giving the sum of the Second Table, omitted to mention the fifth commandment, he replies that this omission was designedly made because the whole context implied the precept, its express aim being to teach the authority due to kings and magistrates. In his commentary on Romans he gives the additional answer that the precept is included in the phrase, "And if there be any other commandment." His general ground of objection is that the course he opposes tends to confound the *religionis et caritatis distinctionem*, which, indeed, were it well founded, would be decisive; for the ultimate basis of all moral obligation is our duty to God, and if this be attenuated the sheet-anchor of ethics is gone.

Others sustain this division by an appeal to Ephes. VI. 2, where the fifth commandment is said to be "the first with promise," which it is said must mean the first in the Second Table, inasmuch as there is a promise attached to the second commandment. But the answer is obvious that the promise in the latter is of a general nature, having reference to the Decalogue as a whole, and stands in no particular relation to the precept which precedes it, so that really the fifth precept is *πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ*, first in point of promise. It has this character, whether it be joined to those that go before it or to those that follow after it. Others meet the argument by urging that the phrase should be rendered, not "the first commandment," but "a prime, i. e., a main precept in a promise." But this, although a possible rendering of the original, is not very natural, nor suited to the connection.

3. *Five and Five.* The earliest mention of this is in Josephus (Ant. III. v. 8) who says that Moses showed the people "the two tables with the commandments engraven upon them, five upon each table; and the writing was by the hand of God." With him agrees Philo, who divides the whole into two pentads. And so Irenæus (II. XXIV. 4), "Each table which Moses received from God contained five commandments." The basis of this distribution is thus given by Plumptree (Smith, Bible Dic. 3209), "Instead of duties toward God and duties toward our neighbors, we must think of the First Table as containing all that belonged to the *εἰσέβεια* of the Greeks, to the *pietas* of the Romans, duties, i. e., with no corresponding rights, while the second deals with duties which involve rights, and come therefore under the head of *justitia*. The duty of honoring, i. e., supporting, parents came under the former head. As soon as the son was capable of it and the parents required it, it was an absolute unconditional duty. His right to any maintenance from them had ceased. He owed them reverence as he owed it to his Father in heaven (Heb. XII. 9). He was to show piety (*εἰσέβειν*) to them (1 Tim. v. 4). What made the 'Corban' casuistry of the scribes so specially evil was that it was in this way a sin against the piety of the First Table, not merely against the lower obligations of the second." To the same effect Oehler (Theol. of the Old Test., § 80) observes, "If in Leviticus (XIX. 32), 'Thou shalt

rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man and fear thy God,' and in Exodus (xxii. 27), 'Thou shalt not curse God, nor revile the ruler of thy people,' reverence to princes and to the aged is deduced from the honor due to God, the same thing must be still more true of honor to parents, since all authority of superiors is originally derived from that of the father." So Luther said (Expos. of the Decal., 1518), "Ideo istud praeceptum post praecepta primae tabulae, quia est de illis qui sunt vicarii Dei. Quare sicut Deus colendus est honore, ita et vicarius ejus."

We may then safely adopt this distribution of the Ten Words as the earliest and the best. It agrees with the definitive and rounded character of the series, and if the number *ten* were adopted, as seems reasonable, both from the completeness of that number and also because it would make it easy to remember by counting the precepts on the fingers, the most natural division of ten is into two equal parts, each embracing a like series of precepts, and each implying the other. Nor is the added gain small from the dignity thus given to the fifth commandment, which is the basis of all human society, and which, if obeyed, sheds its beneficent influence over every rank and condition, and proves an equal blessing to the church and to the state. To the child, so long as he is a child, the parent stands in the place of God, and by the steadfast usage of our own tongue filial obedience is filial piety.* The family has a religious as well as an ethical constitution, and the due performance of its duties is not merely indirectly, as in the Second Table, but directly and primarily, as in the First, an expression of homage to God over all.

* It is worthy of note that this phrase is peculiar. We never read of parental piety or fraternal piety. The term is applied only to what a child owes or performs to its parents as the representatives of God.

SHEKHAR AND LEAVEN IN MOSAIC OFFERINGS.

BY PRESIDENT ALVAH HOVEY, D. D.,

Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass.

An argument for two kinds of *yayin* and two kinds of *shekhar* is drawn from the prohibition of *leaven* in offerings by fire unto the Lord. This prohibition is stated in Exod. xxxiv. 25: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven," and Lev. ii. 11: "No meat offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall be made with leaven; for ye shall burn no leaven nor any honey in any offering of the Lord made by fire." But in Num. xxviii. 7 it is written: "The drink offering thereof shall be the fourth part of an hin for the one lamb: in the holy place shalt thou pour out a drink offering of *shekhar* unto the Lord." Assuming that the process of *leavening* and of *fermentation* is effected by the same principle, that this fact was known to the sacred writers, and that this principle or cause was called by them *leaven*, it is inferred that there was in reality an unleavened and a leavened *yayin* and *shekhar*. Let us test the correctness of this assumption, and the soundness of this argument. To do this we propose the following queries:

1. Is the principle of vinous fermentation ever referred to in the Bible as *leaven*? If it is so named by the sacred writers, we ought to have the passages at command and be able to show it clearly. But if it is never so named, there is some reason to doubt whether the sacred writers knew that the cause of fermentation in wine was identical with leaven.

2. Is wine itself, under any of its names or forms, ever spoken of in the Scriptures as being either *leavened* or *unleavened*? Meal and dough and bread are thus characterized, but we do not know of any place where these terms are applied to wine or strong drink. Why this difference, if leavening and fermenting were known to be equivalent processes, one in solids and the other in liquids?

3. Is there any scriptural evidence that *wine* was removed from the houses of Israelites during the passover? The passover occurred at the beginning of harvest in the spring, before the new wine was ready for use—indeed months before. There must therefore have been old wine, and often an abundance of it, in Jewish houses at the passover—unless it was carefully removed. But we know of no evidence in the Bible, or in Josephus or Philo, that it was removed on account of that festival. But if it could be shown that wine was removed from Jewish houses at the passover, it would not follow that it was removed because it was unwholesome.

4. Is there any biblical evidence that *unleavened* bread was more wholesome or nutritious than *leavened* bread? If there is, let it be produced. We know of none. And, if we assume that the Mosaic legislation was intended to conserve the health of the people, we can hardly suppose that unleavened bread would be prescribed for a week only during the year, nor can we account for the gift of leavened bread to the priests as food (Lev. xxiii., 17-20). The fact certainly is that unleavened bread is harder and less wholesome than leavened. If leavening is fermentation, then fermentation improves the quality of certain substances for

the uses which they were intended to serve. But dietetic considerations were not supreme in the Mosaic ritual. Indeed, the only reason distinctly assigned by the Old Testament for the use of unleavened bread at the passover is thus stated (Deut. xvi., 3): "Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it [the paschal lamb]; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life."

5. Is not Num. xxviii. 7 to be reconciled with Exod. xxxiv. 25 and Lev. ii. 11, by observing that *wine is never thought of or spoken of as leavened* by the sacred writers? Or, if we make a distinction between *yayin* and *shekhar*, is not the first passage to be reconciled with the others by observing that *shekhar* is never spoken of as *leavened*? This surely is the obvious way of bringing the different passages into accord, or rather, of seeing that there is no appearance of contradiction between them. "But if this method of explaining the passages be adopted, we lose the argument for two kinds of *yayin* and of *shekhar* which is derived from the prohibition of leaven in sacrifice." Undoubtedly; but our object is not to get arguments for total abstinence (*in which we believe*), but to interpret the Word of God faithfully.

What then is the proper meaning of *shekhar*? It is used twenty-three times in the Old Testament. *Twelve* times it is represented by *sikera* in the Septuagint (viz., in Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 32; xxviii. 7; Deut. xiv. 26; xxix. 6; Isa. v. 11, 22; xxiv. 9; xxviii. 72; xxix. 9). *Five* times it is translated *μέθυσμα* (viz., in Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. i. 15; Mic. ii. 11); *twice*, *μέθη* (viz., in Prov. xx. 1 and Isa. xxviii. 7); *once*, *οἶνος* (Ps. lxix. 13); and *three* times (Prov. xxxi. 4, 6; Isa. lvi. 12) it is not represented at all, because the Hebrew verses are not given in the Septuagint.

In the Latin Vulgate it is represented by *sicera* five times, by *ebrietas* eleven times, by *omne quod inebriare potest* four times, by *vinum* twice (Num. xxviii. 7; Ps. lxix. 13), and by *potio* once.

In the Revised English Version it is every-where translated strong drink, save in Ps. lxix. 13, where "drinkers of *shekhar*" are called simply "drunkards."

But a more detailed statement is needed. In Lev. x. 9 Aaron and his sons are forbidden to drink *yayin* or *shekhar* when going, or about to go, into the Tabernacle. In Num. vi., 3 the man or woman who takes a Nazarite's vow is forbidden to drink *yayin* or vinegar of *yayin*, *shekhar* or vinegar of *shekhar*. In Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14, the mother of Samson is forbidden to drink *yayin* or *shekhar*, or to eat any unclean thing, because her promised son was to be a Nazarite to God from the womb. In 1 Sam. i. 15, Hannah, when accused of intoxication by Eli, says: "I have drunk neither *yayin* nor *shekhar*, but I poured out my soul unto the Lord." In Ps. lxix. 12 it is written: "They that sit in the gate talk of me, and I am the song of drinkers of *shekhar*." In Prov. xx. 1: "*Yayin* is a mocker, *shekhar*, a brawler." In Prov. xxxi. 4, 6: "It is not for kings to drink *yayin*; nor for princes to say, Where is *shekhar*?" "Give *shekhar* unto him that is ready to perish, and *yayin* to the bitter in soul." In Isa. v. 11, 22: "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow *shekhar*; that tarry late into the night, till *yayin* inflame them." "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink *yayin*, and men of strength to mingle *shekhar*." In xxiv. 9: "They shall not drink *yayin* with a song; *shekhar* shall be bitter to them that drink it." In

xxviii. 7: "These also have erred through *yayin*, and through *shekhar* have gone astray; the priest and the prophet have erred through *shekhar*, they are swallowed up of *yayin*, they are gone astray through *shekhar*." In xxix. 9: "They are drunken, but not with *yayin*; they stagger, but not with *shekhar*." In lvi. 12: "Come ye, say they, I will fetch *yayin*, and we will fill ourselves with *shekhar*: and to-morrow shall be as this day." And in Mic.: "If a man, walking in wind and falsehood do lie, saying, I will prophesy unto thee of *yayin* and *shekhar*; he shall even be the prophet of this people."

In every one of these twenty cases the meaning *strong drink* suits the connection, and may be used in translating *shekhar*, without suggesting to any reader confusion of thought. In most of them an intoxicating drink is *supposed* by the context. The remaining three passages are as follows: In Num. xxviii. 7, *shekhar* is specified as a daily drink offering to the Lord. Josephus says that this offering was of *wine*. The Latin Vulgate and the Authorized English Version translate *shekhar* "vinum" and "strong wine." In Deut. xiv. 26, it is said that a Jew going up to the sanctuary with a tithe of his cattle and grain in money, may "bestow his money for whatsoever his soul desires, for oxen, or for sheep, or for *yayin*, or for *shekhar*, that he may eat there before the Lord, and rejoice with all his house." And in Deut. xxix., 6, the Lord says to the children of Israel: "Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk *yayin* or *shekhar*: that ye might know that I am the Lord your God." In these instances *shekhar* seems to be looked upon as a common beverage, prized by the people, and not necessarily injurious. But until we know that stimulating drinks were regarded by the sacred writers as evil, and only evil, we cannot be sure that *shekhar* means in any of these passages an unfermented liquor. No particular kind of *shekhar* is pointed out. If there were two kinds in use, one fermented and the other unfermented, no hint is offered of this fact.

But there is another Hebrew noun from the same verbal root as *shekhar*, viz., *shikkāron* (ā as in father), which occurs twice in Ezekiel (viz., xxiii. 33 and xxxix. 19). The former passage reads thus: "Thou shalt be filled with *shikkāron* and sorrow, with the cup of astonishment and desolation, with the cup of thy sister Samaria;" and the latter thus: "Ye shall eat fat till ye be full, and drink blood unto *shikkāron*" (RV., till ye be drunken).

An adjective *shikkor* from the same root is found thirteen times in the Old Testament (viz., in 1 Sam. i. 13; xxv. 36; 1 Kgs. xvi. 9; xx. 16; Job xii. 25; Ps. cvii. 27; Prov. xxvi. 9; Isa. xxiv. 20; xxviii. 1, 3; Jer. xxiii. 9; Joel i. 5), and in every case is translated in the Septuagint, Vulgate and English Version by words signifying drunken, or drunkard. The adjective always means drunken.

The verb *shākar* occurs fifteen times; and in all but two of the places where it is used, it evidently means to drink to intoxication. The passages are Gen. ix. 21; Deut. xxxii. 42; 1 Sam. i. 14; 2 Sam. xi. 13; Cant. v. 1; Isa. xxix. 9; xlix. 26; li. 21; lxiii. 6; Jer. xxv. 27; xlvi. 26; li. 7, 39, 57; Lam. iv. 21; Hab. ii. 15; Hag. i. 6. In two of the passages (viz., Cant. v. 1 and Hag. i. 6) the verb may have a slightly weaker sense, viz., to drink to exhilaration. But the stronger and usual sense may be the one intended in these places, as well as in all the rest.

In view of the use of the verb, the adjective and the noun, we do not see how any impartial scholar can deny that the Revisers were right in translating *shekhar*-

"strong drink" (i. e., drink that would intoxicate if taken in sufficient quantity) in Num. xxviii. 7, as well as in all other places, except Ps. lxix. 12, where "drinkers of *shekhar*" are called simply "drunkards." Perhaps it would have been better, for the sake of uniformity, to render literally "drinkers of strong drink" in this passage.

From Exod. xxix. 40; Lev. xxiii. 13 and Josephus Ant. iii. 4, it appears that a libation of wine (one-fourth of a hin) was daily offered to the Lord. Josephus appears to say that this drink offering was poured round the foot of the altar of burnt offerings. Many scholars suppose that it was poured on the altar or on the sacrificial animal lying on the altar, and especially because Exod. xxx. 9 forbids it to be poured *on the altar of incense*. If this libation of wine was identical with the libation of *shekhar* (which is almost certain), it follows that *shekhar* was a designation sometimes given to wine of a certain quality, that is, to "strong wine," and therefore the rendering of Num. xxviii. 7 is substantially correct. Should any one still insist that the *yayin* employed in sacrifice was unfermented grape juice, it is pertinent to ask why it was not called *terosh* instead of *yayin*, since those who believe there were two kinds of wine then in use, namely, unfermented and fermented, insist that *terosh* always meant the former, while *yayin* often meant the latter? Why was not the law made unambiguous when this could have been so easily done? Surely the asserters of the two-wine theory ought to be surprised that the material of the daily drink offering was denominated *yayin* and *shekhar*, but never *terosh*.

Let us now return to the questions concerning *leaven*, and examine the statements of Scripture in relation to the use and effect of this substance. Two different words are translated "leaven" in the Old Testament, viz., *seor*, meaning by derivation to *expand, to swell up, to ferment*, spoken of dough, and *chamets*, meaning by derivation to *be sharp, tart, sour*. The former, however, is used as a noun, the latter as an adjective; the former signifies "leaven," the latter "leavened."

The former (*seor*) occurs in Exod. xii. 15, 19; xiii. 7; Lev. ii. 11; Deut. xvi. 4, and in every instance is properly translated "leaven." The Septuagint version is ζύμη, the Vulgate, *fermentum* (once *fermentatum*). *Seor* is nowhere spoken of in connection with wine or strong drink or indeed any beverage. The material of it is supposed to have been commonly "sour dough."

The latter (*chamets*) occurs in Exod. xii. 15 (cf. 19, 20, *machmetseth*); xiii. 3, 7; xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25; Lev. ii. 11; vi. 10 (Eng. Vers. vi. 17); vii. 13; xxiii. 17; Amos iv. 5. The word means in every instance *leavened bread* or *dough*. It is an adjective, though often translated ζύμη in the Septuagint. It will repay us to look at every one of these texts with a view to accepting or rejecting the statement that *chamets* signifies *leavened bread* or *dough*, and not leavened *yayin* or *shekhar*. The first, Exod. xii. 15, reads: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven (*seor*) out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread (*chamets*) from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." Compare verses 19, 20: "Seven days shall be no leaven (*seor*) found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, that soul shall be cut off. . . . Ye shall eat nothing leavened: in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread." The second place is Exod. xiii. 3, 7: "There shall no leavened bread (*chamets*) be eaten." "Unleavened bread shall be eaten throughout the seven days; and there shall no leavened bread (*chamets*) be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven (*seor*) seen with thee."

The third is Exod. XXIII. 18: "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with (or upon) *leavened bread (chamets)*." The fourth is Exod. XXXIV. 25, and is like the preceding. The fifth is Lev. II. 11: "No *meal offering*, which ye shall offer unto the Lord, shall be made with leaven (i. e., leavened bread, *chamets*): for ye shall bring no leaven (*seor*), nor any honey, as an offering by fire unto the Lord." The sixth is Lev. VI. 10 (Eng. Ver. VI. 17): "And that which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons *eat*: it shall be eaten without leaven in a holy place: in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it. It shall not be baked with leaven" (i. e., leavened, *chamets*). The seventh is Lev. VII. 13: "With cakes of leavened bread he shall offer his oblation with the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving." This leavened bread appears to have been eaten by the priests (verse 16), though it was a part of the thank offering. The eighth is Lev. XXIII. 17: "Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth parts (of an ephah): they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baked with leaven (i. e., leavened) for first fruits unto the Lord." The ninth is Amos IV. 5: "And offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened (*mechamets*), and proclaim free-will offerings and publish them."

In all but three of these instances the reference to bread or meal is in some way expressed, and in three instances where it is not expressed there is *absolutely no reason* to suppose a reference to any thing different. Including the two passages where the participle is used instead of the adjective, there are eight cases in which bread or flour is in some way expressed, and three where it is not, but where it must certainly be understood.

If we compare the use of the verb *chamets* with the use of the noun and adjective, farther light will be gained. The verb occurs in Exod. XII. 34, 39: "And the people took their dough before *it was leavened*, their kneading troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders".... "And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened." In Ps. LXXXIII. 21: "For my heart was embittered" or soured (rather than grieved), "and I was pricked in my reins." In Isa. LXIII. 1: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, crimsoned of garments from Bozrah?" The Greeks, says Gesenius, speak of a *χρῶμα ὄξύ*. In Hos. VII. 4: "They are all adulterers; they are as an oven heated by the baker; he ceaseth to stir (the fire), from the kneading of the dough until it be leavened." In Ps. VII. 4 the present participle *chomets* is translated *cruel man* (= acid, sour man).

From this root, finally, is the word *chomets*, translated "vinegar." It appears in Num. VI. 3; Ruth II. 14; Ps. LXIX. 22; Prov. X. 26; XXV. 20. This word applies to liquids, but it is nowhere found in such connections as to imply that it was a pleasant beverage, used freely as a drink. It was neither exhilarating nor intoxicating, as used by the ancient Israelites. As drink it was bitter, sour, unpalatable, though it was sometimes used as a relish. Of the Nazarite it is said: "He shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink." Boaz says to Ruth: "Come hither, and eat of the bread, and dip thy morsel in the vinegar." The Psalmist puts these words into the mouth of the righteous sufferer: "They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." And there are two Proverbs, one: "As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to them that send him;" and the other: "As one that taketh off a garment in cold weather, (and as) vinegar upon nitre, so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart." Plainly

then this word is never used in the Holy Scriptures to denote any product of vinous fermentation.

But the Rev. J. M. Van Buren blames the translators and revisers of the English Bible for rendering *shekhar* in Num. XXVIII. 7 "strong wine" or "strong drink." Though he lays down the rule, followed in this article, that "if a man makes a dictionary of the Bible, he has no authority but the Bible itself" (*The National Temperance Advocate*, March, 1886, p. 35), he makes what use he can of extra-biblical evidence. For in a previous number of *The National Temperance Advocate* (February, 1886, p. 19) he condemns the translators of the Common Version as follows: "The words 'strong wine' are only a fiction of the translators; they are not in the original Hebrew. . . . Leaven is ferment, and ferment makes 'strong wine;' [and so] is forbidden. An awful responsibility, knowingly to quote this deception. We have a true and proper presentation of Num. XXVIII. 7 in the Septuagint Greek of the Old Testament, made three hundred years before Christ, by learned Jewish scholars, while these offerings were made daily. They did not see 'strong wine' in the text. . . . They simply transferred the Hebrew word *shekhar*, with a slight change for euphony, into *sikera*. If this was used instead of wine, the law required, as it did the wine, that it should be unfermented. Palm wine was *shekhar*; it is now and always has been used fresh."

In another passage he thus writes in respect to *sikera*: "This drink was derived from many sources. The juice of the palm-tree, or palm-wine, was, and still is, used fresh, in Eastern countries. *Sikera* was also expressed from various fruits; it was made from barley, from steeped raisins and dates. . . . This *shekhar*, or *sikera*, made from barley, in its first, unfermented state, was what we now call *sweetwort*. It is a pleasant, nutritious drink; as malt, it is put up as a food for invalids. This liquid, when fermented, is intoxicating; and, with hops now added, makes beer. *Sikera* of any kind was not released from the law, which forbade 'leaven,' or ferment, in that which was poured upon the altar. A shocking imposition was practised when the Translators called this 'strong wine.'" (*National Temperance Advocate*, March, 1886, p. 35.)

Can any thing be more oracular or worthless than this? How does Mr. Van Buren know what the authors of the Septuagint Version understood by *sikera*? How does he know that palm-wine was called *shekhar*, or that *shekhar* or *sikera* "was made from barley, and was what is now called *sweetwort*?" Is the Bible his teacher in these things? According to a late edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary *sweetwort* is "any plant of a sweet taste." Any plant of a sweet taste is *sikera* then! And this is scholarship rebuking the translators and revisers of the English Bible! The cause of temperance deserves better advocacy than is found in these articles of *The National Temperance Advocate*.

ETHICAL VALUE OF PAGAN RELIGIONS.

BY JUSTIN A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

In treating the subject here proposed it is quite unnecessary to dwell, even by way of preliminary, upon the well-known character of pagan morality. That picture which, at a time when paganism was the dominant moral force in the world, when it was both at its best and at its worst, was sketched by a Christian apostle, stood then, as it stands to-day, unimpeached in its truth to the revolting original. Over against this, however, is found the remarkable fact that pagan teaching has always contained so much that commends itself to the Christian intelligence, approaching often, and sometimes even rivaling, at least in the estimation of many, the moral teaching of Christianity itself. Thus it comes to pass that we see in the ethics of paganism much of that same contrast between the moral theory and the moral practice which is found in nominal Christianity. It might, indeed, seem at first open to one who denies the superiority of Christianity among religions, to ask, Wherein, after all, are Christian nations, or is even Christianity as a moral system, really different at this point of view from pagan nations, or from paganism?

One might reply that when all in this direction has been admitted which the actual fact demands of us, still the practical morality of Christendom, when at its worst, is so much superior to that of paganism when at its best, that really no rational comparison can be instituted between them. It is under Christian, and not pagan, auspices that the life of the modern world has been molded and inspired. It is the Bible, and not any pagan philosophy, which has fixed those standards of morality in the light of which Christians themselves are so often called to account by worldly men, and which condemn them when they are found wanting. The Christian family, social Christian life, the Christian nationality, even where these are only nominally Christian, and have been shaped by Christian influence unconsciously to themselves—has there ever been a time when in any part of the pagan world these were even approached in moral excellence and efficiency for the promotion of human happiness; even when full account is taken of those faults which are incident to all things human?

The question, however, which underlies all matters of historical fact in these particulars, or of present experience and observation, is what we are here to deal with. What of good result in the particular now considered do we find *possible* to paganism, taking it at its best? We must in studying its history make those same allowances on the ground of the faults and failures of human nature upon which we insist when Christianity is in a like way brought to the test. After these allowances have been made, how does the case stand? Is pagan morality found, whether in its religion or in its philosophy, even capable of answering the moral ends of either philosophy or religion? It is at this point of view that we are to study it now.

What we have first to notice here is the fact that the ethical value of a religion or of a philosophy cannot be accurately estimated by its preceptive element. It is at this point, in very large measure, that paganism and Christianity are thought susceptible of comparison, the one with the other. And at this point such comparison may be allowed. Since Christianity covers the whole field of morals; since the wisdom of inspiration has anticipated the moral needs of our human nature at every point; and since, as is the fact, the Bible has a lesson, or a warning, or an encouragement, or a restraint for every moral exigency conceivable in the life of a human being—since this is so, the moral teachings of other religions, if there be any truth or any good in them, will show points of resemblance to the moral teachings of *this* religion. So far, then, as preceptive morality is concerned, let it be granted that, up to a certain limit, fixed by the fact that in its preceptive morality paganism covers only a small part of human life and action, and even within this narrow bound is often at fault in its own teachings—up to this limit let it be granted that comparisons may be made. The adequate and conclusive test of ethical value is, after all, not here.

There are three reasons why simply the preceptive part of a religion cannot be regarded as conclusive of its value, either as religion or as morality. One of these is that precept, like law in general, is of value chiefly as it is representative of what is deeper in the heart of things, and mightier in itself than precept alone can ever be. Precept, like law, may be "a dead letter." It is always so, in fact, save as in the individual, the society, or the nation, there is a *conscience* which both endorses and enforces it. What effect did the philosophy of Plato have in staying the moral decline of the Greek people? or the philosophy of Cicero, or Seneca, in staying that of the Romans? What reason have we to suppose that the occasional high tone of moral precept in oriental religions ever really influenced the character or life of oriental nations? It is as when, in any country, laws are adopted far in advance of the reigning public sentiment or intelligence, so that they stand on the statute-book as representative of ideals, not of actualities.

Another reason to a like effect is that the value of precept, even where it is abstractly good, depends so much upon the motive. We may recall in this connection a precept, on its face much like one of Paul himself, which Prof. Mahaffy in his "Social life in Greece" quotes from "the gentle Menander," as he calls him. "Prefer to be injured," is a translation of the passage in Menander, "rather than to injure, for in so doing you will blame others, and you will escape censure." Upon this Prof. Mahaffy comments by saying: "If he had not promised us the luxury of blaming others, the sentiment would have been thoroughly Christian." What Paul says, apparently, but only apparently, to a like effect, is in one place in his epistle to the Romans, where mention is made of the coals of fire on an enemy's head. If any one were to interpret this language of Paul in any sense of requital for injury done, or any selfishness of motive whatever, he would commit himself to the absurdity of either maintaining that the way to be revenged upon an enemy is to feed him when hungry and give him drink when thirsty; or to that of holding that when thus overcoming evil with good, as mentioned in the connection, one is in some way serving himself. In truth, that saying of Paul, which to a certain extent bears such a likeness to the passage in Me-

ander, enjoins a duty which in its motive puts self out of the account altogether, and looks alone to the good of even an enemy. For the "coals of fire" are neither more nor less than just that consciousness of being in the wrong, and shame and repentance on account of it, to which forbearance of this nature may often bring a man, and which are the best that even a man's warmest friends could wish for him when he either does or contemplates a wrong action. This case may illustrate the whole attitude of paganism on the one hand and Christianity on the other as respects the motive annexed to precept. The very highest motive to virtue which paganism any where proposes is the *advantage* of virtue. Does any one need to be reminded how infinitely inferior, at the point of view of ethical worth or value, this is to that motive which makes either *duty* or *charity* the law of life for a Christian man?

This leads to a notice of the third reason why the preceptive element alone is no test of the ethical value of either a religion, or of the morality it enjoins. Precept must be enforced by some adequate *sanction*, or there is very little of practical force to be expected in it. Behind law there is the authority which enjoins the law. The precepts of pagan philosophy, so far as they are good, are simply good advice—nothing more. So much of reverence as may be felt for the teacher, so much of sanction this good advice has; and this, as a moral force, is feeble at the strongest, and is even felt only by those who in some way are in more or less direct relation with the person of the teacher. If it be a precept in pagan religion, what value can it have when the gods whom this religion teaches men to adore are themselves incarnations, not of virtue, but of vice? When the God of the Christian says, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," there is an awful emphasis in the words that lends availing sanction to every precept of the religion which adores the great God as a holy being.

It is not, then, in the precepts of a religion that we are to find either its authority as a religion, or its ethical value as such. This element may exist in it simply in virtue of the fact that some great teacher has infused it here and there with right thoughts on fundamental themes; and it may exist there as practically inert or inoperative, so as to make it worthless to any real result in the interest of morality.

Closely related to the proposition sustained on these three several grounds is this other: That the inculcation of specific virtues, however just and true so far as it goes, does not of itself suffice in giving value to either a religion or a philosophy. We may take as an illustration the virtue of filial piety as enjoined in the teachings of Confucius. That filial piety, in the sense in which we commonly use the phrase, is eminently beautiful and eminently salutary in its influence on human character and in human life, no one can doubt. No religion enjoins it with stronger emphasis than does the religion of the Bible. There are even some things in the Chinese conception and use of it which appeal strongly to our human feeling in this regard. Something pleasing may be in the thought that at family festivals those who seem to be absent because dead are not so really, that places reserved for those who once were present are still filled, though with forms unseen; and there may be something pleasing, again, in the offering

of flowers and fruits set before the vacant seat, as if it were possible for these invisible guests to share in the entertainment. There may be something salutary in the belief that between the living and the dead there is only an apparent separation, and in the desire to so act on all occasions as that the dead parent may still approve the acts of the living child. But when all this grows into a worship, and becomes in the religion a feature so prominent as to characterize it, and to degrade its ritual into a tissue of trifling ceremonials, while the proper object of worship is left out of view, perhaps scarcely even known;—when all this follows, the virtue of which so much is made in Chinese morality, and of which the Chinese sacred books have so much to say, becomes a delusion and a vice. The authorities tell us that Confucius, though he favored the practice of ancestral worship, finding it already in existence, as it had been for many centuries, was distrustful of its tendency. He tried to guard it by such teaching as that there could be no virtue in reverence for the dead while duties to the living were neglected or despised. But the result, in Chinese religion and Chinese morality, shows that simply the inculcation of a virtue does not suffice to make a people virtuous even in that which is thus enjoined. So with the virtue of temperance in all things, and self-control, which in oriental religions in a like way grows into the deformities of ascetic self-immolation. To all which may be added the general truth that while specific virtues are included in morality, yet morality, in any adequate meaning of the word, is virtue itself.

And this is very much the same thing as to say that what *is* the test of ethical value in any religion is the kind of *character* it tends to produce. We will say character in two respects, average character and ideal character. The second should be noticed first, since the ideal character in any religion must powerfully influence average character. To some extent the ideal of character in a religion may be seen in that which is attributed to the deity that is worshipped. It should seem that the conception any people may have of what is best in humanity may always be inferred from what is regarded as proper to deity. The mythology of a people, in fact, indicates its apprehension of what belongs to the highest being. The ideal of character is also seen in those whom pagan teaching and pagan literature set forth as ideal men. This is especially the case where the ideal man is the teacher himself, standing to his disciples in much the same relation, perhaps, as Jesus of Nazareth to those whom he taught. A conspicuous example is Buddha. Those who in these days and in enlightened lands so unaccountably show a tendency to accept the founder of the Buddhist faith as both an ideal teacher and an ideal man, must be strangely blinded. Let us take him just as the books picture him to us. The way in which he is represented as entering upon his career illustrates the fatal fallacy of his whole system. Does a man born to be the ruler of a people owe nothing to them? Is not his life-work provided for him in the very fact of being so born? Then Buddha had other ties; ties with wife and child; ties with the father and the mother whose only son and heir he was. Is it, after all, such a charming thing in him that he casts off all these and goes roaming over the world a barefooted beggar, preaching his gospel of *nirvana*? The story can be told in poetry so as to be very pleasing; but apply to it those tests which are afforded in the hard facts of human life and human duty, and what does it all become? The ideal Buddha affords in his own person is one which, if it were to be used in this world for other than poetical purposes, would take men

every-where out of their spheres of duty and service; would make all manly virtues a crime; would change the world's workers into puling, whimpering ascetics; would make religion itself a mask for selfishness, and morality the carcass of a dead dog. Buddha's boast was, "I am no man's servant." Jesus said, "If any man would be great among you, let him be the servant of all."

How distrustful the best men among pagan teachers have shown themselves of the effect of such ideals as the pagan mythology affords, is well known. Plato, for example, "was of opinion," says Döllinger, "that in a well-ordered state the histories of the battles of the gods, of Hera's captivity, of the pushing of Hephæstos down from heaven, should neither be admitted with allegorical explanation or without." He would have the mythology of his people "purged;" but we may well ask, What would remain of that mythology, after, as he suggests, all that is undignified and morally hurtful had been purged away? If this is true of a mythology which has been a chief inspiration in some of the noblest poetry the world has, in so far as transcendency of genius is concerned, how must the case have been with those worshiping deities supposed to take delight in human sacrifice, in the murder of infants, in debaucheries and cruelties such as we cannot even name? How must it have been with those people along the Nile by whom the supreme object of worship was seen incarnated in a brute? How must it be in pantheistic religions which rob the soul of all sense of a personal deity and leave morality and religion both to be the indigenous growth of man's own bad heart and bewildered mind?

For the production and development of that kind of character which is ideally good, and which practically in the average man represents any just conception of human virtue, Christianity alone, of all historical religions whatsoever, makes any adequate provision. The strongest argument in support of the Christian doctrine of regeneration, apart from the divine authority upon which it is declared, is the absolute necessity of all which that doctrine imports to the ends of human virtue, and to the efficiency of any ethical teaching, however perfect in itself. The words of Jesus to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again," have the indorsement of man's moral history from the beginning. This it is which the ethical systems of paganism, however in their preceptive features or in their inculcation of specific virtues they may have approached Christianity, have always fatally lacked. The answering query of the master in Israel, "How can these things be?" does indeed still linger on the lips of the doubting or the disbelieving; perhaps will do so to the end of time. All the same does the moral history of mankind make it certain that no ethical teaching, however complete in itself, ever transforms human life save as humanity is itself transformed.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,
Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

- SEPT. 5. JESUS THE TRUE VINE. John xv. 1-16.
SEPT. 12. THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT. John xvi. 5-20.
SEPT. 19. JESUS INTERCEDING. John xvii.

In the first lesson, the imagery of verses 6 and 7 is very much like that of Ezek. xv. 4, 5.

The Old Testament citation in John xv. 25, though not in the Lesson, is worth studying, for several reasons. Undoubtedly it is from Ps. lxix. 4 or Ps. xxxv. 19, in each of which places the Hebrew is a part of the subject, the word for hating being a participle used substantively (*shin'ay chinnam*), and is literally translated in the Septuagint *οἱ μισοῦντές με δωρεάν*. Phrases of similar import are used in several other places in the Psalms. Jesus, in citing, makes a complete statement of the words which were, in the original, only the subject of a statement (*Ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν*). The instance would be important in an induction for defining what the New Testament writers mean when they speak of an Old Testament statement as "fulfilled." Jesus here intended to be understood that the world's hatred of him is just such a causeless and unjustifiable hatred as is often described in the Psalms; it is not so evident that he also intended to say that the acts of his personal enemies were specifically foreseen and foretold by the author of one or more of these Psalms.

In the third Lesson, in John xvii. 12, we again find the formula, "That the Scripture might be fulfilled." In this case, the formula is not attended by an actual citation; we are left to inference to determine whether our Savior refers to some particular passage, or to the general tenor of the Scriptures. Both views are actually held. The particular passages commonly claimed to be here intended are Ps. xli. 10 (9), which is cited with reference to Judas in John xiii. 18; Ps. cix. 8, cited in Acts i. 20; and Isa. lvii. 12, 13. Those who claim that the reference is to a class of passages would instance either those passages that are connected in the New Testament with the fate of Judas, or the wider class that refer to the betrayal and death of the Messiah. Yet another theory of the matter might be that when Jesus said, "None of them is destroyed except the son of destruction, that the Scripture might be fulfilled," he was referring to the doctrine of retribution currently taught in the Old Testament, and not to any specific predictions concerning himself or his immediate associates. As a specimen of this doctrine, see Ps. cix. 16-19, in the Hebrew or the Revised Version. In this and a multitude of other Old Testament passages, the doctrine is emphasized that he who persists in playing the part of a "Son of Destruction" will justly be destroyed by Jehovah. Among these various views, one who insists that the fulfilling of Scripture here spoken of must be the coming to pass of a prediction should hold that the Scripture here said to be fulfilled is the whole line of prediction concerning the death of the Messiah; on any other theory, the fulfillment is simply the

fact that certain statements, made in the Old Testament, closely fit the case in hand, and may, therefore, be fairly applied to it.

The phrase "Son of Destruction," in xvii. 12, is a notable Hebraism. The fact that the citation in xv. 25 is from the "law" renders that verse one of the half dozen important instances for proving that, in the time of the writing of the New Testament, the term "the law" was currently applied to the whole Old Testament, as well as to the Pentateuch.

In the Lesson for Sept. 12, and throughout the chapters covered by the Lessons for the month, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is very prominent. This fact calls for the suggestion that the best way of studying the New Testament doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost would be to begin by studying the Old Testament doctrine. The study would be a surprise to many who are accustomed to think of the Old Testament as very barren in respect to this doctrine; it is, on the contrary, peculiarly rich here. Extending over the larger part of the ground which a Christian student would wish to cover, the two Testaments teach parallel doctrines concerning the Divine Spirit; and so far as they are parallel, the Old is very much more full and explicit than the New. Where they cease to be parallel, the New could best be studied by differentiating it from the Old. In making this study, one should, of course, avoid the carrying of New Testament ideas back into the Old Testament; and he should equally avoid the assuming that the New Testament ideas are not to be found in the Old, and the consequent straining of the language of the Old Testament, to prevent its teaching what the New Testament also teaches.

In John xvi. 20, and elsewhere in the chapters for the month, occurs the expression "verily, verily." No Bible student ought to need to be informed that the Greek word here is *ἀμην*, the same word with the "amen" at the end of the Lord's Prayer, and elsewhere. The word, of course, is Hebrew. We are accustomed to be told that it means, at the end of a petition, "so let it be." But a little study of Hebrew usage will give to the word a much richer meaning than this. Aaron and Hur stayed up the hands of Moses, and his hands were steady (*'emunah*) till the going down of the sun (Exod. xvii. 12). This is a good instance by which to keep in mind the meaning of the Hebrew stem. It is applied to anything that is so well supported that it can be relied upon. From this radical idea come the Hebrew words for truth, and for believe. Verbally, in the Hebrew, truth is *that which can be relied upon*, and faith is our relying upon that which is reliable. Practically, the result is the same as that finally reached by all evangelical theology; but the path to this result through the Hebrew is direct, while that through latinized scholasticism is as circuitous as a horseshoe.

SEPT. 26. REVIEW.

OCT. 3. JESUS BETRAYED. John xviii. 1-14.

The fact that a Judas and a betrayal were necessary, that Jesus might be delivered into the hands of his enemies, is by itself conclusive proof that his death was not the work of the whole Jewish people, nor of the Palestinian Jews, as a body, nor of the constituted representatives of the nation acting in their proper capacity. On this account, Judas is a very interesting character to the lovers of the truth in Israelitish history. According to the narratives in the Gospels, a large majority of the men who held official position were among the enemies of

Jesus, and were determined upon his death. It is therefore the more significant that they dared not proceed against Jesus by public arrest and legal trial, but had to bargain with Jesus to get him privately into their hands. The actual proceedings against Judas will be considered in the lessons for the next month; for the present, we have to look at the fact that Jewish public opinion in regard to Jesus was, from the beginning to the end of his career, overwhelmingly and unswervingly in his favor. It is true that in John's Gospel the term "the Jews" is often used, without qualification, to denote those Jews who were hostile to Jesus. But this usage is peculiar to John, and is one of the marks of the relatively late origin of that Gospel. It is not found in the other Gospels, except, possibly, in Matt. xxviii. 15. It is occasionally found in the Acts and Epistles, but is frequent only in John. Among the New Testament writers, only John wrote after Christianity had become so completely differentiated from the rabbinical Judaism that Jew and Christian were habitually thought of as hostile to one another. The other gospels, with the Acts and the Epistles, habitually speak of the Jews as a people, some of whom openly accept Jesus, some of whom openly reject him, and some of whom do neither, but merely treat his claims with outward respect. When they wrote, this was still the prevalent condition of things; when John wrote, it had become a condition of things belonging to the past; it had already come to be generally considered that the Jews had one religion, and the Christians another; Christianity and Judaism were no longer regarded as two opposing movements in the Jewish religion.

But although John employs the term "the Jews" in this way, he certainly did not intend to be understood as saying that the Jewish people or nation hated Jesus and sought his life. In regard to this his statements agree with those of the rest of the New Testament. The Jews who sought the death of Jesus were a combination of public men, opposed one to another in many points, but agreeing in the fact that they all had reasons for wishing Jesus out of the way. Some of the traditional notions of us Christian people in this matter are very unjust to the Jews. In times when Christian nobles regarded the Jew as without the pale of common justice, and deemed it rare sport to persuade him, by means of the gridiron and the thumbscrew, to divide his wealth with them, it was natural to justify this by the theory that each particular Jew, in all time, is, in virtue of his being a Jew, one of the murderers of Jesus. Now that we have abandoned the Jew-compelling gridiron as infamous, it is time that we abandon this equally infamous misinterpretation of the New Testament.

The accounts of the history of Judea in the times of Christ, whether found in Josephus and the other original sources, or in the many secondary works that have been written, are confused and confusing. One should here be cautious how he illustrates Scripture by what purport to be historical facts, unless he has first tested the facts. Accounts of the scribes and pharisees and of the literature concerning them may be found in the larger Bible dictionaries and similar works, under the headings "Scribes," "Pharisees," "Mishna," "Talmud," and the like. Many of these accounts are quite full; they are usually rather unsatisfactory, perhaps necessarily so, on account of the nature of the subject. Edersheim's *Life of Christ*, published a year ago, and Shürer's *History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, just published, give to the general student advantages in this department of study, such as have never before been enjoyed.

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHET.

BY PROF. EDWARD L. CURTIS, PH. D.,

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

The Hebrew word for prophet is *nabhi'* from *nabha'* to burst forth, bubble up like a fountain, kindred with *nabha'* to boil forth, gush out. This is the derivation given by Gesenius. It has been disputed whether the word is active or passive; whether it denotes one who bubbles forth the divine message or one who is made to bubble forth—one inspired. The weight of authority is now decidedly in favor of the active meaning. This, however, is a matter of small moment. Practically it must denote both, one moved upon, and one giving forth, a recipient and a revealer or proclaimer of the divine will; one to whom the *ne'um*, the secret confidential communication, of Jehovah was given and one who utters this forth. Abraham was the first called a prophet, Gen. xx. 7. "Restore this man to his wife," said the Lord to Abimelech, "for he is a prophet." Abraham was one to whom the Lord revealed his will. Gen. xviii. 17. "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" He received also the divine promises and must have communicated them to his household. The next use, however, of this term in the Old Testament settles more precisely its meaning and presents the active force of the word. In Exod. vii. 1, God says to Moses, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." But in Exod. iv. 16 it had been said, "And he [Aaron] shall be thy spokesman unto the people, and it shall come to pass that he shall be to thee a mouth and thou shalt be to him as God." Hence a prophet is the mouth-piece of God, the speaker of God, "the organ through which the Invisible One speaks audibly to his people." And the word *nabhi'* is probably best to be connected directly with the Assyrian *nabû* "to speak, say, name, appoint," which appears in the name of the Assyrio-Babylonian god Nebo, the speaker or Mercury of the gods, who carried their messages to men. Moses was thus pre-eminently a prophet, Num. xii. 6 seq.; Deut. xvii. 15; Hos. xii. 13. Moses and Christ were the greatest of the prophets. In a strictly biblical and Old Testament sense is Christ called "Our Prophet."

But if the prophet is a revealer or speaker of the divine will, how does he differ from the other writers of Scripture? The prophet gave the divine will or message as something apart and distinct from his own thoughts. He differs thus from the sacred poet. "The poet gave utterance to the longings, aspirations, fears, doubts and anxieties of man's heart, whereas the prophet was commissioned to address himself directly to the people as conveying to them the message of God. One represented so to speak the human side of the truth, what man feels and is; the other, the divine, what God is and requires. One speaks from man to God, the other, from God to man." In like manner, also, does the prophet differ from the writer of the wisdom literature. That is divine truth, but it is truth obtained by a process of reflection and study. "And I applied my heart," says the writer of Ecclesiastes (i. 13), "to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all that is done under heaven." "I communed with my own heart" (i. 16). Within the same class come also the sacred historians, who received their information from

living witnesses and written documents or oral tradition, but to whom generally we cannot infer that aught of historical knowledge was revealed. Their method of procedure, judging from their frequent references to authorities, was not unlike that of Luke, who says, "It seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus." (Luk. i. 3). The matter of these writers we regard inspired, but not revealed. The prophet, on the other hand, received truth by revelation. His natural faculties of reflection, reason, and imagination were doubtless not abated, nay rather were quickened, yet he was conscious of receiving information in some other way than through these. It was not the result of his own efforts, instruction or intention, not the product of his own thinking, but was a divine communication. A power outside and apart from himself gave it unto him; a power compelling him to speak. Hence the hand of the Lord was said to be upon him. Isa. viii. 11; Jer. xv. 17; Ezek. i. 3; iii. 14, 22; viii. 1. Hence his message is repeatedly called the word of the Lord, a "thus saith the Lord," as commences nearly every paragraph of the prophetic writings. The prophets distinguished themselves from the false prophets because the latter spoke a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord (Jer. xxiii. 16). False prophets spoke according to their own wishes and desires, spoke to flatter and please their hearers. Not so did the true prophets. They spoke even against their own inclination (Jer. xx. 9). This distinct consciousness of uttering the word of God, is one of the strongest arguments for the truth of their claim to be the revealers of the divine will, just as one of the strongest arguments for the messiahship and divinity of Christ is his own consciousness and testimony of the same. As in the case of the greatest of the prophets, so also of his forerunners, they were either deceivers, or self-deceived, or, as they claimed to be, the mouth-pieces of God.

UNROLLING THE MUMMY OF RAMESES THE GREAT.

[From a translation (in *Sunday School Times* of Aug. 14, 1886) of Prof. Maspero's Official Report.]

The mummy (No. 5,233) [discovered in 1881 in the tomb of the priest-kings at Dayr-el-Bahari] first taken out from its glass case is that of Rameses II., Sesostris [the first Pharaoh of the oppression, according to the view of many eminent scholars], as testified by the official entries bearing date the sixth and sixteenth years of the reign of the high-priest Her-hor Se-Amen, and the high-priest Pinotem I., written in black ink upon the lid of the wooden mummy-case, and the further entry of the sixteenth year of the high-priest Pinotem I., written upon the outer winding-sheet of the mummy, over the region of the breast. The presence of this last inscription having been verified by His Highness the khedive, and by the illustrious personages there assembled, the first wrapping was removed, and there were successively discovered a band of stuff (*sic*) twenty centimetres in width rolled round the body; then a second winding-sheet, sewn up and kept in place by narrow bands placed at some distance apart; then two thicknesses of small bandages; and then a piece of fine linen reaching from the head to the feet. A figure representing the Goddess Nut, one metre in length, is drawn upon this piece of linen, in red and white, as prescribed by the ritual. The profile of the

goddess is unmistakably designed after the pure and delicate profile of Seti I., as he is known to us in the bas-relief sculptures of Thebes and Abydos. Under this amulet there was found another bandage; then a layer of pieces of linen folded in squares and spotted with the bituminous matter used by the embalmers. This last covering removed, Rameses II. appeared. The head is long, and small in proportion to the body. The top of the skull is quite bare. On the temples there are a few sparse hairs, but at the poll the hair is quite thick, forming smooth, straight locks about five centimetres in length. White at the time of death, they have been dyed a light yellow by the spices used in embalmment. The forehead is low and narrow; the brow-ridge prominent; the eyebrows are thick and white; the eyes are small and close together; the nose is long, thin, hooked like the noses of the Bourbons, and slightly crushed at the tip by the pressure of the bandages. The temples are sunken; the cheek-bones very prominent; the ears round, standing far out from the head, and pierced like those of a woman for the wearing of earrings. The jaw-bone is massive and strong; the chin very prominent; the mouth small but thick lipped, and full of some kind of black paste. This paste being partly cut away with the scissors, disclosed some much worn and very brittle teeth, which, moreover, are white and well preserved. The moustache and beard are thin. They seem to have been kept shaven during life, but were probably allowed to grow during the king's last illness; or they may have grown after death. The hairs are white, like those of the head and eyebrows, but are harsh and bristly, and from two to three millimetres in length. The skin is of earthy brown splotched with black. Finally, it may be said that the face of the mummy gives a fair idea of the face of the living king. The expression is unintellectual, perhaps slightly animal; but even under the somewhat grotesque disguise of mummification, there is plainly to be seen an air of sovereign majesty, of resolve, and of pride. The rest of the body is as well preserved as the head; but in consequence of the reduction of the tissues its external aspect is less life-like. The neck is no thicker than the vertebral column. The chest is broad; the shoulders are square; the arms are crossed upon the breast; the hands are small and dyed with henna; and the wound in the left side through which the embalmers extracted the viscera, is large and open. The legs and thighs are fleshless; the feet are long, slender, somewhat flat-soled, and dyed, like the hands, with henna. The corpse is that of an old man, but of a vigorous and robust old man. We know, indeed, that Rameses II. reigned for sixty-seven years, and that he must have been nearly one hundred years old when he died.

▷BOOK NOTICES◁

ORELLI'S OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY.*

We notice first the scope of this work. In the Introduction biblical prophecy is defined and clearly distinguished from analogous heathen phenomena; its subject-matter, the kingdom of God, is stated; the influence of the age upon it is shown and limited; the office of the type is set forth, and the notion of fulfillment, in general and in the new covenant, is given. Thus we have here enough to enable one to comprehend fully the phenomena of biblical prophecy. In the main work there is traced in its historical development the heralding word of God's kingdom in all its phases through the entire Old Testament. This is not merely done by giving this in outline as a general scheme found running through the Old Testament, but by a critical translation and exegesis of the leading Messianic passages. Notes also contain introductions to the prophetic books. Thus the extent of the subject-matter of this single volume may be compared with that of Hengstenberg's *Christology of the Old Testament*, in four volumes.

We notice next the spirit and view-point of this work. Prof. Orelli is a conservative Christian scholar, a thorough believer in the supernatural and the divine element in prophecy, and yet he is not hide-bound in his conservatism or a blind follower of tradition. He belongs to the modern school of historico-biblical critics, and uses their methods. Noticeable is his comment on the blessing of Noah, p. 103. "The question from whom such an oracle sprang or received its present form is one of extraordinary difficulty. It is clear from the above interpretation how great was the influence of the Hebrew language on the form of Noah's blessing, and of course the Hebrew language was just as little spoken by the patriarchs as by Adam in Paradise. In its contents also the oracle is conditioned by the revelation given to the people of Israel after Moses. Compare the emphatic use of the name of Javeh and the description of Canaan as cursed by the progenitor. On the other hand, it is out of harmony both with the spirit of antiquity and in particular with the moral earnestness of the biblical authors to invent such oracles of set purpose and publish them as words of an ancestor. Rather in this old Hebrew oracle we have to deal with a primitive tradition, the kernel of which reaches back beyond the Hebrew nationality, but which received its present form from the spirit of the Israelitish theocracy (as in the account of creation). The greatness of its contents makes it certain that it was a prophetically deep and far-seeing seer who put down Noah's word as the Alpha of the world's history. Such a saying can not be explained as a limited reflection of the view of a particular time, or as the product of certain political relations and moods."

* THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY OF THE CONSUMMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD, traced in its Historical Development. By C. Von Orelli, Professor of Theology, Basel, Switzerland. Translated by Rev. J. S. Banks, Headingley College, Leeds. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. 1885. Pp. viii, 472.

Isa. XL.-LXVI. is assigned to another than Isaiah. Zechariah is regarded the work of more than one writer. Yet the views of this work as a whole are those of our orthodox conservative scholars, and so completely is it pervaded with an earnest, reverent, candid tone that it cannot but prove acceptable and stimulating to Bible-loving and evangelical students, whatever their critical views. As regards all the interpretation of prophecy Prof. Orelli is sober and sound. He is not an extreme literalist, nor does he unduly spiritualize prophecy. He follows the rule which he gives respecting the relation of prophecy to fulfillment: *A prophecy can only be regarded as fulfilled when the whole body of truth included in it has attained living realization.*

For a German theological writer his style is unusually clear. No one in reading this book is liable to be lost in a fog. Hence for a comprehensive, clear, sound view of Messianic prophecy we highly commend this work. We know of no better.

SCRIPTURES HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN.*

How shall we introduce young people or others to the study of the Bible? Shall we present them the book as a whole, either with or without comment? Or shall we by judicious selection give them the salient contents of the book, arranging together history, prophecy, law, proverb and song, so that their matter will not only be known, but their mutual relations will be seen at once? Drs. Bartlett and Peters have adopted this latter method—and the principle is a true one: as far as possible let Scripture be its own introduction—and have given a volume admirably suited for this purpose. There is no note or comment, only condensation and re-arrangement. A book has been furnished to which a young reader will often more readily turn on a Sunday afternoon for instruction or entertainment, than to the ordinary Bible, because the selections present nothing dull, nothing obscure, and nothing irrelevant to the topics chosen. Phrases unintelligible, unchaste and unnecessary have been omitted. At the same time there has been scholarly fidelity to the original and a preservation for the most part of the wording of the Authorized or Revised English Version, so that none of its classic beauty has been lost. The minor changes made have been mainly in the direction of simplifying passages or idioms unintelligible to the average reader. Explanatory glosses have, of course, been at times introduced, but these when of more than one or two words are indicated. The mechanical execution of the work is very attractive.

While thus heartily commending this work as adapted to the end in view, and prepared to serve as an open door for a further study and knowledge of the Bible, notice must be taken of the fact that the reading of the book will tend to fit one to receive the results of modern criticism. This is owing to the frequent and at

* SCRIPTURES HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN. Arranged and Edited for Young Readers as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible, by Edward T. Bartlett, A. M., Dean of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia, and John P. Peters, Ph. D., Professor of the Old Testament Languages and Literature in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia. Vol. I. Hebrew Story from Creation to the Exile, comprising material from the following Books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press. 1886. Pp. xii, 545.

times striking agreement between the editors' arrangement of the Bible story and that of modern critics. The Hebrew law, for example, is to be placed in the second volume, which will deal with Jewish history from the Captivity to the time of Christ. Nothing from Leviticus appears in the first volume. The editors, however, disclaim any intention thus to favor the reception of modern critical views. They state that, "when they observed the agreement between their practical division, and the division of the critics, they were as much surprised as any of their readers can be. We do not wish to be understood as disclaiming critical views, but we are not conscious of having made this work a vehicle for the expression of those views." (Pref. pp. iii, iv.)

EIGHT STUDIES OF THE LORD'S DAY.*

The eight studies of this book are: "The Phenomena of the Day." "The Week." "The Primeval Sacred Day." "The Mosaic Sabbath." "The Sabbatic System of Israel." "The Permanent and the Transient in the Sabbatic System." and "The Fourth Commandment." Their object is to set the admitted facts connected with the Lord's Day in a proper light; to show that the whole Bible does provide and prophesy this day now kept by Christians. They are addressed to believers and based upon the principles, first, that "The conduct of Christians must be guided solely by the Word of God, intelligently examined, not merely as to isolated passages long or short, but also as to its teaching as a continuous developing and integral revelation;" and second, that "Christian consciousness through the ages has been at heart always right." This is a work of more than ordinary merit, having the charm of dealing with facts, those of secular and Christian life and of the Bible, and of confining itself to these. Hence it is not a dogmatic treatise, nor made up of practical homilies, nor of polemic arguments, but, as its modest title declares, of studies, scientific in method, fresh and vigorous in thought, and replete with stimulating suggestion. It is a real contribution to the literature of its subject. The most striking study of all, perhaps, is that of The Week which thus closes: "The week has been, through the ages, as now, the sign of a relation between God and man. It is a witness, not—like months and years—to the material, but to the spiritual. It tells not of sun, moon, and stars, which are seen, but of a Spirit unseen. It exists, not in accordance with conditions and circumstances inherent in nature, but by the arbitrament of a Supreme Will, communicated to loyal dependents. It is fitted for human use, kept in its regular unvarying succession before human notice, and maintained as the assurance of divine regard for man, by the institution of a sacred day which marks its boundary and illuminates the transition from one week to the next. The emphasis, then, of the fivefold Gospel statement is on this circumstance, that our Lord's resurrection day is the boundary, the defining day of a new week—identical with the old, yet transfigured in this new morning light. So then all the significance of that day, which seals to man his one great all-comprehending divinely centred hope, is blended with the significance of that period which, through the ages, has assured a bond between God and man,—when the transcendent day of days is described as the first day of the week."

* EIGHT STUDIES OF THE LORD'S DAY. Cambridge: *The Riverside Press*. Printed for Private Distribution. 1884. (Copyright, 1884, by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.)

A MANUAL ON OLD TESTAMENT BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.*

This is the second volume in what promises to be a very useful series of manual text-books for theological classes and students. The first volume was published fifteen months ago as a "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology, based on Hagenbach and Krauth. Part I. Exegetical Theology." It met with a welcome reception not only in America but also in Germany and other European circles. The object of the series is to take the leading works of conservative authors on the various theological disciplines, and by a careful and critical condensation to make them suitable text-books for theological students. For the Old Testament field no better work could have been chosen than that of the departed Oehler, acknowledged the *facile princeps* in this department among the better class of German theologians. The only question in connection with Prof. Weidner's work is whether the condensation can be pronounced satisfactory. We consider it well done. His style is clear and to the point, and he everywhere seems to have reproduced the gist and marrow of the original. Reproducing another's work in substance is not an easy task, and Professor Weidner is for that very reason entitled to special recognition.

One or two suggestions, however, present themselves to the reader. The bibliography of the subject added by Professor Weidner is good as far as it goes, although occasionally slips will occur, as, e. g., forgetting to mention on page 10 that the second edition of Shürer has appeared in a much enlarged form in both German and English, and failing to mention on page 215 the work of Bissell on the Pentateuch. And aside from this, we think that in a bibliography intended for students, something more should be given than merely the title, place and date of publication. In a few words the size, character and importance of the books could have been added, as has been done in the case of a few. The theological discussions in Old Testament Theology since the death of Oehler are almost entirely ignored. These discussions have not been an unmixed evil. They have brought forth some good gold for the benefit of positive Christian science. And, besides, a resumé, no matter how briefly outlined, would have helped the student to understand the burning questions of the day in the department to which this book introduces him. Still, we heartily recommend this work of Professor Weidner.

* BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, based on Oehler. By Revere Franklin Weidner, Professor of Theology in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. Philadelphia: H. B. Garner, 710 Arch Street, 1886. 8vo, pp. xiii, 222.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- The Evolution of a Shadow; or, the Bible doctrine of Rest.* By A. M. Weston. Cincinnati: Standard Pub. Co. Cl., pp. vii. 292.\$1.50
- The Jewish Altar.* By the late John Leighton. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Cl., 12mo, pp. iii, 127.75c.
- Bible and Belief, a letter to a Friend.* By Rev. W. Humphrey. London. 12mo.\$1.25
- Eternity. What does the Bible say of it? A concordance.* Willard Tract Society.70c.
- Haman and Mordecai; a drama in five acts.* By Clifton Harby. Cincinnati: The Bloch Pub. and Printing Co. 16mo, pap.25
- Theologie de l'Ancien Testament.* By Ch. Piepenbring. Paris: Fishbacher. 8vo.7 fr. 50
- Beitraege zur Geographie Palaestinas.* By H. Hildesheimer. Berlin: Rosenstein.M.4
- Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the College Libraries of Oxford.* Compiled by Ad. Neubauer. London: Clarendon Press. Catalogue £3 13s. 6d.; the Facsimiles.£2 12s. 6d.
- Sculpture, Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman.* Containing a Chronological List of Ancient Sculptors and their Works. By George Redford. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. Crown 8vo.5s.
- The Apocalypse in Evolution and the Book of Daniel in its First Interpretation.* Utica, N. Y.: Arthur Urie. Pp. 72.
- Biblia Hexaglotta.* Edited by Edward Riches de Levante. London: R. D. Dickinson. Half French Morocco. Six vols.\$22.00
- Bible Readings.* Arranged by Susan L. Hatch. Boston: Congregational Sunday-school and Publishing Society. 16mo, pp. 72.40c.
- The Six Days of Creation; the Fall; and the Deluge.* By J. B. Reimensnyder. Philadelphia: Lutheran Pub. Soc. 12mo, pp. 368.\$1.25
- A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.* Second Division. Vol. III. By Emil Schuerer. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford. Pp. 381.
- Anglo-Israelism not necessary to the fulfilment of Scripture promises.* By Jasper Wilson. Toronto, Canada: W. Briggs. Pp. 24.10c.
- The Churchman's Family Bible.* With Commentary by various authors. Part XIV., Ezekiel to Micah; Part XV., Micah to Esdras; Part XVI., Esdras to Wisdom of Solomon. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 4to.each part 8s.
- Studies in the Prophecy of Daniel.* By W. A. Crocker. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. Pp. 104.
- Bible Use of Illustration.* An Address by Chas. M. Hobbs before the Sixth Annual Convention of the Colorado Sunday-school Association. Denver: Tribune-Republican Print. 18mo, pp. 32.
- History of the Bible.* By Albert Colby. East Conway, N. H.: Published by the author. 12mo, pp. 132. Revised ed.50c.
- Moses—the Man and the Statesman.* By Isaac M. Wise.25c.
- Biblical Essays.* By C. H. A. Wright. New York: Scribner & Welford. 12mo.\$2.00
- Rays of Messiah's Glory; or, Christ in the Old Testament.* By D. Baron. London: Hodder. 8vo, pp. 270.6s.
- Die Stellung Ezechiels in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie.* By Th. Arndt. Berlin: Haack. 8vo, pp. 32.M.1.20

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- The Mummy of Sesostris.* By G. Maspero in Aacdemy, July 3, '86.
- The Royal Mummies at Boulak.* Ib., ib., July 31, '86.
- The Royal Mummies at the Boulak Museum.* Ib., July 24, '86.
- The French Excavations in Susiana.* Ib.
- German Translations of the Bible before Luther.* By Karl Pearson, ib., Aug. 7, '86.
- Hosmer's "The Jews."* By P. A. Barnett, ib., July 10, '86.
- Revision of the Bible.* By G. Vance Smith in Nineteenth Century, July, '86.
- Note on Genesis and Science.* By W. E. Gladstone, ib., August, '86.
- The Study of the Old Testament.* By Joseph T. Duryea in Church Union, June 15, '86.
- Does it Pay to Study Hebrew?* By J. W. Payne in Pulpit Treasury, June, '86.
- The Light of Holy Scripture.* Positive Aspect. By E. V. Gerhart in Reformed Quarterly Review, July, '86.
- The Ancient Oracle.* By H. P. Laird, ib.
- The Prophets.* By S. Calthrop in Unitarian Review, July, '86.
- On Maccabean Psalms.* By C. H. Toy, ib.
- The Eternal's Secret with the Prophets.* By N. P. Gilman, ib., Aug., '86.
- The Revision of Genesis.* By Charles R. Brown in Bibliotheca Sacra, July, '86.
- The Revised Version of the Old Testament.* By Samuel Ives Curtiss, ib.
- The Book of Jubilees.* (Chapters XII-XXIV.) Translated from the Ethiopic by Geo. H. Schodde, ib.
- The Vision of Ezra the Scribe concerning the latter times of the Ishmaelites.* By Isaac H. Hall in Presbyterian Rev., July, '86.
- The Revision of the English Old Testament.* No. IV. By G. C. M. Douglas in Monthly Interpreter, Aug., '86.
- Biblical Topography.* VI. Sites connected with the History of Abraham—Haran, Damascus, Hebron. By G. Rawlinson, ib.
- The Argument of the Book of Job.* By David Shanks, ib.
- The Patriarchal Times.* IX. The Tower of Babel. By Thomas Whitelaw, ib.
- The Revised Version of the Old Testament.* The First Book of Kings. By A. F. Kirkpatrick in Expositor, July, '86.
- Brevia.* Job vi. 25; Ps. CXXIII. 2. By T. K. Cheyne, ib.
- Dancing and Pentateuch Criticism in Correlation.* By Franz Delitzsch, ib., Aug., '86.
- The Revised Version.* The Second Book of Kings—Nehemiah. By A. F. Kirkpatrick, ib., Aug., '86.
- The Book of Zechariah.* 4. The Flying Roll and the Ephah. By Marcus Dods, ib., Aug. '86.
- The Gospel Given to Abraham.* By Joseph Angus, in Sunday-school Times, June 5, '86.
- Sheol, Hades, or the Intermediate State.* By A. A. Hodge, ib., July 3, '86.
- A Critical Reconstruction of the Religion and History of Israel.* Ib., August 7, '86.
- Biblical Inspiration; or, Inspiration as a fact related to Scripture.* By Ransom B. Welch in Independent, July 29, Aug. 12, '86.