

THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1884.

No. 5.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PERIOD OF THE JUDGES.

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

The marginal references in most of our Bibles date the Exodus at 1491 B. C. This date seems to be obtained as follows:

Supposed date of Rehoboam's accession B. C. 975
Solomon's reign, 1 Kgs. XI., 42; 2 Chron. IX., 30, 40 yrs.
Date of founding Temple, 1 Kgs. VI., 1, after Exodus, . . . 480 "

Less year of Solomon's reign, 1 Kgs. VI., 1; 2 Chron. III., 2, 4

1495

1491

The current opinions in regard to this may be arranged in three classes: 1st, the opinions of those who, in an approximative, general way, defend the numeral 480, generally at the cost of discrediting some of the other biblical numerals. Examples are the schemes of Cassell and Bachmann, in the American edition of Lange. 2d, the opinion which discredits the 480, holding that the period was at least a century or two longer than that. An accessible presentation of this view is the article "Chronology," in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia. 3d, the opinion which discredits the numeral 480, regarding it as, say, a century and a half too long. A clear and compact presentation of this view may be found in Lord Hervey's Introduction to the Pulpit Commentary on Judges, or in his Introduction to the Speaker's Commentary on the same book. This is certainly the prevalent opinion on the subject, if any opinion can fairly be so called. Discussions more or less full with descriptions of the literature of the subject, may be found in the articles already mentioned, and in the other introductions and articles in all the great commentaries, Bible dictionaries and other books of reference.

All these opinions, however, are confessedly based on conjecture, and not on proof. They all have this decided defect, that they discredit what ought to be the most decisive evidence in the case, namely, the explicit statements of the Old and New Testaments. None of them, therefore, can be regarded as final. The question is still open for investigation.

The subject may be conveniently treated under the form of a consideration of some of the reasons commonly assigned in favor of the shorter chronology.

1st. It is alleged that the 480 in 1 Kgs. may be explained as an interpolation, and the 300 in Judg. XI., 26 as a misreading. But this is only negative, and with the probabilities strongly against it. Some copies of the Septuagint, indeed, have the reading 440 instead of 480; but all the other testimony is uniform in favor of the integrity of these numerals as they now stand.

2d. Josephus, they allege, gives this interval variously as 592, 612, or 632 years, and Eusebius as 600 years, while other patristic writers give various other numerals. Evidently, this argument also has at best only a negative force, especially when it is employed in the interest of the shortened chronology; to say nothing of its being worthless by reason of the secondary and conflicting nature of the evidence on which it rests.

3d. It is alleged that the several genealogical lists contain an average of perhaps six names each for the period of the Judges, from the death of Moses to the birth of David; in other words, that they indicate a period of about six generations, that is, of something less than 200 years. This argument is admirably, though briefly, presented on page 111 of the Pulpit Commentary on Judges. It is the one argument for the shortened chronology which has some value.

But it has also decided elements of weakness. Lord Hervey, for example, counts ten genealogical lists, in all, crossing the period of the Judges. He counts these as containing from five to eight generations each. Now it is possible, and, from what we know of the Hebrew genealogies, not very improbable, that each of these lists may have omitted some of the generations. In that case, the omitted generations may be different in the different lists. It is possible that some may mention generations which some or all of the others omit, so that the true number of the generations may be larger than that of even the longest list. In fact, some scholars actually claim that some of the genealogies, that of Samuel, for instance, extend through double the above number of generations. See "Samuel," in McClintock and Strong. Questions like these can only be determined by tabulating the lists, in

the light of such additional information as we can find. Until this is correctly and carefully done, the induction from a few lists, each taken by itself and unchecked by other evidence, is a very precarious basis for argument. The assertion, therefore, that the number of the generations from the Exodus to the Monarchy does not exceed even the number mentioned in the longest of the genealogical lists cannot be accepted as final.

But suppose that the tabulation had been made, and had resulted in showing that we have no reason for lengthening the lists. Lord Hervey and others, counting the generations as four or five in the shortest lists, and eight or nine in the longest, proceed by averaging them, making the period to be that of six, or at the outside, of seven generations. Palpably, this is bad arithmetic. If we count the lists as genuinely historical, the whole number of generations cannot well be less than that which appears in the longest list. It would be competent for the advocate of the short chronology to show, if he could, that the generations in some of the lists were exceptionally brief, or were properly something less than generations; but it is not competent for him to dispose of them by arbitrarily averaging the longer lists with the shorter.

But even if we waive all this, most of these men who argue that the time from the entrance into Canaan to the birth of David did not exceed that of seven generations, and was therefore not far from 200 years, themselves assign a period of 400 or more years to the four generations of the sojourn in Egypt, Gen. xv., 13, 16; Ex. vi., 16-20. No one holds that the sojourn was less than 215 years; but it was a period of four generations in the Hebrew genealogies. This and other well-known instances prove that a comparatively short list of generations may cover several centuries of time. This may be explained, in part, by the fact that it was customary to omit, in the lists, some of the links in the chain of descent. We do not know on what principles the omissions were made; but the mere fact that they were made is sufficient to prevent such inductions from the genealogies, as those which we are criticizing, from being conclusive.

4th. The advocates of the shorter chronology say that their mode of procedure brings the Exodus within a few years of B. C. 1313, which is the traditional Jewish date for it. If this argument have any weight, it should lead them to adopt that date, which they seem not at all disposed to do.

5th. They say that their computation brings the Exodus to about the times of Menepthah, who is supposed to be the Egyptian Pharaoh under whom the Exodus took place; and that it is confirmed by the

coincidence. But this is reasoning in a circle. The chronology of the Egyptian kings of this period is itself greatly dependent on the data given in the Bible. Except by using the biblical data, we have no adequate means of determining when Menepthah reigned. Dates thus based upon a certain interpretation of the Bible cannot be made to serve, in turn, as a basis for that interpretation.

6th. They assert that if we add the periods of rest and oppression, as given in the history, the sum is much more than 480 years; and that there is no plausible selection from the smaller numerals, which will check, and thus prove, the larger. The first of these assertions is true; the second is mistaken.

The Book of Judges consists of five parts: 1st, Preparatory matters, chaps. I. and II., 1-5; 2d, the Connected History, chaps. II., 6 to XIII., 1; 3d, the Accounts of Samson, chaps. XIII., 2 to XVI.; 4th, the Account of the Founding of Dan, chaps. XVII., XVIII.; 5th, the Account of the Benjamite War, chaps. XIX. to XXI. The prefatory matters which compose the first part were probably prefixed after the rest of the book was written. The third, fourth and fifth parts are each a complete historical composition by itself. They begin alike with the formula: "And there was a man," introducing a narrative. In paucity of chronological materials, and in being evidently out of their proper chronological order, they resemble one another, and differ decidedly from the connected history of the second part. As they clearly belong to periods of time treated in the second part, it is remarkable that the events they relate are not there mentioned. This looks as if the author of the connected history had these three narratives in his possession, already written by himself or by some one else, before he wrote the connected history, and purposely omitted the facts contained in them from his main narrative, because he intended to append them in full to that narrative. They contain, however, sufficient notices of time to enable us to determine to what place in the chronology they belong, when once we understand the chronological system employed.

Now it is quite natural to assume that the 480 years of I Kgs. VI., 1 is intended to begin with the beginning of the forty years of the Exodus; but it puts no strain on the meaning to suppose that the intention is to date from the end of the forty years, provided we have evidence to that effect. Whether we have such evidence will appear as we pursue our investigation. If we have, the date in I Kgs. will become 480 years from the crossing of the Jordan, that is to say, 520 years from the crossing of the Red Sea.

The numbers 480 and 520 are each even multiples of forty. Taken in connection with the numerous periods of forty years which are ex-

plicitly mentioned in the historical account of those times, as given in the Bible, this fact is remarkable, and has always been so counted. The suggestion is very strong that we have here a peculiar mode of counting time, by periods of forty years; and that the expression: "The land had rest forty years," means had rest to the close of the forty year period then current.

The period of 480 years closes, approximatively, with the two forties of the reigns of David and Saul, 2 Sam. v., 4; 1 Kgs. II., 11; 1 Chron. XXIX., 27; Acts XIII., 21. The administration of Saul was preceded by an interval which included the administration of Samuel, and that by another period of forty years, during which Eli was judge, 1 Sam. IV., 18. We have, therefore, at the close of our long period, three forty year periods, with one interval of unspecified length.

Again, at or before the beginning of our long period, the life of Moses is described to us as consisting of three successive periods of forty years each.

Still again, the second part of the Book of Judges, which gives chronological data throughout, and therein differs from the other parts, calls our attention to the following forty year periods. It is convenient to designate them by the names of the distinguished persons or events mentioned in connection with them. We have the forty of Othniel, Judg. III., 11; the two forties of Ehud, Judg. III., 30; the forty of Deborah, Judg. V., 31; the forty of Gideon, Judg. VIII., 28, and that of the Philistine oppression, Judg. XIII., 1. Here, then, are six forties after the crossing of the Jordan. The first five are evidently consecutive; the sixth is separated from the fifth by an interval.

With the beginning of this interval, that is, at the close of the five consecutive forty year periods from the crossing of the Jordan, there begins another succession of numbers. It is, apparently, an enumeration of the successive chief magistrates of Israel, with the number of the years of the administration of each. Up to this point, there has been nothing of this kind; but here we have the following:

Abimelech.....	3 years, Judg. IX., 22.
Tola.....	23 years, Judg. X., 1.
Jair.....	22 years, Judg. X., 3.
Samson.....	20 years, Judg. XV., 20.
Ammonite Oppression.....	18 years, Judg. X., 8.
Jephthah.....	6 years, Judg. XII., 7.
Ibzan.....	7 years, Judg. XII., 9.
Elon.....	10 years, Judg. XII., 11.
Abdon.....	8 years, Judg. XII., 14.

117 years.

Except in the case of Samson, these numerals are here given in the order in which the writer of the Book of Judges gives them. The place assigned to Samson is that assigned to Bedan, 1 Sam. XII., 11. The years of the Ammonite oppression are given along with those of the Judges because the narrative so gives them, this being the only item of the kind. The result, as we shall see, seems to show that we are correct in this treatment of it.

In this aggregate of 117 years, we have three forties lacking three years. Add the previous five forties, and the result is eight forties lacking three years. Add the three forties of Eli, Saul and David, with the three years of Solomon's reign which had elapsed before the founding of the temple, in the second month of his fourth year, and we have exactly eleven forties. Then, if the interval within which Samuel was judge lasted forty years, we have, in it, the twelfth forty of a period of 480 years from the crossing of the Jordan.

This fitting together of the numbers is too complete to be accidental. Its completeness and exactness are quite in contrast with the complicated and inexact combinations of numbers in most of the articles on this subject. Look at it again. In the numerals for the administrations of Abimelech and his successors, we have three complete forties, lacking three years. At the close of our long period, we have a succession of forties, plus the three years which preceded the fourth year of king Solomon. The deficiency in the one series balances the excess in the other, making the forties even. We are able distinctly to identify eleven of the twelve forties needed to make up the number 480, and we have an interval remaining which, from the events which occurred in it, must have been about forty years, and is likely to have been just the missing period of forty years required to make up the 480.

This finds additional confirmation in Jephthah's assertion that, in his time, Israel had dwelt for 300 years in the cities across the Jordan, Judg. XI., 26. Of course, the 300 here is naturally expected to be a round number, and not exact. Now, of the 117 years above mentioned, 86 preceded the accession of Jephthah. Add the 86 to the five forties of Othniel, Ehud, Deborah and Gideon, and we have 286, making about 287 years during which Israel had dwelt in the cities east of the Jordan, up to the time when Jephthah was negotiating with the Ammonites. This is sufficiently near to the round number 300 to confirm the validity of both.

If our position is well taken, the forty years of the Philistine oppression, mentioned above, are probably the same with the forty years of Eli, or rather with the forty year period which terminated three years after the death of Eli; since they are mentioned at the point when the

narrative is brought up to that date, and since we know that the period of Eli was a period of Philistine oppression, 1 Sam. iv., 9. But several other plausible hypotheses might be formed, and, among them, that the Philistine forty years was the earlier forty year period which included the time of Samson.

Our theory seems to require us either to assign forty years to the period after Eli, during a part of which Samuel was chief magistrate, or else to count that period as entirely overlapped by those of Eli and Saul. Now the Bible does not tell us the length of Samuel's administration. Josephus, Ant. VI., XIII., 5, says that it covered twelve years before the accession of Saul and eighteen after that accession. The latter numeral he repeats, Ant. VI., XIV., 9. But it is inconsistent with better established numerals, and is therefore mistaken. Saul reigned 40 years, Acts XIII., 21. David began to reign at 30 years of age, 2 Sam. v., 4; Jos. Ant. VII., XV., 2. David was therefore born about the tenth year of Saul, and was about eight years of age when Saul had reigned eighteen years. But Samuel, instead of dying at that date, lived long enough to be associated with David after David had become a man and a celebrated hero, 1 Sam. XIX., 19-24; Josephus Ant. VI., XIII., 5 and VI., XI., 5. The numeral 18, being thus fictitious, detracts from the trustworthiness of the numeral 12 which Josephus connects with it, as giving the years of the separate administration of Samuel. Besides, Josephus seems to have regarded the twelve years as being the whole interval after Eli's death. But the narrative makes the impression that Samuel was a young man at the death of Eli, and explicitly says that he was an old man before the accession of Saul, 1 Sam. VIII., 1. His administration was marked by a long interval of supremacy over the Philistines, 1 Sam. VII., 13, 14. His circuits as judge, 1 Sam. VII., 15, 16, and indeed, the whole tenor of the accounts concerning him, point to a considerable length of time during which, as judge, he was the sole chief magistrate of the commonwealth of Israel. Further, we are explicitly informed, in 1 Sam. VII., 2, that a part of this interval was twenty years. The whole, therefore, must be longer than the twelve years which Josephus seems to give to it. If we understand the twenty years as dating the beginning of Samuel's administration, and the twelve as giving its duration, making the interval to be 32 years, plus whatever time had elapsed before the twenty years began (1 Sam. v. and VI., especially VI., 1), we get numerals that are much more plausible. But since this is a rather unnatural interpretation of the Josephus numeral 12, and since we have found that this numeral is somewhat discredited by the bad company it keeps, and since it is uncertain whether the seven months during which the ark was in the *country of*

the Philistines is inclusive or exclusive of the time during which it was in the Philistine *cities*, the proof that the interval was limited to about 32 years is of but little weight. Still less have we any other testimony that can be depended upon as to the length of time between Eli and the Monarchy. From our scheme of forties we infer that it was forty years; and the inference, at least, agrees with all the known facts in the case, and is contradicted by no trustworthy evidence.

7th. The advocates of other views assert that the numeral 480 in 1 Kgs. is contradicted by the 450 of Acts XIII., 29, if the latter numeral applies to the period of the Judges; for, they say, Acts XIII., 20 makes the reign of Saul to be 40 years, and this, with the 40 years of David, 2 Sam. v., 4, and 1 Chron. XXVI., 31 and XXIX., 27, and the 4 years of Solomon, 1 Kgs. VI., 1, added to the 450, makes a period much longer than 480 years. Hence many of them regard it as probable that the 450 years is the period of the sojourn in Egypt and the wandering, and not that of the Judges; while others hold that either the 480 or the 450 must be regarded as erroneous.

It is true that the passage in the Acts is obscure, but it is most natural, on any reading, to refer the numeral to the period of the Judges. Thus referring it, we sufficiently remove all difficulties, if we count it to be, in a merely general way, identical with the number in Kings. Nothing in the apostle's purpose required that he should be more exact than this. Or, the 450 years may begin earlier than the 480, and so terminate with the accession of Saul or the death of Samuel or the birth of David. On the scheme just sketched, Paul's "about 450 years" correspond well with the 437 years from the crossing of the Red Sea to the beginning of Saul's reign.

8th. Finally, it is alleged that, if the biblical numerals are correct, they designate long periods of time which are not marked by any historical events. If this were true, it would have no great weight as argument against the numerals; for long periods might naturally elapse without any events which would call for record in so brief a history. But, as it happens, the allegation is mistaken, as well as inconclusive.

In presenting our scheme, we have already presented an amount of evidence for it which far outweighs that for the schemes that contradict it. But the application of any such scheme to the facts of the history ought to give us the means of testing it somewhat more decisively. It is supposable, at the outset, that the facts may be found to be absolutely inconsistent with it. Or they may be found to be barely capable of being adjusted to it, in which case, they must be regarded

as, on the whole, confirming it, unless they can be shown to agree better with some other equally plausible scheme. Or again, they may be found to fit it so readily, and to be so illuminated by it, as to make the confirmation altogether decisive. The actual state of the case approaches at least as near to the third as to the second of these alternatives.

According to the scheme just presented, the events of the first forty years after the crossing of the Jordan were the fighting of the great battles of the conquest, the accomplishing of certain of its minor details, mentioned in Joshua and in the first chapters of Judges, the distribution of the land west of the Jordan, followed, after a little, by the oppression of Cushan Rishathaim, lasting eight years, and the deliverance under Othniel, Judg. III., 9.

The events of the second and third periods of forty years were the eighteen years' oppression by Moab, with the deliverance under Ehud, Judg. III., 12-30; then the Danite expedition, Judg. XVII., XVIII., and after a little, the Benjamite war, Judg. XIX.-XXI. That the Danite expedition was previous to the times of Samson appears, from the fact that it gave the name to the place Mahaneh-Dan, Judg. XVIII., 12, which name it still bore when Samson lived, Judg. XIII., 25. That it was before the time of the Benjamite war appears from the fact that it established Israelite settlements in Dan, where they had not been before, Judg. XVIII., 29 and context, and that the Benjamite war found the settlements there, Judg. XX., 1. That the Benjamite war was early in the times of the Judges appears from the fact that "Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron" was then living, Judg. XX., 28. Moreover, the remnant of Benjamin obtained their wives largely from the maidens who attended the out-door dances in connection with the Lord's feast at Shiloh, Judg. XXI., 19-23. In the nature of things, these women must have been mostly Ephraimites; and their homes in Benjamin were not very far from those of their Ephraimite relatives. It follows that, for a generation or two after, and never at any other time in history, the people of Benjamin might be counted as "among the peoples" of Ephraim. They are so counted in the song of Deborah, Judg., v., 14. This shows that the Benjamite war occurred long enough before the middle of the forty year period of Deborah, so that then a generation of Benjamite warriors had already sprung up, whose blood relation to Ephraim had not yet become distant. Other items of evidence might be added, but these are sufficient to show that the eighty years of Ehud were not an empty period in history, but were marked by stirring events. We must not omit to notice, however,

that the war with Benjamin was bloody and demoralizing; and must have left Israel in a condition which afforded his enemies a tempting opportunity to band together against him.

Such a banding together was, in fact, the characteristic event of the fourth forty year period from the crossing of the Jordan. In the north was the oppression for twenty years by the Canaanite king Jabin, from which Deborah and Barak delivered Israel, Judg. IV., 3. Contemporaneous with this, and probably a part of the same movement, was a Philistine oppression in the southern parts of the country, from which Shamgar was the deliverer, Judg. X., 11; V., 6 and III., 31. The mention of this is very brief, but it seems to have been a severe oppression. Shamgar's weapon was an ox-goad. In Judg. V., 8, Deborah asks:

"If a shield may be seen, or a spear
Among forty thousand in Israel?"

These seem to be indications that the Philistines, at this early period, employed the same policy of disarmament which they afterward enforced in the days of Saul.

The events of the fifth period were the Midianite oppression of seven years, and the deliverance under Gideon, Judg. VI.-VIII. This was followed by the unsuccessful attempt to establish a kingdom, with Gideon for the first monarch, Judg. VIII., 22, 23.

The sixth period opens with the short reign of Abimelech. That so weak and bad a king as Abimelech should have succeeded in maintaining himself even for three years, with sufficient prestige to entitle his name to be in the list of Israel's chief magistrates, is a fact which shows how strongly the idea of monarchy had taken hold of the minds of the people. Gideon's refusal and Abimelech's folly prevented the idea from being then realized; but from that time, the chief magistrates of Israel followed one another in regular succession, and the years of each successive judge appear in the record.

At the time of the close of the sixth period, the Philistines had so far recovered from the chastisement they received under Shamgar, that they were again oppressing Israel, Judg. XIII., 5, and X., 7; I Sam. XII., 9, 11. During the first decade of the seventh period, Samson's public life began. At that time, the Philistines had secured from Israel an acknowledgement of allegiance, Judg. XIV., 4 and XV., 11, etc. By his exploits, especially at his death, Samson appears actually to have accomplished the promises of deliverance that were made through him. At least, the violence of the Philistine oppression was broken. But this oppression was at once succeeded by another not less distressing—that of the Ammonites, which lasted eighteen years, that is, till

after the close of this period, Judg. x., 7, 8, 9, etc. The seventh period may fairly be called that of Samson, and the sixth, the period next before that of Samson.

The eighth period begins during the Ammonite oppression. It includes the deliverance under Jephthah, the civil war that followed, the three brief administrations which succeeded, and the first three years of Eli. Perhaps it was near the close of this period, after the bitterness caused by the Ammonite war had subsided, that Elimelech went to the country of Moab to sojourn, Ruth I. This period is naturally named after Jephthah.

The ninth period is that of Eli, extending to three years after his death. It was a period of religious corruption, 1 Sam. I.-IV., and of servitude to the Philistines, 1 Sam. IV., 9. Near its close, a determined effort was made to throw off the yoke, 1 Sam. IV. The Israelites were signally defeated, and the ark captured.

The tenth period is that of Samuel. When it opens, Israel is in subjection, the ark and the sanctuary are separated, and Israel has no chief magistrate; but Samuel is already universally recognized as the Lord's prophet, and as a man of prime influence. For more than twenty years, he labors to elevate the public sentiment of the nation to a degree which will render it feasible to make a movement for independence and public reforms. At the end of that time, he places himself at the head of a carefully planned movement, accepts the chief magistracy, 1 Sam. VII., 6, achieves independence by a single decisive victory, and enters upon a remarkably successful administration, 1 Sam. VII., IX., X., XII. Three years before the close of the period occurred the bloodless revolution by which the theocracy was transformed into a monarchy, with Saul for the first king.

The eleventh period is that of the reign of Saul. It is a time of vicissitudes such as Israel has never before seen. Under their new king, the people are sometimes victorious, and sometimes reduced to servitude of unprecedented severity, 1 Sam. XI., XIII., XIV., etc.

The twelfth period of forty years covers the last thirty-seven years of the reign of David, with the first three of Solomon. Israel, hitherto, a loose confederacy of tribes, maintaining a precarious existence, within narrow limits, on the two banks of the Jordan, became a strong empire, extending from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates.

So brief a sketch, of course, does not exhibit the historical sequence of the events as they would be exhibited in a fuller presentation of them. But even this sketch is sufficient to complete the proof which has been given, in this article, of the following four propositions:

First, it is possible to make a complete scheme of the biblical num-

erals for the period of the Judges, including every one of them, without a discrepancy or an improbability, or a word of special explanation for any special case. Merely upon the pointing out of the principles which govern the chronological statements of this period, every date falls at once into place. After the crossing of the Jordan, there were five consecutive periods of forty years each, defined as such; then three periods of forty years each, defined by other numerals; then four periods of forty years each, defined approximately by the terms of office of Eli, Saul and David, and by the historical facts, concerning Samuel; making in all the required 480 years from the crossing of the Jordan to the Founding of the Temple. So far as the periods are concerned, however, it would still be supposable that some of them may have been contemporaneous instead of successive, thus reducing the aggregate to 480 years from the crossing of the Red Sea, or even bringing it within yet shorter limits. But the remaining three propositions seem to weigh against this.

Secondly, on applying this chronology to the events, it becomes at once clear that all the persons who are called Judges of Israel were in good faith, actual chief magistrates of the nation. No two administrations were contemporaneous. We have no further occasion for guessing that one was military judge, and another merely civil judge, and that one officiated only in Northeast Israel, and another only in Southwest Israel. We need waste no further ingenuity in trying to combine into one the four separate Philistine oppressions of the days of Shamgar, of Samson, of Eli, and of Saul; or in explaining away the supposed incongruities of the four accounts, since these have no existence, but are mere results of an attempt to identify things which are different.

Thirdly, using this chronology, all the recorded events of the period, without exception, readily find their places in an intelligible order; while, to a large extent, the order is such that we can trace the sequences, and see how one condition of affairs sprang from another.

Fourthly, except in the case of the undated events recorded in the three separate treatises which narrate the history of Samson, that of the Danite expedition and that of the Benjamite war, our chronology finds the events to have occurred in substantially the order in which they are related in the narratives.

As much as this can hardly be said of the other current schemes. From the Egyptian monuments or from other sources, we may sometime obtain more explicit evidence on many of these points. Nothing much short of new and explicit evidence can set aside such proof as has just been sketched of the true interpretation of the biblical chronology for the period of the Judges.

SOME FEATURES OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY ILLUSTRATED BY THE BOOK OF JOEL.¹

BY REV. EDWARD L. CURTIS, A. B.,

Instructor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the Northwest, Chicago.

II.

Joel links not only the most distant future to the present, but he represents it also in terms of the present. Jehovah judges in the valley of Jehoshaphat.² Tyre and Sidon and Philistia are the subjects of judgment.³ Egypt and Edom are particularly punished.⁴ The redemption promised also is the restoration of children sold into slavery,⁵ great fertility,⁶ peace and security in dwelling in Judah and Jerusalem,⁷ Jehovah enthroned in Zion.⁸ This then illustrates the law of prophecy that descriptions of the future are in terms of the present, or grow out of conditions and circumstances of the present. This is natural because the immediate design of Messianic prophecy was to comfort and admonish cotemporaries. The work of the prophets was not simply to foretell, to utter predictions, which afterwards verified would prove the divine origin of their message. This was secondary, subordinate, though not unimportant. Their immediate object was to preach righteousness, to reprove, exhort, especially urging steadfast adherence to Jehovah that calamity might be averted, that prosperity might be secured. Prophecy came in a day of trouble. The direct occasion of Joel's prophecy was the terrible locust plague. Calamity gave it birth, and so in general. In the midst of oppression, and disasters from foreign enemies, violence and corruptions from rulers at home, people needed comfort and consolation, and then God chose to give promises of future redemption. The development of prophetic revelation was in precise proportion to the decline of Israel. This refers, of course, to direct prophecy. Days of joy and gladness could give typical prophecies. The marriage song written for a Solomon or Joram passes over into a description of the future anointed of Israel.⁹ And one, celebrating in all probability the defeat of Sennacherib, becomes a prediction of Jehovah's reign over all the earth.¹⁰ But in general the darkest hours gave the brightest hopes. Indeed, in the other instances the prophetic element arose from the somewhat similar cause. The incompleteness, the imperfection of that celebrated by the psalmists, led to the deeper meaning. The original subjects came not up to that demanded

¹ A paper read before the Hebrew Summer School (1883) at Morgan Park, the first part of which appeared in the December No., 1883.

² Joel iv., 2, 12. ³ iv., 2. ⁴ iv., 19. ⁵ iv., 7. ⁶ iv., 18. ⁷ iv., 15. ⁸ iv., 17. ⁹ Ps. xlv. ¹⁰ Ps. xlvii.

by the covenant promises of God. In general, however, to repeat, the darkest hours gave the brightest hopes. In the reign of the wicked Ahaz came the promise of Immanuel, and of the child, wonderful counselor, everlasting father, prince of peace. No prophecies also are richer and fuller of brighter blessings than those of the new covenant given by the weeping Jeremiah. And who does not know of the Gospel of the second portion of Isaiah so intimately associated with the Babylonian captivity?

But to warn and admonish, to console and comfort, blessings promised and judgments threatened must be intelligible, adapted to the circumstances in which they were uttered, and hence, as has been said, must be given in terms of the present. Joel thus began his prophecy with the assurance of deliverance from present troubles. The army of the locusts will be destroyed.¹ Fertilizing and seasonable rain will come.¹ A blessing of wonderful fruitfulness is twice repeated.² The kingdom of Judah had suffered much from neighboring enemies, from Egyptians, Edomites, and more recently by Philistines.³ The royal city had been plundered and Phœnicians as slave merchants had sold captives to the Edomites and distant Javanites.⁴ Joel therefore especially threatens with divine judgment these nations and gives assurance of the deliverance and return of captives.⁵ This is the way in which he beheld the last times. These events were to take place and then Jehovah was to reign in Zion and the fullness of blessing come. Micah illustrates the same principle. He associates the last days with the chastisement of Assyria the leading enemy, in his time, of God's people, and the Messiah, the ruler out of Bethlehem, would be a deliverer from Assyrian oppression.⁶ Isaiah belonging to the same epoch, in his earlier prophecies, has a similar view of the future. Immediately after judgments upon Assyria shall there come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.⁷ Then follow promises of restoration from Assyrian captivity.⁸ The question now might arise, whether under these nations others are typified, or whether we have the prophecy of a judgment which actually did befall them, but did not bear the relation anticipated to the redemption through the Messiah. As far as one enemy of God's people is the type of another, other nations may be typified. But the Edomite or the Assyrian or the Phœnician does not represent *particularly* some far distant people, the Roman for example, who lived in the commencement of the Messianic period. The literal fulfillment of prophecies in all detail is not to be insisted upon. Many doubtless were so fulfilled. The exact corres-

¹ Joel ii., 18-27. ² ii., 18-27; iv., 18. ³ 1 Kgs. xiv., 25, 26; 2 Chron. xxi., 16, 17; xxii., 1. ⁴ Amos i., 9, 10. ⁵ Joel iv., 1-8. ⁶ Mic. v., 2-6. ⁷ Is. xx., ff. xi., 1. ⁸ Is. xi., 11.

pondence between subsequent history and many predictions justifies in a certain degree the definition of prophecy as history written beforehand. But of some prophecies we have no knowledge of such fulfillment, and in the letter they may always remain unfulfilled. Exactly how divine judgment should be executed, or when and how redemption should come was a matter of minor importance. "It may have been," says Prof. Green,¹ "of little consequence to Isaiah or to Micah or to their cotemporaries to have the political changes disclosed to them by which Assyria was to be superseded on the map of the world or erased from the roll of nations, but it was of vast moment to them to know that whether the ancient Assyria should survive or whatever new Assyria might arise to take its place, the strife between the great empires of the world should hereafter give way to peaceful and amicable intercourse, and instead of their present animosity toward the people of God they should heartily be united with Israel in the service of Jehovah, and should any future Assyria venture to molest Israel or disturb his peace his Messiah would effectually protect him and avenge his cause."

In idea, then, prophecy must always be fulfilled. How far the prophet expected or looked for such a fulfillment rather than a literal one, no one can positively state, but that to him the idea was the main thing is evident from the frequent use of symbol and figure, the play upon words and events. Joel places the final judgment in the valley of Jehoshaphat. Here is a play first upon a valley where a great victory had taken place under Jehoshaphat and secondly upon the name itself, meaning Jehovah judges. Hosea plays similarly upon place and the meaning of words, in choosing the valley of Jezreel as the place of decision,² and also Zechariah, when he assigns mourning to the valley of Megiddo.³ The writer of Revelation makes use of Ar Mageddon in the same way.⁴

Joel also passes from the declaration of the judgment of the particular enemies of Judah,—Tyre, Sidon and Philistia,—which the times in which he lived demanded, to a wider and fuller judgment,⁵ placed also in the valley Jehoshaphat, when he mentions no nation by name, showing that the idea was the main and most important element of his prophecy,—that he wished to set forth the ever present enmity between the heathen powers and the power of God, and the assurance that the kingdom of God through severe conflict should attain final victory and peace.⁶ This idea is taken up and presented repeatedly by the other prophets.⁷

¹ In the *Princeton Review*, July 1878, p. 308. ² Hos. i., 4, 5; ii., 2, 24. ³ Zech. xii., 11. ⁴ Rev. xvi., 16. Ar Mageddon is מַגְדוֹן, the hill of Megiddo which with Jezreel is a locality of the plains of Esdraelon, the battle-field of Northern Palestine. ⁵ Joel iv., 9-17. ⁶ See *Messianic Prophecy*, by Dr. Riehm, p. 40. ⁷ Mic. iv., 11-15; Zech. xii., 1-13; xiv., 3-5; Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix.

Symbol is also doubtless found in Joel's allusion to commotions of nature.¹ What is the meaning of those mysterious portents borrowed and repeated so often from this source both in the Old Testament and in the New? Did the prophet expect such appearances in nature? Possibly, probably; yet their real significance is that they are the attendants of a theophany. The idea lying beneath them is that Jehovah would manifest himself. Peter alluded to them as though they had already been accomplished when the Spirit was poured out on the day of Pentecost.² As Jehovah had appeared on Sinai so thought the prophet of subsequent appearances, and they depicted them in similar imagery. It was their way of emphasizing the advent of Jehovah. Similarly, in the likeness of the passage through the Red Sea and the wilderness, future redemption was pictured.³

Consider also Joel's promise of wonderful fertility, that the mountains shall drop new wine, and all the hills flow with milk.⁴ Now to his cotemporaries it may be that there could be no conception of a glad time of future redemption without such actual fertility. This may have been all which he meant to prophesy. And yet even to himself was there not something more wrapt up in this promise? Did it not stand directly upon the threshold of having a higher meaning, however vague and dim, to the prophet and those for whom he wrote? He says, a fountain shall come forth from the house of the Lord and water the valley of Shittim.⁵ The mention of this fountain suggests a spiritual meaning. For why for the purpose of mere agricultural irrigation should the house of the Lord be chosen as the source of a fountain? Ezekiel and Zechariah use this fountain or stream flowing from the house of God as a symbol of spiritual blessings and in the N. T. it appears as in the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb.⁶

Again Joel in common with the other prophets speaks of Jehovah dwelling in Zion.⁷ Zion is the centre of the Kingdom of God, and Jehovah actually dwelling among his people is an essential element of the O. T. representations of the Messianic times. The O. T. saint could grasp in no other way the thoughts of the establishment of the divine kingdom. But when one asks from the N. T. point of view for its fulfillment, the idea is found to be the main thing. How was this prophecy fulfilled? In the incarnation of the Son of God. He became flesh and dwelt among us.⁸ So "I am with you even unto the end of the world."⁹ N. T. fulfillment far outstrips the O. T. promise. It casts

¹ Joel iii., 3, 4. ² Acts ii., 19, 20. Compare David's description of his deliverance in Ps. xviii., 8-10. See Perowne and Murphy on the same. ³ Is. xl., 15, 16. ⁴ Joel iv., 18. ⁵ Ezek. xlv., 18. ⁶ Ezek. xlvii., 1-12; Zech. xiii., 1; xlv., 8; Rev. xxii., 1, 2, ⁷ Iv., 17. ⁸ Jno. i., 14. ⁹ Matt. xxviii., 20.

aside the terms, the forms in which the promises were clothed, and gives something better. The idea is taken up and, as it were, glorified. The Jerusalem of earth is but a type. We are come unto Mt. Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.¹ The holiness² is that of the city into which there shall no wise enter anything that defileth or maketh a lie.³ And the final fulfillment of Jehovah's dwelling there is in the reigning of God and the Lamb forever and ever.⁴

THE LAW OF RELEASE,

As Understood and Practised in the Apostolic Age.

BY RABBI B. FELSENTHAL,

Chicago, Ill.

P R E F A T O R Y .

The knowledge of the post-biblical history and literature of the Jews is of very great importance,—not only to him who makes the essence and history of Judaism his special object of study, but, both to the historian of the apostolic age and to the historian of the pre-conditions of Christianity. We shall have a true insight into, and understanding of the then existing actual life of the Jews and of the mental atmosphere, in which they breathed, only after we have become familiar with the Jewish usages, and customs, and statutes, the Jewish cult and rites, and other religious institutions of those times. It is an error to suppose that, for this purpose, a knowledge of the legal contents of the Pentateuch is sufficient; that the so-called Mosaic Law remained the unaltered regulator of Jewish life. An historical development, a gradual growth of the same took place, and the Mosaic statutes were but the roots, from which an excessively rich outgrowth of post-biblical Jewish law organically developed itself. And if any of the readers should once inquiringly visit, e. g., the library of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, or some other larger Hebrew library, he would be shown *hundreds* of volumes treating of Jewish law,—institutions, and pandects, and novellae, and opinions without number.

There *was* a time when Christian scholars studied and cultivated this Jewish law. This was during the sixteenth and seventeenth century. But—with regret it must be said—this study has fallen into neglect. In our times we have neither a Selden, nor a Lightfoot, neither a Buxtorf, nor a Reland. It would certainly be a step in the right direction if such a highly developed system of law, as the Jewish, would be more appreciated, and if a thorough knowledge of the same would be striven after.

In Cambridge, England, Professor Schiller-Szinessy, an erudite Jewish scholar, has taught for many years the Talmud and kindred branches with great success. English scholarship in this field has had a wonderful growth during the last 25 years. Could not, and should not, a Professor's chair for the talmudical studies also be created in one of the more pretentious American Universities? Shall this

¹ Heb. xii., 22. ² Joel iii., 17. ³ Rev. xxi., 27. ⁴ Rev. xxii., 1.

branch of learning forever remain locked up in a ghetto, so to speak, forever remain inaccessible to Christian students?

But enough of these prefatory remarks; we shall proceed now to our historical comments upon the Law of Release.

The Bible (Deut. xv., 1, 2) contains the following law:

At the end of every seven years thou shalt make a release. And this is the manner of the release: Every creditor that lendeth ought to his neighbor shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbor, or of his brother; because it is called the Lord's release.

It is not necessary for our purpose to discuss the question, whether the original intent of the legislator was that the payment of debts should be *suspended* only in the seventh year, and the debts stand over to be paid in subsequent times, or whether the release of these debts should be *total and final*. So much is historically certain; that in post-Maccabean times, from the middle of the second century B. C., and perhaps earlier, the law in Deuteronomy was understood and practiced in the sense that in every Sabbatical year all debts should be totally released, and payment of the same could not be insisted upon if this year had intervened.

Such a law, dictated by the most humane considerations, was well enough in a primitive society, where money is only borrowed by really poor people, and for the purpose of procuring the absolute necessities of daily life. But as soon as a nation rises so far as to pursue commerce and industry to some extent, the possession of money will bring to its owner some usufruct, and wealthy men will not be so ready to lend their money to the poor if they are in danger of losing not only the usufruct, but also the principal. Instead of being beneficial to the poor, the law became, in the course of time, burdensome and detrimental to them, as they found it difficult to get any loan in days of need.

What was to be done? Circumstances had altered, the law had become impracticable. But there it stood, inflexible, unrepealed, and (in the eyes of every Israelite then living) as a biblical statute, unrepealable. What was to be done?

The same thing has taken place in every period and in every country where a law, yet standing in the Code, has outgrown the former conditions of life, under which, and with reference to which, it had been enacted, and is no longer adaptable to the altered circumstances. The same thing happens daily in our own times and in our own country, when any judge, or any other officer of sound common sense is called upon to apply obsolete and impracticable statutes. The

law was so construed as to suit the new order of things, the new conditions of civil society.

In such cases, it must be admitted that the letter of the law is often stretched, and the new constructions often forced.

At an early day it was generally held that the law in Deut. xv., 1, 2 should not find application if the debt was for goods bought, or for servants' hire, or for fines decreed by a court, or for any indemnity to be paid to an offended party, or if the debt was secured by a pawn,* or if the borrower had waived his right of release in the seventh year,† etc. It is interesting to read the discussions in the Talmud concerning this matter,‡ and to observe how the Rabbis and jurists in that remote past tried to justify these constructions. As I do not desire to write an exhaustive monograph on the subject, I omit reproducing these talmudical discussions.

Hillel, who lived in the century preceding Christ, and died as the president of the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, instituted another facilitating custom in order to free the people from the embarrassments which arose from the law under discussion; aye, he made it thereby altogether illusory.§ This new institution consisted in the issuance of the so-called *Prosbul*, that is, a written or verbal declaration by the creditor before the court, that he reserves to himself the right to claim his debt even after the intervening of the Sabbatical year. To preserve the appearance, as though the Mosaic law were not abolished by Hillel's *Takkanah*, it was ordained that a *Prosbul* could only be executed if the debtor, or his warrantor, possessed some real estate. The formula of such a *Prosbul* is still known. It is to be found in *Shebiith* x., 4, and in *Gittin* 36, a.

Some readers may perhaps desire to learn how, in the times of Christ and the apostles, such judicial papers read, and how they were executed. To gratify this desire, let us suppose for a moment that, on the wings of our imagination, we are carried back 1900 years. We are in a Galilean city. We enter the court room and are in the midst of a large gathering of people, amidst tradesmen, agriculturists, and mechanics. Behind a large table we behold the court, consisting of three venerable judges, in the midst the *Abh Beth Din*, the president of the court, to his right and left the *Dayyanim*, the associate judges.¶ At one end of the table is the *Sopher*, ready to perform the clerk's duties.

It is Monday forenoon. A boy, of a pensive countenance and wondrous blue eyes,—Jeshua, son of Joseph, is his name—has attracted

* Mishnah Shebiith x., 1, 2. † Talm. Bab. Maacoth 3, b. ‡ Gittin 34 and sq. § Shebiith, x., 3.

¶ A court, competent in such matters, had to be composed of three judges; Mishna, Sanhedrin, i., 1.

our attention as soon as we have entered. Him we approach, and, upon our inquiry, he informs us that it is one of the courts' standing rules to sit regularly on Mondays and Thursdays in civil matters.* The official business of the court begins, and we listen to the proceedings. Could we tarry long enough, we might observe many things interesting. But our time is limited. The first case called is that of Joseph, the carpenter, against Hyrkanos, the blacksmith. Without delay one of judges rises, turns to the president, and respectfully says. "Rabbi, I am incompetent to sit as judge in this case; the plaintiff rendered me some services of friendship sometime last winter, and although I am firmly resolved to pronounce justice without looking to the right or to the left, yet, unwittingly, I might be biased in favor of the man.† I must, therefore, vacate my place." The *Dayyan* is excused, and the *Abh Beth Din* calls upon Eliezer, a learned Pharisee, who happens to be present in the hall, to take a seat at his side, and fill the chair of the conscientious judge‡ who has just vacated it by his own free will.

A somewhat similar circumstance we note in the next case. Gamliel, the defendant, calls the attention of the court to the fact that one judge is incompetent on account of his being related to Simon, the plaintiff.‡ The judge leaves his seat, and another man, learned in the law, occupies it for the time being upon invitation of the president.

After the statements of the litigants and the depositions of the witnesses have been heard, and after the various interrogations of the judges have been answered satisfactorily, the court renders judgment.

These two civil suits have been finally disposed of, and another citizen of that Galilean town now appears. We call him Antigonos. He will occupy the court's time but a few minutes. He states that Jochanan, the shoemaker, owes him one hundred Shekels. The Sabbatical year is approaching, and he wishes a *Prosbul* to be written, so that he may ask payment even after this year has elapsed. The president questions, "Has Jochanan some real estate upon which you can have a lien by virtue of the *Prosbul* asked for?" Antigonos replies that his debtor owns a small vineyard near the neighboring city of Sepphoris. "That is sufficient," says the judge, and he directs the *Sopher* to issue the document. It is short and we may insert it here. Thus it reads:

* Among the ten new *Takkanoth* (regulations and institutions), ascribed by a talmudical tradition to Ezra, was also the one that the courts should hold regularly sessions on Mondays and Thursdays; *Babha Kamma* 82, a.

† A judge who had received any service, or present, or favor whatsoever from any of the litigants, could not sit in a case in which the person, who had thus befriended him, was a party; *Kethubhoth* 105, b.

‡ No one could officiate as a judge who was a relative to one of the parties; Compare *Mishnah*, *Niddah* vi., 4, in connection with *Sanhedrin* iii., 4; *Shebhuoth* iv., 1, etc.

מוסר אני לכם איש פלוני ופלוני הדיינים שבמקום פלוני שכל חוב שיש
לי שאגבנו כל זמן שארצה.

(Signatures of the judges or witnesses.)

(In translation: I lay down the declaration before you, N. N. and N. N., judges of the city of N., that I shall claim every debt, due me, at any time when I may desire to do so.)*

We have been long enough in the old Palestinian court. Let us now again look upon the matter under consideration from our nineteenth century standpoint.

For many years after Hillel, the written document had to be shown when payment was asked for a debt contracted before the preceding Sabbatical year.† At a later period this, too, was declared unnecessary.‡

Such is the power of progressive life over the dead letter of the law. By and by, feature after feature of such antiquated laws falls into neglect, and in some case, as, for example, in the one under discussion here, the old law becomes even imperceptibly perverted to the contrary. It is known that some Rabbis shook their heads to the Prosbul-innovation, so, e. g., the eminent jurist *Samuel*, president of the Academy in Nehardea, in Babylonia, in the beginning of the third century. He said, "Prosbul is an unwarranted assumption of the judges; if I should have the power, I would certainly abolish it."§ But how could the opinions of some theorists stem the onward moving mighty current of a new-conditioned life?

Before I close, I beg to make a remark concerning the etymology of the word *Prosbul*. I believe that Benjamin Musafia (in his *Addimenta to the Aruch*, s. v. טב IV.) gave the right explanation 200 years ago; and Geiger, Sachs, Graetz, Jost, and others, adhere in the main to it. According to these authorities, "Prosbul" is a word borrowed from the Greek, *προςβουλη*, (a declaration before the court).

* It is proper to remark that Rashi, Maimonides, and other post-talmudical authorities take the first three words in our Prosbul-document in another sense than I did. According to them I should have translated: "I hand over to you"—*sc.* the notes and other similar papers which are evidence of debts due me. But I have reasons to think that my interpretation is the right one. To state these reasons would, perhaps, occupy too much space here.

† Kethuboth ix., 9. ‡ Ibid. § Gittin 36, b.

A PARAPHRASE OF THE NINETIETH PSALM.

BY PROF. O. S. STEARNS, D. D.,

[Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass.]

To paraphrase a psalm requires a fourfold process: a careful study of the whole psalm in Hebrew, grammatically; a similar study, exegetically; an analysis of it; and an historical setting of it. This work being done we are prepared to recast the thought into our own language, and reproduce it paraphrastically. In the following paraphrase I have assumed that even if the Psalm is not of Mosaic authorship, it belongs in thought to the last days of the Mosaic era.

In order that the course of thought may be more clear, I will preface it with an analysis of the Psalm.

GENERAL SUBJECT.

The frailty and brevity of human life, as a consequent of sin, a motive to repentance and obedience.

SUBJECT UNFOLDED BY REFLECTIONS.

1. God's eternity is apparent by comparing it with man's mortality and transitoriness, vs., 2-6.
2. The reason for this transitoriness is the wrath of God against sin, vs. 7-10.
3. Ignorance of this terrible fact should lead us to pray for true wisdom, vs. 11-12.
4. God being the eternal home of his people, notwithstanding he may justly cut us off for sin, we may urge our plea for his compassion: (a) to give joy for sorrow, (b) to give success to our endeavors, vs. 13-17.

PSALM XC.

O Lord, thou hast been the home of thy people in successive generations. Thou art the eternal God. Thou art the all-creating God. This globe which men deem their home, and which with its ancient hills might seem to be permanent, compared with the generations who live upon it, and pass away from it, is but a thing of a day, compared with the eternity of its Creator. It is therefore in the Creator, and not in the created, that man must find his true and safe home. And well he may when he considers how frail he is. By the fiat of his Creator he crumbles quickly to dust, and by the fiat of the same Creator others appear to take his place. "One generation goeth and another cometh," but "thy years know no end." Thou art "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." What in fact is man's duration on this permanent globe? Could he live a thousand years, that period compared with God's eternity is like a dream when one awaketh. A thousand years in the mind of God glides away as imperceptibly as a yesterday, when it is vanishing, irrecoverably gone, and almost unnoticed; yea, more, it is as a watch in the night, a third part of the night, wherein one sleeps and wakes, and knows absolutely nothing of the passing of time. And this rapidity with which he passes away is by thy decree. Thou, O Lord of the universe, sweepest them away as with a storm. When thou dost this, they are as a sleep, there is no trace of their existence. Or to change the figure, they are like the grass which after a night's invig-

orating rain, shoots up fresh, and green, and blossoms, but in reality, soon passes away. In the morning it blossoms, and fades, in the evening one mows it down and it withers. And so man bursts into life, flourishes a short time, is full of vigor and promise, but death soon cuts him down, and he is gone. Surely when we consider man's frailty, compared with God's immutability, none but the eternal God can be a sufficient refuge. Moreover our case as a people is a peculiar one. While man at his best estate is as a sleep compared with thy infinite duration, our days have been shortened in consequence of thy wrath against us. We clamored for Egypt. We forsook the God of our fathers, and worshiped a calf. Massah and Merribah, and Merribah-Kadesh,—temptation and striving, and striving repeatedly, have stirred thine anger against us. "We remembered not the multitude of thy mercies," but continued to provoke thee. "We envied Moses in the camp; and Aaron the saint of Jehovah." "We joined ourselves to Baal-peor and ate the sacrifices of the dead." "Forty years long wast thou grieved with this generation, and didst say, It is a people that do err in their hearts; and they have not known my ways." And as a consequence, we have been consumed by thine anger, and by thy hot wrath have we been terrified with the dread of death. Nor was this causeless. Justly have we met the result of our own sin. Thou hast seen us just as we are, and it is because of our iniquities—iniquities, the very depths of which, and the inexensableness of which, were under the gaze of thine eye. Yea, though we thought to cover them, and supposed they were so low in the abyss of our natures, that they could not be perceived by thee, thou didst cast the revealing light of thyself upon them, as the sun once pierced through the misty veil which enclosed our globe, and the pollution which is hidden from the human eye, was quickly manifest to thee. Oh! how the whole matter now seems to us! So different from our expectations! All our days have fled from us in consequence of, or by means of, thy just, but overflowing wrath. Our forty years, nay, our whole life now seems to us but a single thought. The days of our years, this life, the sum of it, what is it? Some of us have had seventy years of it. Others by means of unusual vigor, have stayed here seventy and ten years. Yet the whole period has been one of anxious toil and nothingness; for its honor and glory, and boasting hopes and terrible vexations, have quickly disappeared, and on the wings of the past we fly into the unknown future.

Oh! who can know, so as to thoroughly comprehend, the strength of thy anger against sin? Who can so use this knowledge, as to acquire a heart unto wisdom, and secure the prime design of life? To whom is revealed the strength of thine overflowing wrath against sin, so as to beget within him a perpetual reverence for thee, such as is thy just due? Alas! no one regards thee as the immutable, holy God, who can by no means spare the guilty! We are ever resisting thy just decrees. We deem ourselves the arbiters of our own fortunes, and think that our times are in our own hands. "Oh! That men were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end." But such knowledge is too high for us, unaided by divine enlightenment. Lord! cause us to know in the most practical way the number of our days, their brevity, their fleeting nature, their vast importance to the final issues of life. Give us, O Lord, the real connection between thy wrath and our own mortality, and we will bear the harvest with us, and bring the acceptable sacrifice—a heart, where "the fear of the Lord is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding." O Jehovah! turn from thine anger against us as a people! "Why shall the Egyptians speak in derision of us,

saying, for evil hath he brought them out, to slay them among the mountains, and to consume them from off the face of the ground?" Turn back from the heat of thine anger, and repent from the evil against thy people. Remember Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and thy strong, repeated promises, through them, to bless the whole earth. Ex. xxxii., 12. How long shall thy fury burn against thy chosen servants? Oh! concerning thine own elect, show thy compassion. A long night of fear, discontent and remorse has been ours. Let a new morning dawn upon us. Let the darkness of thy displeasure pass away, and let thy mercy, as the food of our souls, revive us, yea, satiate us. We are hungry for thy favor. Let our hunger be relieved, and we will sing out our gratitude, and be glad, with a radiant heart, the remainder of our days. Yes! compensate our sufferings by proportioned joys. Let these forty years of sorrow and sad apprehension, find their counterpart in our subsequent prosperity.

We pass away. Soon all the rebellious ones, against whom thine anger was kindled will pass away. Though we go, let those who come after us enter into thy rest. That is thy purpose. That is thy work of mercy. Let it appear. O, thou whom we have called by the majestic name of Lord, and whom now we call by thine endearing name Jehovah, and thy name of power Elohim, let thy promised work unto thy chosen ones appear, and thy splendor and glory descend upon their children.

O thou ruler of the universe, thou covenant keeping God, thou God of the whole earth, our fathers had the pledge, let the fulfilment descend upon their children. Let thy promised inheritance be theirs: an inheritance we have forfeited.

But do not, indeed, cast utterly off even us. Let thy condescending loveliness and grace descend upon us, who are about to pass away. Let our work, imperfect as it is, and confirmed as it is by our departure, be not fruitless. Yea, the work of *our* hands, establish thou it. Then shall we not have lived in vain, nor shall we have died in vain. Then wilt thou prove, that thou hast been the home of thy people in all generations, and that thou wilt continue to be their home until time shall end.

➤CRITICAL NOTES.◀

On the Study of the Old Testament.—This is an age of knowledge and it must in justice be added, in spite of occasional superficiality, an age of widely-diffused learning. The Christian believer is liable at any time to discredit the personal influence he might otherwise exert, if he exhibit a lack of intelligent acquaintance with the varied information which has been brought to bear upon all the subjects centreing in the Bible.

It is no doubt true, that God has no need of our learning, and that he can use the simplest and weakest instrument to confound the wisest, but he has still less need of our ignorance, and it is for us to offer him the best services at our command.

I wish to plead for a more critical study of the Old Testament, and I address myself to two classes of readers: 1) To intelligent laymen and those of the clergy,

who not being *versed in Hebrew*, are, for this very reason discouraged from beginning any critical work. 2) To clergymen, of scholastic training, who are fully aware how necessary it is for an expounder of the Bible to be able to read it in the original languages.

I. For the encouragement of the first class be it said, a) that we have no right to say that the study of the original languages of the Old Testament is dry and pedantic. The first difficulties are the greatest. The man who firmly faces and overcomes the initial difficulties may never indeed become a learned Hebraist, and may never be competent to give a decided opinion on a difficult text, (few can do that,) but he will be able to appreciate the learning of others; he will know where to look for a solution; he will avoid pitfalls into which those who cannot read Hebrew are frequently tumbling; he will learn to take pleasure pictorial in the beauty, the philosophic depth, the stately grandeur of the Hebrew Scriptures, and he will become more and more an accurate interpreter, a scribe, who brought out of his treasures, things new and old.

b) That it is the uniform testimony of those competent to judge, that except in the case of the *most advanced scholars*, to whom the use of the original may have become a second nature, much more may be learned from the careful study of the Old Testament in a critical English version than from the *laborious* perusal of it in an *unfamiliar* tongue. But in the present day, in which an intelligent knowledge of the text of the Scriptures is widely spread, in which we have on all sides the discussion of various translations, it is particularly necessary to be on the guard against quoting a text on any critical point without knowing whether the original will bear the interpretation which the English version may seem to suggest.

II. To the second class of readers, we would simply say: a) Pursue a systematic, exegetical study of the Old Testament. There are very few clergymen, who deliberately study through whole books of the Bible for their own private edification.

If after the most careful inquiry into all the historical, chronological, geographical, biographical, and social questions which arise in the peculiar circumstances connected with the portion of Scripture under consideration, we would analyze, and examine critically the force of every word and particle, and consider its grand harmonies with the entire body of divine truth, every faculty of our minds would be called into exercise, grander views of divine truth would be communicated, and the varied doctrines of God's Word would shine out in a new lustre.

b) Some of the most important critical questions of the day centre around the Old Testament, and he who would be an authority in these subjects, must have mastered the Hebrew language, not only in its classical form, but also in those cognate dialects which so frequently illustrate both the thought and the idiom of the Old Testament. He must know Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and the composite tongue which is the language of Jewish tradition and Jewish Exegesis.

Prof. R. F. WEIDNER.

The Remission of Debts.—Was it temporary or final? Most readers of the passage in Deut. xv. have thought the command of Moses to enjoin the total cancellation of pecuniary obligations. The ambiguity lies in the word "remission" or "release." The passage reads as follows: *At the end of seven years thou shalt make a release. And this is the manner of the release. Every master of the lending*

of his hand (i. e., creditor) who lendeth to his neighbor, shall 'make release. He shall not urge his neighbor and his brother, for a release unto Jehovah has been proclaimed.

It is evident that nothing can be decided from the English word "release" as to the point under consideration. Will the Hebrew word help us? It is the same word as that used in Ex. xxxiii., 11, where it is commanded that the fields *lie fallow* in the seventh year. It also is found in 2 Kgs. ix., 32 in the command to *throw down* the wicked queen from the castle window. But this idea is equally ambiguous. Is the debt to *lie fallow*, to be *thrown down*, only for a time, or for ever? If the former, for how long? If the release were to be made at the beginning of the seventh year it might seem plausible that it was to continue only during that year, but as the statement is expressly made, "*at the end* shalt thou make a release," it would be difficult to place any limit to the temporary release since none is mentioned in the text itself. Would it be for a week or a year? The law as it stands would on this hypothesis be so vague as to be ineffective.

Giving up then the expectation of finding help in the settlement of the problem from any examination of the words, our hope lies in the careful analysis and weighing of more general considerations. The lawgiver in the entire passage seems to have in mind not the ordinary transactions of trade and commerce between those who are able to pay their obligations, but those loans, whether of food or money made by the rich to their poorer brethren. The whole aim of the legislator is thus stated: *to the end that there be no poor among you.* The command to establish the release *at the end* of the Sabbatical year would then afford great relief, as during the enforced season of idleness when the fields were lying fallow the poor Israelite would naturally be quite dependent upon his richer neighbor who by reason of his wealth was enabled to make much more adequate preparations for this vacation-season. Moses accordingly, in the verses that follow, urges the rich not to be unconcerned about the distress of the poor. But should the rich man after lending to his neighbor during the seventh year, at the close of it and the beginning of the new season urge and press his poorer brother for payment, the poor man would be disheartened and weighed down at the outset of the labor with a burden too great for him. Hence the command to cancel all such debts is seen to be a wise and merciful provision of the great lawgiver. He makes the law in the interests of a beneficent and brotherly charity. It is another form of securing the closest fraternal unity. Nor was this command likely to be abused. The rich would be restrained from indiscriminately lending by the very law which demanded from him the freest benevolence. Should this law indeed be considered to apply to all transactions it would as a matter of course destroy all business credit. It would deal a death-blow to commercial progress. Such was not the aim of Moses. The whole spirit of the command limits it to the class of transactions which have been mentioned, loans made to the poor whether in the unavoidable business inactivity of the Sabbatical year or on earlier occasions of distress, want or misfortune. At the close of the seven years' cycle, his crushing burdens are removed and he can once more pluck up courage to labor with the hope of success.

G. S. GOODSPEED.

The Bible.—Certainly we should have no jealousy of what is called the Higher Criticism. It concerns itself with the authorship of the books of the Bible, the times when they were written, the manner in which they came to have a place in

the Sacred Canon, and such like questions. Lovers of the Bible can lose nothing by such criticism; and they may gain much from it. True it is not always serious or reverent. It is not always fair. The spirit of much of it is anti-supernaturalistic. If men set out with the idea that they are to find neither miracles nor prophecy in the Bible, they will probably account for the miracles recorded in it by ascribing them to the superstition of the times when the books of the Bible were composed; they will view them as simply the popular conception of natural events; and as to the prophecies, as one of the school said to the writer of this paper, they must have been written just after the events took place. But this irreverent, unfair spirit,—this spirit which proceeds on false assumptions, will injure most those who cherish it. Certainly, if there is truth in the Bible, it cannot injure that. If the Bible as itself declares, is “given by inspiration of God,” and if the God who is believed to have inspired holy men of old to write it, “makes the wrath of man to praise him, and will restrain the remainder thereof,” its inspiration will be all the more evident and luminous for this criticism. The Bible has stood many tests in its past history. We may be assured that it will come out of the ordeal to which it is now subjected, not only unscathed, but victorious.

It is useful in times of trial and mental strain to disencumber our minds of wrong conceptions. Like useless lumber these are apt to be in the way. It has been found useful to distinguish between revelation and inspiration. “Revelation is the communicating from God to a mortal, of knowledge which could not be, or had not been, obtained in any other way, by his immediate influence on the human mind.” Inspiration is “the qualifying a recipient of revelation to communicate the revealed knowledge to his fellow creatures with perfect certainty or accuracy.” “That which was not communicated by revelation, but which a person might have previously known by any of the providentially appointed means of acquiring information (such as personal observations, bearing a part in transactions, memory, traditions, conversation, written documents or public notoriety) might be matter appointed by God to be conveyed to others; in which case the due selection of the matter, and the faithful transmission of it to others by speaking or writing, would be the object of inspiration, though without revelation, as well as the former case of inspiration resting upon a revelation.” These definitions are taken from a note in Dr. John Pye Smith’s “Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.” p. 24, vol. I., ed. 4th, 1847. According to them, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” but “all Scripture” is not revelation. It is not claimed that the whole Bible has been directly revealed by God; but that the writers of the Bible had an influence exerted on them by God, by which they were taught what and how they should write and speak. Truth which the human faculties could never have reached, was revealed to them; this truth they were inspired to make known; it is believed to be contained in the volume, which, because of its incomparable excellence, is called the Bible—The Book.

Another distinction is very useful,—that between inspiration as a fact, and theories of inspiration. Very much of the opposition to the religion of the Bible has been directed, not against that religion itself, but against human conceptions of it. We must not suppose that a person impugns the inspiration of the Scriptures, because he assails some theory of inspiration, which lovers of the Bible, in their zeal to defend its truth, have advanced. A person may be a sincere believer in the Atonement though he may refuse assent to some theory as to the nature of the work of the Redeemer of men, which some school of theologians has advocated. A per-

son may devoutly believe in the work of the Holy Spirit on the human soul to produce regeneration, though he may be unwilling to accept all that some school of theologians has set forth on that subject. And so it is possible to accept the Bible as an inspired book, though some theory of inspiration that has long held sway be rejected as inconsistent with the facts of the case. A man must not be branded as an infidel because he does not believe in *verbal* inspiration. Extreme theories, false, because they are extreme,—are mischievous. Not only do they foster a narrow spirit in those who advocate them, they repel the sincere inquirer after truth, and confirm in his position the sceptic, who in his keen-sightedness, sees their inconsistency with facts.

One thing, in regard to the Bible, cannot be disputed. It is in existence. The question is, How are we to account for it? If it has not been given to us by men whom God inspired for the purpose, how has it come into existence? Is it such a book as man either could or would have produced?

It is a book which has greatly influenced men wherever it has been circulated. It has stimulated the human intellect. It has quickened and refined the human sympathies. The highest culture and civilization of the age is the effect of the influence of the Bible on man. This ought to be taken into account in forming a judgment as to its character.

It is a book, to elucidate and explain which many books have been written. This is one of the ways in which it has quickened the human understanding. The literature to which the Bible has given rise is no inconsiderable part of the literature in existence. Nor does there seem to be any diminution of the power of the Bible to produce other books. More books are being written in this age in defence and in illustration of the Bible than in any previous age: and yet the Bible is ahead of them all and maintains its place as the book for the ages. Not only this: but, in every age, books have been written against the Bible, which have no more effect towards destroying it, than the beating of the surf against the rocky coast. Books *versus* the Bible written in past ages are comparatively unknown, while the Bible is as much loved as ever, and marches on in its conquest of the minds of men. This fact also should be weighed in forming an estimate of the book.

The Bible is a book too, which many people are trying to circulate all over the earth. Men have combined to translate this book into all the languages spoken by men (and have succeeded in translating it into a great many of them) and to give it to all peoples. And what is strange, if the book be of man, these translators and circulators of the Bible claim that the motives which constrain them in this work are derived from the book itself. They do it not for selfish ends: to increase their gains, or to acquire power, or to obtain the ascendancy over men politically. This work of Bible diffusion (and we may add of extending the religion of the Bible) is the greatest and purest benevolent movement of the age. The end contemplated is gained when the book is read, its truths understood and believed, its spirit imbibed and its precepts practised. If men, without divine help, have produced a book which has led such multitudes to accept itself as a Book from God, and which has awakened in them such enthusiasm to spread it and disseminate the religion which it inculcates, they have certainly achieved a great wonder.

Such considerations may well beget in us a desire to examine the Bible so that we may ascertain what there is in it different from other books. We may discover that it is a book which bad men could not have written, and which good men would not, unless by the inspiration of the Almighty.—REV. G. ANDERSON.

➤GENERAL NOTES.◀

Jotham's Fable.—The oldest fable of which we have any trace is that of Jotham, recorded in Judg. ix., 7-20. The trees are represented as going forth to choose and anoint a king. They invite the olive, the fig-tree, and the vine to come and reign over them, but these all decline, and urge that their own natural purpose and products require all their care. Then the trees invite the bramble, which does not refuse, but, in biting irony, insists that all the trees shall come and take refuge under its shadow! Let the olive-tree, and the fig-tree, and the vine come under the protecting shade of the briar! But if not, it is significantly added, "Let fire go out from the bramble and devour the cedars of the Lebanon." The miserable, worthless bramble, utterly unfit to shade even the smallest shrub, might, nevertheless, well serve to kindle a fire that would quickly devour the noblest of trees. So Jotham, in giving an immediate application of his fable, predicts that the weak and worthless Abimelech, whom the men of Shechem had been so fast to make king over them, would prove an accursed torch to burn their noblest leaders. All this imagery of trees walking and talking is at once seen to be purely fanciful. It has no foundation in fact, and yet it represents a vivid and impressive picture of the political follies of mankind in accepting the leadership of such worthless characters as Abimelech.—*From Terry's Biblical Hermeneutics.*

Characteristics of the Chokma.—The tendency of the age of Solomon in relation to the tendency of that of David, may be compared to the tendency of Alexandrian Judaism in relation to that of the Palestinian. It is directed to the human, the ideal and the universal elements in Israel's religion and history, and connects the essence of the Israelitish religion with the elements of truth in heathenism. As knowledge (*gnosis*) goes forth from faith (*pistis*), so the age of Solomon is the new age of wisdom (*chokma*), which has gone forth from the age of David. While prophecy serves the process of redemptive history, *chokma* hastens on before it, and anticipates the universal ideas, through which the adaptation of the religion of Jehovah to become the religion of the world is recognized. The Book of Proverbs, the Book of Job, and Solomon's Song are products of this intellectual, and, to a certain degree, philosophical tendency. In the Book of Proverbs the name of Israel nowhere occurs, but that of man (*adam*) is found all the more frequently. The hero of the Book of Job is a personal and actual proof of the grace which is not able to keep sin and suffering apart. And Solomon's Song is a circle of dramatic pictures which place before our eyes the love of man and woman in its monogamous and divinely sanctified ideality. All these three books treat of the relation of man, as such, to God and man. From this we perceive how little there is that is specifically Israelitic in the Solomonic literature.

We see the preparation for this largeness of heart, and for the removal of the husk of nationality from humanity in the Psalms; for (1) in them the desire is expressed in many ways that the heathen may be drawn into the fellowship of salvation; and (2) in them the ceremonial of the Tora is already broken in pieces, so that the spirit does not recognize it at all except as symbolic. Samuel gave expres-

sion to a thought which in this respect can be considered as one of the productive germs of the poetry of the Psalms, 1 Sam. xv., 22, 23: "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, to hearken than the fat of rams; for disobedience is the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is teraphim-wickedness."

There are scarcely two books which furnish a greater contrast in their contents than Solomon's Song and the Book of Job; the former bounds like a gazelle in the spring-time and sunshine, the latter wades through the mire of deep suffering and enigma; and between them the Book of Proverbs moves with a cheerful earnestness through the "vanity fair" of life. But all three books are of one character. They are not specifically Israelitic, but place themselves upon the basis of pure humanity. The allegorical interpretation of Canticles makes Solomon a prophet or a mystic, but he was neither the one nor the other.

The epos and the drama are peculiar to the Indo-Germanic race. The peoples of Islam first received epics and dramas through the Persians who were converted to Islam; but in the time of Solomon the Israelitish literature was removed only a step from the development of the drama. The Song of Solomon and the Book of Job are dramas: the one, even as the ancients called it, is a comedy, the other a tragedy. But the one still lies in the swaddling-clothes of lyric poetry, and the other in the swaddling-clothes of historiography. The Book of Job also resembles the classic tragedy in other respects. Job is a tragic hero. He maintains an unshaken consciousness of his innocence before the decree which crushes him like fate. But the result of the drama is not here, as in the ancient tragedies, that the fate destroys him, but that Job's idea of the fate (*decretum absolutum*) itself, that is, his false conception of God, is annihilated as a phantom of temptation.—From *Delitzsch's O. T. History of Redemption*.

The Sources of the Chronicler.—I. It is clear that when the Chronicler refers to the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, 1 Chron. ix., 1, 2 Chron. xvi., 11, xxv., 26, xxvii., 7, xxviii., 26, xxxii., 32, xxxv., 27, xxxvi., 8, or to the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xx., 34, or to the Midrash (Commentary) of the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xxiv., 27, he does not intend our Book of Kings, for many reasons, of which we give the following examples:—

1. The canonical Books of Kings do not contain the registration of all Israel, which is assigned to the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, 1 Chron. ix., 1: "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies: and, behold, they were written in the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah."

2. If we translate 2 Chron. xx., 32, "Now the rest of the acts of Jehoshaphat, first and last, behold, they are written in the words of Jehu the son of Hanani, which were received [instead of 'mentioned,' as in the English version] into the Book of the Kings of Israel," we find that while Jehu is mentioned as prophesying against Baasha, he has nothing to say about Jehoshaphat.

3. The rest of the acts of Amaziah, first and last, 2 Chron. xxv., 26, and the rest of the acts of Jotham, xxvii., 7, and all his wars and his ways, are not found in the canonical Books of Kings, since the same material, in almost the same form, and more complete, is found in Chronicles (compare 2 Kgs. xiv., 1-20 with 2 Chron. xxv.; 2 Kgs. xv. 32-38 with 2 Chron. xxvii.).

4. Manasseh's prayer unto God, and the words of the seers that spake to him,

2 Chron. xxxiii., 18, are not given in our Books of Kings (compare 2 Kgs. xxi., 1-18 with 2 Chron. xxxiii., 1-20).

II. It is certain that the Chronicler refers to works which are not contained in our canonical books.

1. The visions of Iddo (or Jedo, who was perhaps another person from those who follow) the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat, 2 Chron. ix., 29; the words of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies, 2 Chron. xii., 15; and the Commentary (Midrash) of Iddo, 2 Chron. xiii., 22, do not occur in our Books of Kings, but probably refer to writings of the persons named which were used by the Chronicler.

2. The acts of Uzziah, which were written by Isaiah the son of Amoz, 2 Chron. xxvi., 22, are neither to be found in the canonical Books of Kings nor in the prophecy of Isaiah, who, to be sure, mentions Uzziah, Isa. i., 1, vi., 1, as he does Jotham and Ahaz, i., 1, vii., 1, 3, 10, 12, xiv. 28, xxxviii., 8. But it is clear that the writing of Isaiah in regard to Uzziah is entirely independent of such a passing notice as he gives him in his prophecy.

3. The Commentary on the Book of Kings, which is quoted as giving particulars respecting the sons of Joash, the greatness of the burdens laid upon him, and the repairing of the house of God, 2 Chron. xxiv., 27, is no longer in existence, but was still accessible to the Chronicler and his contemporaries.

4. Since we have established the independence of these sources, it seems to us in the highest degree improbable, that when the Chronicler mentions other authorities whose names appear in our Books of Kings, he simply refers, after the Jewish fashion, to sections where their names occur.

(1) When he quotes the words of Samuel the seer as one of his authorities for the life of David, 1 Chron. xxix., 29, he evidently refers to one of the sources of our two canonical books which were originally one.

(2) If, however, we understand him as quoting historical documents of Samuel, what is to prevent us from understanding that Nathan the prophet and Gad the seer were the authors of other documents, from which the Chronicler might have derived his account of the activity of the priests and Levites in the time of David? This supposition derives some probability from 2 Chron. xxix., 25: "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet, for so was the commandment of the Lord by His prophets." Since Gad's words are as fully given in 1 Chron. xxi., 9-19 as in 2 Sam. xxiv., 11-19, we have good reason for believing that, as we have already intimated, he is author of an independent work.

(3) The Chronicler cites Shemaiah with Iddo as containing the acts of Rehoboam first and last, 2 Chron. xii., 15; but he could not have referred to 1 Kgs. xii., 22-24, where Shemaiah's prophecy occurs, which he repeats with slight variations, 2 Chron. xi., 2-4. Shemaiah has undoubtedly given fuller accounts of Rehoboam's reign than are found in these three verses.

(4) We have no warrant for understanding that one original Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel is indicated under the different authorities which are quoted. This conclusion has been drawn from 2 Chron. xx., 34, which mentions that the Book of Jehu the son of Hanani was embodied in the Book of Kings, and from xxxii., 32, where many read, "In the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel." The singling out of these two books

as being reckoned under the Book of Kings would naturally lead us to suppose that the others were not reckoned in the same category. Besides, it is doubtful, in the second case, whether the vision of Isaiah is not to be understood as an authority besides the Book of Kings. This meaning is favored by the translation of the Septuagint, which, together with Chaldee, is followed by the English version.

(5) When we duly weigh all these points, we do not wonder that Graf was at last inclined to admit that he had gone too far in maintaining that the Chronicler had only freely adapted our Books of Kings to his own views. We have, as it seems to us, abundantly shown that the Chronicler had reliable authorities, and that the assumption that he has deliberately changed the historical facts for a didactic purpose, is entirely without foundation.

(6) The question now remains, In what shape did he consult these authorities? Professor Dr. Franz Delitzsch, my honored friend and teacher, answers the question as follows:—The Chronicler had (1) our two Books of Samuel; (2) our two Books of Kings; (3) a *Midrash Sepher ha-Melakim*,—that is, a commentary on an older Book of Kings,—in which this older book was illustrated by excerpts out of the official annals of Judah and Israel, and out of many prophetic documents of different times. It is probable that Ezra was the compiler of this great work, which closed with the history of his own time.

While we hold, with Professor Delitzsch, that the Chronicler had our Books of Samuel and Kings, we find no adequate proof that the mass of the material was comprehended under a compilation from the older documents named, or that that the expression *Midrash Sepher ha-Melakim* is equivalent to *Sepher Malche Israel ve Jehuda*. (a) As we have already observed, there is no evidence that *Dibre Nathan*, *Dibre Gad*, *Nebuath Ahijah*, *Chazoth Yedo*, *Dibre She-maiah*, *Dibre Iddo*, and *Midrash Iddo* were contained in one work. Indeed, it is far more probable that they existed as independent documents. The fact that the work of Jehu the son of Hanani is mentioned as being embodied in the Book of Kings, 2 Chron. xx., 34, does not indicate that those above mentioned were collected in the same work; it rather shows that the others were not included in it. (b) Although the Chronicler does not quote his main source without some slight variations, yet we cannot argue from this that he considers *Midrash Sepher ha-Melachim* equivalent to *Sepher Malche Israel*, which he mentions twice, or to *Sepher Malche Jehuda ve Israel*, to which he refers four times, much less that the above-mentioned documents of Nathan, Gad, etc., were all constituent parts of a larger work.

(7) Our theory is that the Chronicler had access to these documents, which all illustrated the history of the regal period, and with which he was perfectly familiar. Since we cannot identify the *Sepher Malche Jehuda ve Israel* with *Dibre ha-Yamim*, which is so often quoted in the Book of Kings, it is probable that our present Books of Samuel and Kings lay before our author, from which he took the basis of an enlarged and modified work, which was enriched by the sources already mentioned, and which truly represents the course of history during the regal period from a Levitical standpoint.—*From Curtiss' The Levitical Priests*.

The Historical Standpoint.—It is of the first importance, in interpreting a written document, to ascertain who the author was, and to determine the time, the

place, and the circumstances of his writing. The interpreter, should, therefore, endeavor to take himself from the present, and to transport himself into the historical position of his author, look through his eyes, note his surroundings, feel with his heart, and catch his emotion. Herein we note the import of the term *grammatico-historical* interpretation. We are not only to grasp the grammatical import of words and sentences, but also to feel the force and bearing of the historical circumstances which may in any way have affected the writer. Hence, too, it will be seen how intimately connected may be the object or design of a writing and the occasion which prompted its composition. The individuality of the writer, his local surroundings, his wants and desires, his relation to those for whom he wrote, his nationality and theirs, the character of the times when he wrote—all these matters are of the first importance to a thorough interpretation of the several books of Scripture.

A knowledge of geography, history, chronology, and antiquities, has already been mentioned as an essential qualification of the biblical interpreter. Especially should he have a clear conception of the order of events connected with the whole course of sacred history, such as the contemporaneous history, so far as it may be known, of the great nations and tribes of patriarchal times; the great world-powers of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Persia, with which the Israelites at various times came in contact; the Macedonian Empire, with its later Ptolemaic and Seleucidaic branches, from which the Jewish people suffered many woes, and the subsequent conquest and dominion of the Romans. The exegete should be able to take his standpoint anywhere along this line of history wherever he may find the age of his author, and thence vividly grasp the outlying circumstances. He should seek a familiarity with the customs, life, spirit, ideas, and pursuits of these different times and different tribes and nations, so as to distinguish readily what belonged to one and what to another. By such knowledge he will be able not only to transport himself into any given age, but also to avoid confounding the ideas of one age or race with those of another.

It is not an easy task for one to disengage himself from the living present, and thus transport himself into a past age. As we advance in general knowledge, and attain a higher civilization, we unconsciously grow out of old habits and ideas. We lose the spirit of the olden times, and become filled with the broader generalization and more scientific procedures of modern thought. The immensity of the universe, the vast accumulations of human study and research, the influence of great civil and ecclesiastical institutions, and the power of traditional sentiment and opinions, govern and shape our modes of thought to an extent we hardly know. To tear oneself away from these, and go back in spirit to the age of Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Ezra, or of Matthew and Paul, and assume the historic standpoint of any of those writers, so as to see and feel as they did—this surely is no easy task. Yet, if we truly catch the spirit and feel the living force of the ancient oracles of God, we need to apprehend them somewhat as they first thrilled the hearts of those for whom they were immediately given.—*From Terry's Biblical Hermeneutics.*

Jesus and Mosaism.—When we compare the estimate which Jesus makes of Mosaism with the claims made for it in the Old Testament, we observe certain points of coincidence and also certain points of contrast. That the Mosaic law contained a revelation of the divine truth and the divine will; that it therefore

brought to all men elements of absolute ethical and religious verity in successive self-disclosures of God; and that it was especially the means of divine pedagogy to Israel, through which the theocratic nation became possessed of those great Messianic ideas that underlie the kingdom of God on earth,—these truths Jesus teaches in no equivocal fashion. But that he was capable of distinguishing between the elements of human weakness and error with which they were mingled, in a manner altogether impossible for the writers and teachers of the Old Testament, we are also not permitted to doubt. And, in fact (as we have already seen), he made this important distinction. We can scarcely fail to believe that he might have carried the same distinction into many other details of the Mosaic law, had not a wise reticence, due to his times and to the nature of his mission, prevented him. As far as he has spoken, we are left to notice how widely his manner diverged in many respects from that of the Old Testament. The *jus talionis* to which Mosaism gives a place in the Book of the Covenant, as belonging to the words which Jehovah spoke to Moses and as part of the national compact with God, Jesus characterizes rather as one of those concessive and morally imperfect enactments which were spoken by Moses and his successors to the men of old time. (Compare Matt. v., 38 and Ex. xxi., 24). The law of divorce which Deuteronomy gives among the other statutes of Jehovah commanded through Moses, Jesus regards rather as a statute of Moses, necessitated by the hardness of the human heart, and indeed no better than a virtual permission of adultery. (Compare Matt. v., 31, f., xix., 8, 9, and Deut. xxiv., 1.) How different, moreover, is the entire manner of Jesus when speaking of the Mosaic law, from that of the unqualified praises of the latest books of the Old Testament, with their peculiar tendencies to insist rather upon the ceremonial and sacerdotal provisions of the written Tora! The spirit of his words accords with that view which upholds the principles of righteousness embodied in the Mosaic law, and its symbolic testimony to the great Messianic ideas; while, at the same time, it relatively depreciates that which is distinctively ceremonial and sacerdotal. The scribe, with his growing importance, due to an increasing number of minute and often seemingly conflicting legal enactments, and with his superlative regard for manuscript authority is rather pushed into the background by the teaching of Jesus. But the genuine and living word of Jehovah, which this scribe is quite too likely to overlook in his zeal for the written law, is brought forth from its hiding-place in the manuscript. Thus does Jesus differ in his estimate of Mosaism from both its earlier and later claims in the Old Testament, although drawing in spirit decidedly nearer to those earlier claims. He does not, however, so differ as to abrogate in the least his own declaration, "Until heaven and earth shall have passed away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise have passed away from the law, until all things shall have come to pass."—*From Ladd's "Doctrine of Sacred Scripture."*

➤ EDITORIAL NOTES. ◀

Our readers are requested to make the following verbal corrections in the article of Professor Lyon published in the December Number. On page 104 in the sentence beginning "On any given ethical question," for "ethical" substitute "critical." On page 105 the "itinerancy of the wanderings" should read "the itinerary of the wanderings."

The Use of Commentaries.—How is a commentary to be used? Are commentaries generally used or abused? These are practical questions?

Some students use the commentary first; if any time remains, and this is seldom the case, they take a glance at the portion of Scripture which they persuade themselves that they have been studying. Some read the passage under consideration hastily, glance over the first lines of each paragraph in the commentary, and wonder why commentaries are so dry. Some go nervously from a word in the text to the comment upon it, or from the comment to the word, twisting and confusing various comments and different words. Some, though but a moment of time is at their disposal, decide absolutely upon many questions; if the commentator seems to hesitate, if he fails to present a positive solution, he is regarded as loose, and unworthy of confidence. Some, finding that various explanations have been offered in the case of a certain expression, conclude at once that it is not worth while to give much attention to the study of the Bible, about which there may be held such divergent views. Some have no regard whatever for the views propounded in a commentary, and seek to ascertain those views only that they may be able to adopt one which the commentary does not suggest. It is probably true that by nine persons out of ten the use of a commentary is rather an abuse.

But what is the commentary for? When? As often as there is need. How? By complementing and supplementing the knowledge of common sense of which the ordinary Bible student is supposed to be possessed. There is a use of commentaries which is worthy of consideration. Study the portion of Scripture *first* without assistance. Read it carefully, examining every word, if possible, in the original, at least in the translation. Read it a second time, marking the relation which exists between the sentences and parts of sentences. A third reading will throw much additional light upon the matter in hand. Now note those words or phrases which you do not seem perfectly to comprehend. And again, those words and phrases of the meaning of which you can obtain no satisfactory idea.

There are three elements, (1) that which you seem to understand; or (2) that which is more or less doubtful; (3) that which is entirely uncertain as to meaning. *Now*, but not until now, refer to the commentary, and see what solutions or explanations are suggested for those points of greatest difficulty. Weigh the views that are presented, and decide, with the light which you have, i. e., in view of all the circumstances, upon that which is the most satisfactory. Examine the remarks touching the questions which were partly but not entirely understood. Finally read over whatever else may be said in the commentary, and note everything suggested, which did not occur to you. Read over the passage with all the light which has thus been shed upon it. If you have several commentaries, pur-

sue the same method. Use them (1) to solve difficulties which you could not be expected to solve; (2) to throw light upon that which is more or less doubtful; (3) to suggest that of which you might not have thought. Use commentaries, but do not *abuse* them.

In Reference to Higher Criticism.—The publication of Dr. Lyon's article on *The Results of Biblical Criticism* in the December STUDENT has started one or two questions in the minds of some of our readers: What is the position of THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT on this subject? If its position is a conservative one, does it do right to publish the views of those who are not so conservative? The Editor of the STUDENT appreciates the fact that these are important questions. They are the test-questions which are put to every instructor in the Old Testament department. It is true, as has often been said, that the position of no religious instructor is so delicate and difficult as that of the Professor of Hebrew in our theological seminaries. The difficulty of the position, however, varies somewhat, a greater amount of freedom being allowed in some denominations than in others. What seems necessary to be said in this connection may be classified under the head of facts and under that of conclusions which are thought to be clear in consideration of these facts.

It is a *fact* that, in Germany, every scholar, of any considerable reputation, save one, has accepted to a greater or less extent the results which Higher Criticism claims to have reached.

It is a *fact* that among these scholars, no matter what may be said to the contrary, the degree of unanimity which has been reached in reference to the more important points is, indeed, remarkable.

It is a *fact* that in England a large proportion of the most reputable clergymen and scholars, even in the denominations which pride themselves upon their strict orthodoxy, have adopted in whole or in part these views.

It is a *fact* that in America a respectable number of the most esteemed Old Testament scholars sympathize in a few cases openly, in many cases, privately with these views.

It is a *fact* that just as the general view of the interpretation of important portions of Scripture, [e. g., the interpretation of Genesis 1., has undergone a radical change within a quarter of a century, so that the opinion which was formerly accepted unanimously, is now treated almost with ridicule,] so the general view of the composition, authorship and literary character of certain books has, in the minds of those who have given these questions any considerable thought, become quite different.

It is a *fact* that entirely correct views as to any of these questions have not as yet been attained, nor may they be expected so long as human knowledge remains finite.

It is a *fact* that they who oppose most strenuously the claims of Higher Criticism take as representatives of that science those who hold the most extreme views. It is not right to suppose that all critics are Kuenens and Wellhausens. There are men like Delitzsch, Strack, Briggs and Curtiss, who accept to a greater or less extent these results, yet remain strictly evangelical.

It is a *fact* that the results which Higher Criticism *claims* to have reached have more in their favor than the majority of persons are willing to concede, and that

these so-called results are objected to rather on the ground of their tendency, than because of a lack of proof.

It is a *fact* that many of those who make the loudest outcry against the so-called results are, for the most part, those who have not, and indeed, can not have a clear conception of the basis on which they rest.

It is, however, a *fact* that a large portion of what are called *results*, rest upon a very uncertain foundation; that although in many cases there seems to be some plausibility in the arguments adduced, absolute proof has as yet been presented for a very inconsiderable number of these results.

It is a *fact* that even if these results, at least those of a less radical character, should be shown to be true, it is possible, while accepting them to maintain a strict view as to the general truth and inspiration of the Bible.

And now, granting these to be *facts*, we believe

1) that it is the duty of every minister of the Gospel to acquaint himself with investigations, whether the results be true or false, which are attracting so largely the attention of the church.

2) that these questions can be settled only by free and open discussion.

3) that if these results are true, we ought to know it; if they are false we ought to prove it.

4) that the places for the discussion of these questions, and for obtaining a knowledge of the facts in the case are (1) the lecture-room of the theological seminary, and (2) the pages of professional journals. The weekly religious paper, read by every member of the family, is, of course, no place for the publication of such views. But a journal published in the interest of Old Testament study, aiming to present the current discussions of the day, circulating almost exclusively among ministers and the higher class of laymen, such a journal furnishes certainly the best, and indeed, the only medium for presenting and refuting these views.

5) that in no way can a greater mistake be made, supposing the conclusions to be absolutely false, than by prohibiting all presentation of such conclusions.

6) that, whatever may be the outcome of this discussion, it can only result in benefit to biblical study, and in more firmly establishing the authenticity and credibility of the Sacred Scriptures.

In the Prospectus, published in the first number of the *STUDENT*, there appeared the following notice:—

“In its attitude towards ‘new theories,’ the Journal will be conservative. Judicious discussion of questions of criticism will be encouraged, but in no case will the editor be responsible for views expressed by contributors.”

Up to this time there has occurred nothing to occasion any change of policy, nor has anything appeared in the Journal, contrary to the spirit of this announcement.

→BOOK NOTICES←

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

EGYPT UNDER THE PHARAOKS.

Among the most valuable of recent works upon ancient Egypt is that whose title we give below.* The author enjoyed during a period of thirty years exceptional opportunities for research among the antiquities of that most interesting country of which he writes. Connected officially with the government of the then Khedive, Ismael Pasha—whence his title of “Bey”—and encouraged and aided in his explorations and studies by that prince, who seems to have himself cherished an enlightened interest in what relates to the ancient history of the land he ruled, Dr. Brugsch, in association with his friend and associate, Marriette-Pasha, prosecuted during the thirty years of his residence in Egypt the researches whose fruits are given in these two noble volumes. The work was first published in French, in the year 1857, though not by any means in its present complete state. In 1877, it appeared in German, the French edition having been entirely re-written, and the plan of so much of the whole work as relates to Egypt under the Pharaohs having been fully executed. It is from the German that this translation is made. The value of the work is much enhanced, in its English form, by the discourse upon “The Exodus and the Egyptian Monuments,” which is given at the end. In September, 1874, Dr. Brugsch, as a delegate of the Khedive, attended the meeting of the International Congress of Orientalists in London. This discourse was delivered on that occasion. The “Additions and Original Notes by the Author,” which accompany the work, as we now have it, also supply matter of great interest and value.

It is exceedingly gratifying to find Dr. Brugsch treating his subject in a spirit of entire fairness toward Bible history, so far as that history comes into relation with his general theme, as it often does. His interpretations do not always agree with long accepted ones: yet the original record is always treated and spoken of by him as if recognized fully in its claim to be inspired and infallible. What his personal views upon the subject of Scripture inspiration are is not, anywhere, expressly indicated. It is in any case to his credit that he respects the convictions of those who hold the Christian doctrine in that regard; while he is so express and clear in showing how the monuments confirm the Bible narrative at every point where they bear upon each other, that one is led to hope that it is from the Christian point of view that all such questions are seen by him.

The work itself is strictly a history, as it imports to be. One does not find in it details upon the ancient language and literature of Egypt as in Osburne, nor like details as to the customs, mode of life, agriculture, government and religion

* *A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs* Derived entirely from the Monuments. To which is added a Discourse on the Exodus of the Israelites. By Dr. Henry Brugsch-Bey. Translated and edited from the German by Phillip Smith, B. A., author of “The Student’s Ancient History of the East.” Second edition, with a new Preface, Additions, and Original Notes by the Author. Maps and Illustrations. London: John Murray.

of the ancient Egyptians, as in Wilkinson. The reader may, at first, feel a degree of disappointment on this account. It seems to be in some measure assumed that what lies back of the history proper is already known, and it is only in rapid allusion that we find mention made of the astonishing achievements of this ancient people, even as far back as the time of Abraham and Moses, in those works to which a high degree of civilization is essential; only in those incidental and brief descriptions which help rather than hinder the continuous flow of the narrative, that we have brought into view the mighty temples, with their pylons and walls covered with hieroglyphic inscriptions; the tombs, and palaces, and great cities which even in their ruins make the land of the Nile the world's wonder; the antique literature stored in papyri thousands of years old, or covering pillars, and obelisks, and palace walls and gates, and even the entrances and enclosures of tombs with painted records whose colors are as brilliant to-day as when first laid on. The reader as he follows the narrative in these volumes is supposed to have all these things, more or less, in his consciousness. And still as the great story proceeds he is often made to realize, in brief and vivid allusions, in what a theatre and on what a stage the mighty drama went forward.

It consists best with the purpose of our magazine, that we occupy ourselves principally in this brief review with so much of the contents of these volumes as connects the testimonies of the Egyptian monuments with the narrative of Hebrew history, in the Bible. The Scripture personages named in that connection are chiefly three, Abraham, Joseph and Moses, and the event in Hebrew history which is most dwelt upon is that of the Exodus. Dr. Brugsch is very express and emphatic in maintaining that all which has yet appeared in researches such as his own, confirms the Biblical narrative in every case where the two come into relation with one another. In speaking of the Exodus he says: "My discussion is based, on the one hand, upon the texts of Scripture, in which I have not to change a single iota; on the other hand, upon the Egyptian monumental inscriptions, explained according to the laws of a sound criticism, free from all bias of a fanciful character." He finds it necessary to say that for "almost twenty centuries the translators and interpreters of Holy Scripture have wrongly understood and rendered the geographical notices contained in that part of the Biblical text which describes the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt;" yet adds, "The error, most certainly, is not due to the sacred narrative." In translating the noble poem of Pentaur, a contemporary of Moses, the oldest heroic poem in the world, celebrating the victory of Rameses II. (the Greek Sesostris) over the Khita, Dr. Brugsch says: "Throughout the poem the peculiar cast of thought of the Egyptian poet fourteen centuries before Christ shines out continually in all its fulness, and confirms our opinion that the Mosaic language exhibits to us an exact counterpart of the Egyptian mode of speech. The whole substance of thought in minds living at the same time, and in society with each other, must needs have tended towards the same conception and form, even though the idea which the one had of God was essentially different from the views of the other concerning the nature of the Creator of all things." The perfect consistency of the story of Joseph with what the monuments and the papyri show of the history of Egypt in that period, the famine of which the monuments themselves have a record, and the character of the people at that time, is most strikingly shown. Like testimonies, though not so full, appear with reference to Abraham. In fact, a candid and careful reader of these volumes should find it very difficult to believe that the books bearing the

name of Moses can have been written by any one save himself, or at any other time than that very period to which they import to belong.

If space would allow, we should be glad to present in full the theory of Dr. Brugsch with regard to the Exodus. His Discourse, at the end of the History, shows in statements made by himself that this subject was with him for years a special study. Three times he traversed the region indicated in the Scripture narrative, carefully noting those indications which might be of service in such an inquiry. The result is the conviction that interpreters have hitherto been quite at fault as to the line of march taken by the Hebrews, and as to the point at which their miraculous deliverance occurred. He does not think that the crossing took place at the head of the Gulf of Suez, as has so long been held; but that the march of the people as led by Moses, starting from a more northerly point, at the city of Ramses, near the borders of Goshen, having taken first a south-easterly direction, turned northward, after crossing the Pelusiac branch of the Nile at Pitom, passed Migdol, and continued northward until the Mediterranean was reached. Between the Mediterranean and the Lake Serbonis, long known as "the Serbonian Bog," he shows that there was a passage which under certain conditions was dry and safe, yet under others became exceedingly dangerous. Northerly winds brought the Mediterranean down upon this passage, covering it with raging waves, and sweeping whatever came in its way into the deep gulfs of the Serbonian lake. An easterly wind drove back the waters of the great sea, and left the passage clear. Along this road he conceives that the Hebrews passed, the "strong east wind" which the Lord gave, driving back the waters. When the Egyptians sought to follow them, the wind changed, "the sea returned to his strength, and the Lord overthrew" them.

This theory of Dr. Brugsch has been much criticised, and there certainly are objections to it. His treatment of it, however, while deeply interesting, is rich in information concerning the geography of that part of lower Egypt, east of the Pelusiac Nile branch, where the Goshen of Israel lay, and that other district between the Pelusiac and Tinaitic branches, where lay the land of Succoth, and where Pharaoh's "treasure cities," Pitom and Ramses were built by the enslaved Israelites. It should seem that he holds his theory as to the miracle of the deliverance consistently, in his own mind, with a recognition of that special divine interposition which the Hebrews celebrated in their song of triumph. The theory does avoid some difficulties in the received interpretation, while it is true that divine power and purpose might work a miracle on the shore of the Mediterranean as easily as at the Gulf of Suez. Whether the Lake of Serbonis could be rightly understood as "the Red Sea," or any part of it, and whether this account as a whole meets the conditions of the Bible narrative, the readers of the Discourse are not as yet, all of them, by any means convinced.

We have not brought this work to the attention of readers as a new one; but with a view to recognize it as one of the foremost in value of recent contributions to those archaeological studies in which just now so many are interested. It is a book which one peruses with pleasure no less than with profit, the admirable narrative style of the original being so reproduced in the translation as to charm the reader's attention and hold it unwearied.

J. A. SMITH.

HISTORY OF THE SABBATH.*

This latin tract of 108 pages treats of the origin of the Sabbatic institution, with special reference to the new light derived from Assyrian inscriptions, of which the author is master. Incidentally the theories of Wellhausen and "the Higher Criticism" receive condemnation from the Euphrates valley. The stones cry out in honor of the much abused Scriptures of the Old Testament. The following summary of the book is made by the author.

1. The principal signification of the word Sabbath is "quiet."
2. The Old Testament does not say plainly that the week and the Sabbath were used before Moses.
3. Other ancient peoples besides the Israelites and Babylonians did not observe sabbaths or reckon by seven days, except in astrology.
4. Our week arose from the combination of the Hebrew and astrological seven days.
5. Fortuitously the Jewish Sabbath and the astrologer's day of Saturn were the same.
6. The Hebrew Sabbaths were not in principle days of Saturn.
- 7 and 8. The astrological week was invented by the Babylonians but used, not by the public, but only by astrologers.
9. The Babylonians commonly used a week that originated by the fourfold division of the lunar month.
10. Their Sabbaths occurred the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th days of each month.
11. The Sabbaths were not evil days, not at all sad, but rest was severely enjoined.
12. The Sabbaths did not pertain principally to the worship of the moon.
13. Six was the principal number of measures in Babylon, so that in six days labor was full and a day of quiet must follow.
14. The Israelites received the Sabbath from the Babylonians, Moses accommodating it to the religion of Jehovah.
15. From the days of Moses each seventh day was a Sabbath.
16. From the historical and prophetic books it appears that from the time of Moses the Sabbath was regarded as a day in which it was wrong to transact business of any kind, and that in the time of Amos the intermission of business was not more negligent [as Wellhausen says] but more diligent than in the time of Nehemiah.
17. All writers of the pentateuch demand the intermission of all kinds of labor on the Sabbath.
18. It cannot be proved that the laws of the Elohist (PC) book commanded sabbatic rest any more severely than other laws.
19. Sabbath rest is considered by the prophets and the writers of the laws as of all things most sacred.
20. The cause of Sabbath rest is always chiefly this that the Sabbath as sacred to Jehovah is profaned by the labor of man.
21. They did not consider that the prescribed rest was a sequence of the sanctity of the Sabbath as of other feast days, but that the Sabbath from the beginning was made sacred that it might be a day of rest.

* *Quaestiones de Historia Sabbati. Scripsit Guilelmus Lotz, Lipsiae, 1883.*

22. God did not set apart the day chiefly for the sake of slaves and beasts but that it might be celebrated with homage to God.

23. But it was not a mere ordinance. It was a benefit also.

24. The reason for the sabbatic rest given in the decalogue makes the sabbatic rest signify both an ordinance and a benefit.

25 and 26. The writer of Deuteronomy makes the reason for sabbatic rest both an ordinance and a benefit. He probably knew the reason given in the decalogue but omitted it to make room for another.

27 and 28. "Liber sanctitatis" predicates rest on the sanctity of the day to Jehovah.

29. There is no occasion for us to suppose that Ezechiel was the first to lay down this reason for sabbatic rest. •

30. Even if Ezechiel had invented that reason it could not be contended that the nature of the Sabbath was different in his day from what it had been.

31. Exod. xxxi., 16-17 are later than Exod. xx., 11 and were inserted into the "librum sanctitatis" before it was received into the "librum elohisticum" (A. PC.).

32. Even if the writer of A. PC. had been the first to give this reason for sabbatic rest it does not follow that he thought differently from earlier writers concerning the nature of sabbatic rest.

W. W. EVARTS, JR.

THE TALMUD AGAIN.

The hue and cry against the Jews has brought forth a considerable literature. In this a peculiar place must be given to the work entitled "An Opinion on the Talmud of the Hebrews."* It was written in the year 1802 and not intended for publication but for the information of a personal friend. The author Karl Fischer was censor of the press for the department of Hebrew, was a thorough Hebrew scholar, a devout Christian and a strongly upright man—these particulars are taken from the brief introduction to the present work.

The work itself begins with a statement as to the wide variety of opinions expressed concerning the Talmud; wherefore the author thinks there [is room for one more. He does not propose to go at length into the history of the work, but simply describes its form, then passes to the great controversy of the fifteenth century between the monks and Reuchlin. This is related at considerable length. The opinion of Christian scholars is quoted—Fabricius, Wagenseil, Buxtorf, Lightfoot and others with a reference to the literature of the subject.

The author next gives a number of Talmudic passages which resemble sayings of Christ or of the Apostles. He considers the charge that the Talmud carries on a polemic against Christians and shows that at least in a majority of instances the charge is false. He gives at length (with a translation) the disclaimer of the Austrian Jews published in 1767 in view of such an accusation. One might think this protest composed with a special view to the slanders of Rohling. A second charge (that the Talmud makes it lawful for the Jews to cheat and rob the Christians) is considered at some length and refuted from Jewish sources.

* *Gutmeinung ueber den Talmud der Hebraeer.* Verfasst von KARL FISCHER, k. k. Zensor, Revisor und Translator im hebraeischen Fach zu Prag. (Nach einem Manuscript vom Jahre 1802.) Wien, 1883. (VII and 112 pages 8vo.)

The rest of the book is occupied with a consideration of legendary or fabulous passages on account of which reproach is brought against the Talmud. They are justified in part as having a basis of fact (how many specimens of animals have been exterminated!), in part as being parallel to the myths of Classic literature (at which no one takes offence), in part as being allegory or containing a higher sense. In accordance with the opinion thus expressed the author declares that he will so administer his censorship as not to compel the Jews to publish mutilated editions of their Talmud and not to take away any copies already in their possession. The whole book makes an agreeable impression as being a well considered expression on the part of a competent judge. It is besides interesting for the amount of information it contains on a subject of which the most of us must confess extreme ignorance.

In this controversy as in every other allowance must be made for party feeling. The Christian reader will feel less sympathy with Dr. Jellinek* than with Censor Fischer. The Jewish Rabbi is carried away by his affection. He finds all perfection in the venerable code of the Oral Law. His first discourse entitled, "What is the beginning and what is the end of the Talmud" proposes to make us acquainted with the "intellectual keenness, the spiritual wealth, the readiness, the wit and wisdom, the mildness, the kindness, the pitying and compassionate heart of our ancient sages." One feels at once that the case is prejudged. The method of proof (if such it may be called) does not destroy this impression. The lofty Jewish conception is dwelt upon, as embodied in the שמע ישראל—but it need not be said that this is a Biblical verse and not distinctively Talmudic. The second discourse on "The Talmud full of Life" errs in the same direction. "He who studies in this work with zeal becomes a man of free and independent spirit[!], is trained to make full use of his intellectual powers, to analyze all things, to seek their origin, their composition, and their relations."

It will be said that allowance must be made for a preacher in the presence of a sympathetic congregation. The reply is—a preacher must preach the truth; and especially when he publishes his statements must expect them to be criticized if too strongly colored.

H. P. SMITH.

THE REVISION OF LUTHER'S BIBLE.†

This is an address on the progress of revision in Germany, by one of the committee engaged in the work. The author speaks first of Luther's own ideal of a translation of the Scriptures, in accordance with which he introduced changes in each new edition published during his life. Since his time of course there have been many changes in the use of language, and recent editors have followed Luther's example not always with his skill. The variations in copies of what is known as Luther's translation are consequently numerous and there is great need that the text be at least fixed so as to secure uniformity. Some years ago the question was raised whether this might not be done by a commission who should also be competent to correct at least obvious mistakes. After considerable discussion a commission was appointed. Their first meeting was held in 1865. The

* *Der Talmudjude*. Reden von Dr. AD. JELLINEK. I (14 pages), II (14 pages). Wien, 1882.

† *Die Revision der Lutherischen Bibel-Uebersetzung* von Lic. Ernst Kuhn. Halle 1883.

New Testament was finished in 1868. In 1869 the various Bible Societies took steps for the revision of the Old Testament, and among those engaged on the work we find Kleinert, Riehm, Schlottmann, Delitzsch and others almost equally well known. Their aim is stated in the following particulars:

1. To correct errors which have crept into the standard text [as such, was taken that of the Canstein establishment].
2. When Luther gave two or more different renderings of the same passage to choose the best—namely the one nearest the original.
3. To change obsolete or now offensive words.
4. To bring nearer the original passages misunderstood or not clearly understood by Luther, and in such cases to use so far as possible Luther's vocabulary in the new expression.

The commission has met nearly two hundred times and the work is about complete. In fact it was hoped that the first impressions might be ready by the anniversary of Luther's birth. It is proposed to issue first a proof [*probibibel*] in which all changes will appear in heavy faced type. After sufficient time has elapsed for calm criticism of the work, the commission is to be called again together to consider suggestions and fix the text in its final form. H. P. SMITH.

HEBREW RIDDLES.*

Dr. Wuensche the translator of the *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* here gives an essay on riddles and conundrums among oriental peoples including the Hebrews. The material in the Bible is not very extensive it must be confessed. Besides the well known case of Samson, our author finds riddles (or conundrums we should call them) in the Book of Proverbs:

(The question) "Three are insatiable,
Four say not: enough."

(The answer) "Sheol and the barren womb,
The earth which is never full of water,
And fire which never says enough."

This will serve as a specimen. There are several others in the same chapter. It seems hardly proper to put in the same category the fine parable of the eagles and the cedar in Ezekiel XVII., 1-10. The Talmud and later Jewish literature is much richer in this sort of production. A specimen or two from *Juda ha-Seir* may not be unwelcome here.

"What is blind, yet has an eye: it is constantly occupied in clothing others, yet itself is always naked?"—(Answer: The needle.)

"What weeps without eyes or eye-lashes, and when it weeps, parents and children rejoice: but when its eye smiles and weeps not, all hearts are sad?"—(Answer: The rain.)

The latter would be more appropriate in some climates than in others.

Dr. Wuensche has given us an entertaining essay, if not a contribution to the advancement of science. H. P. SMITH.

* *Die Raethselweisheit bei den Hebraeern mit Hinblick auf andere Voelker dargestellt von Lic. Dr. AUG. WUENSCHKE. Leipzig, 1888. (65 pages 8vo.)*

THE MIDRASCH OF DEUTERONOMY.*

The entire religious literature of the Jews may be divided into two great classes, *Halacha* and *Midrasch*. The former comprises those legal precepts which were grafted upon the law of Moses, with the necessary comments thereupon, and appears preeminently in the *Talmud* and the *Tosefta* (supplementary to the *Mischna*). The latter is devoted to Interpretation of the Scripture whether expounded in the Schools of Theology or in the Synagogues before the Congregation. To be sure, the two elements are found in all Jewish writings and, e. g., the lectures in the School were perhaps predominantly *Halacha*, being given to the justification of the *Mischna*-rules by exegesis. Still a writing, so far as it was Law, was called *Halacha*; so far as it was Interpretation, was *Midrasch*. The *Midrasch* is contained in three classes of writings. 1. In the *Targums*, in so far as they pass the bounds of translations. 2. In the *Halacha* literature, whenever they give themselves to Scripture interpretation. 3. In the *Midraschim*, in the narrower sense, in which the several books of Scripture are interpreted homiletically, for the edification of the Congregation, this homiletical element being termed *Haggada*. To this third class belongs the *Midrasch* of Deuteronomy which is now under consideration.†

The book before us contains 5 pages of Introduction, followed by a literal translation of 117 pages, 3 pages citations of sources and parallels, closing with 15 pages of remarks and corrections by Rabbi Dr. J. Fuerst and by D. O. Straschun. An appendix furnishes, in 47 pages, 25 extracts from the *Pesikta Rabbathi*, a *Midrasch* of the 9th century, in age and quality closely related to our *Midrasch*, though it embraces the treatment of sections from various books of Scripture.

From the Text and Introduction we learn the following :

This *Midrasch* contains many extracts from both *Talmuds* and from the *Midrasch* of Genesis and Numbers; also from the *Haggadas* of Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song. We can not certainly say that it was written before A. D. 1150, and it is the latest of the *Midraschim* on the Pentateuch.‡ It is divided into 27 nearly equal sections (*Paraschoth*), 11 of which are named (corresponding in content with *Paraschoth* 44-54 of the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy.—B.). In each of the 27 sections, a verse, or verses are expounded in the following manner. First, a *Halacha* consisting of some question of casuistry, with the answers of the several Rabbis, quotations of Scripture and parabolical teaching upon the same, is introduced; then comes the *Midrasch* proper, a *Haggada*, or homily upon the passage, embracing Scripture parallels, opinions of Rabbis, stories, legends, parables, covering reminiscences of the past, meditations of the present and hopes for the future, a mass of matter, occasionally terse, original and beautiful, but, oftener, diffuse, fanciful, contradictory and silly. The *Halachoth* were evidently chosen as Introductions kindred in character to the *Haggada* portions which followed them. Sometimes, the similarity is apparent as in Sections 5, 15 and 19; at other times very remote, if not far-fetched as in 4 and 7.

* *Der Midrasch Debarim Rabba*, das ist, Die Haggadische Auslegung des Fuenften Buches Moses. Zum ersten Male ins Deutsche uebertragen von Lic. Dr. AUG. WUENSCH. Leipzig: Otto Schulze. 1882.

† For a fuller description of these terms see Weber's "System der Altsynagogalen Palaestinschen Theologie," Leipzig, Doerfling & Franke, 1880.

‡ According to Weber, this *Midrasch* dates from the 9th century and is older than that of Exodus, Numbers and Ecclesiastes.

In expounding the Scripture there were very wide differences of statement, due to play upon words, and other strained attempts to gather a meaning entirely new. In this effort, words are "cleft in twain," letters transposed and vowels altered, at pleasure.

The substance of a single section will be sufficient to set forth the method employed; pp. 37, sqq.:—

Deut. vi., 4. *Hear O Israel! The Eternal our God, the Eternal is one.*

Halacha. Has an Israelite done his duty who reads the pattern (Schema) without strict attention to the letters (sounds, pronunciation, &c.)? The wise-men have taught thus: R. Jose says: "Yes, he has done his duty." R. Jehuda, on the contrary says: "No, he has not done his duty." What are we to understand by the careful reading of the letters? The Rabbis have taught; e. g., in **בכל לכנס**, there must be a separation between the two letters **ל**, since the first word ends with the same letter with which the second begins. R. Jehuda says: "He who reads the pattern (Schema), walking, must standing, take upon himself the Kingdom of Heaven." What is the Kingdom of Heaven? "The Eternal, our God, the Eternal is one." How long since the Israelites began to read the Schema? R. Pinchas bar Chama says: "Since the giving of the law." How so? Thou findest that God began with these words on Sinai, "Hear O Israel! I am the Eternal, thy God," and all the Israelites chimed in with the words: "The Eternal, our God, the Eternal is one," and Moses added "Blessed be the name of the glory of His Kingdom for ever and ever." According to the Rabbis. God spoke to the Israelites: "My children, all that I have created have I created *in pairs*. Heaven and earth are a pair, sun and moon are a pair, Adam and Eve are a pair, this world and that world are a pair, My honor however is one and alone in the world." How do you prove that? From the words "Hear O Israel! &c."

Or: "Hear O Israel! &c.," in connection with Ps. LXXIII., 25: "Whom have I in Heaven? &c." According to Rab there are two firmaments, the Heaven and the Heaven of Heavens; according to R. Eleasar, however, there are seven, **שמים** the heaven, **שמי שמים** the heaven of heavens, **רקיע** the expanse, **מעין שחקים** clouds dwelling, **זבול** dwelling and **ערפל** cloudiness, and God opened them all to the Israelites to prove to them that "There is no other God than He." The Congregation of Israel spoke before God: "Lord of the world! whom have I in the heavens, besides thy honor. As I have only thee, so desire I no other upon the earth. As I join with thee no other God in the heaven, so on earth, but I go daily into the houses of assembly and testify that besides thee there is no God and I say: 'Hear O Israel! the Eternal, our God, the Eternal is one.'"

Or: "Hear O Israel! &c.," in connection with Prov. xxiv., 21, "Fear the Eternal, my son, and the king and meddle not with innovators." What means **ומלך**? Have I not caused Abraham who feared me, to rule in the world, as it says in Gen. xiv.: "In the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's valley?" And Joseph, as it says in Gen. xli., 6, "Joseph was governor over the land?" Or: "Fear the Eternal, my son; **ולוך**" that is;—"and rule over thy passion." R. Simeon ben Eleasar went once to a city in the South, came to a Synagogue and asked the Scribe: "By thy life! is there wine for sale?" "To be sure, Rabbi, in this city are Samaritans, they do not deal in pure wine, however, as my ancestors did." The other said: "If thou hast any wine left, I will take it." The

Scribe answered: If thou art master of thyself, do not taste it." R. Simeon replied: "I am, and have been master of myself." That is the sense of **ומלך**, namely **ומלך**.

Or: "Fear the Eternal, my son **ומלך**. What means **ומלך**? **ואל למלך**, as it says in Lev. XVIII., 21: "and thy seed shalt thou not devote to Moloch."

* * * * *
Or: "Hear O Israel!" The Rabbis say: "When Moses mounted the heights of heaven, he heard the angel say to God—'Praise the name of His glorious Kingdom for ever.' This expression he brought back to the Israelites." Why do the Israelites not repeat it publicly? "For the same reason," said R. Asi, "that a man who has pilfered an ornament from the King's palace and given it to his wife says to the latter, 'Do not ornament yourself with it publicly, but only within the house.' But on the day of the Atonement, when the Israelites appear as innocent as the angels, then they say aloud 'Blessed be the name of his glorious Kingdom for ever.'"

A brief Haggada upon v. 5 closes this section.

Historically the Midrasch is valuable, otherwise it is nearly worthless.

C. R. BROWN.

→SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.←

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- TRUMBULL, H. C., D. D. Kadesh Barnea: Its importance and probable Site. New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons*. 1 vol. 8vo. \$5.00
WILSON, COL., Picturesque Palestine, Sinai and Egypt. Their History, Souvenirs, Sites and Monuments. New York: *D. Appleton & Co.*, 2 vols., 4to \$32.00
FIELD, H. M., D. D., Among the Holy Hills. New York: *Chas. Scribner's Sons*. 1 vol., 8vo. \$1.50
PERROT AND CHAPIEZ, History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria. New York: *A. C. Armstrong & Co.* 2 vols., 8vo. \$15.50

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- SCHWABE, E., **ב** nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauche im alttestamentlichen Canon gewuerdigt. Dissertation. Halle: 1883, 44 S. 8.
MUELLER, J., Kritischer Versuch ueb. der Ursprung u. die geschichtliche Entwicklung d. Pesach—u. Mazzothfestes. (Nach den pentateuch. Quellen.) Ein Beitrag zur hebraeisch-jued. Archæologie. Bonn: *Weber*, 1883, VII., 85 S. gr. 8.
BICKELL, G., Dichtungen der Hebraeer. Zum erstenmale nach dem Versmasse d. Urtextes uebersetzt. III., Der Psalter. Innsbruck: *Wagner*, 1883. X., 278 S. 12.
MASSEY, G., The natural genesis; or second part of a book of the beginnings, containing an attempt to recover or reconstitute the lost origines [sic] of the myths and mysteries, types and symbols, religion and language, with Egypt for the mouthpiece and Africa as the birthplace. London: *Williams & Norgate*, 1883, 2 vols. XVI., 552, VI., 535 pp.

RECENT ARTICLES.

- ROBERTSON, J., The graphic Element in the Old Testament. *The Expositor*, Oct. '83, pp. 241-258.
- BERTIN, G., M. R. A. S., Suggestions on the Voice-Formation of the Semitic Verb. A Comparative and Critical Study. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. XV., Part IV., Oct. '83.
- LILLIE, ARTHUR, M. R. A. S., The Buddhism of Ceylon. *Ibid.*
- CONDER, C. R., Lieut. R. E., Light from the Orient on Bible Texts. The Hitites. *Pulpit Treasury*, Dec. '83, pp. 507-508.
- SAYCE, REV. A. H., The Gods of Cauaan. *Contemporary Review*, via *Eclectic*, Nov. '83.
- SHAPIRA'S MSS., Signification of אָדָם "man," Judaica and Rabbinica. *Independent*, Nov. 22, '83, pp. 6-7.
- TERRIEN DE LA COUPERIE, The Chinese Mythical Kings and the Babylonian Canon. *The Academy*, '83, Oct. 6, pp. 212-213.
- DEANE, W. J., The Book of Ecclesiasticus: its Contents and Character. *Expositor*, '83, Nov., pp. 321-349.
- GRETILLAT, Wellhausen et sa méthode dans sa Critique du Pentateuque. *Revue de theol. et de philos.*, '83, Sept., pp. 484-510.
- GIBSON, E. C. S., Some names in Genesis. *The Expositor*, '83, Nov., pp. 350-362.

REVIEWS.

- GESENIUS' WILH., Hebraeisches und chaldaeisches Handwoerterbuch ueber das Alte Testament. 9. vielfach umgearb. Aufl. von Proff. F. Muehlau und W. Volck. Leipzig: F. W. C. Vogel, 1883, XLVI., 978 S. gr. 8, M. 15. By Siegfried: *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, No. 23, Nov. 17, '83.
- DILLMANN, A., Die Genesis [Kurzgef. exeg. Handbuch 11. Liefg. 4. Aufl.] J. Halévy: *Revue critique*, 41.
- ELLCOTT, C. J., An Old Testament Commentary for English readers. J. E. C.: *Modern Review*, Oct. '83.
- HUEBSCHMANN, H., Armenische Studien, I. Dillon: *Goett. gel. Anz.* '83, 41, S. 1281-1299.
- LENORMANT, F., La genèse. J. Halévy: *Revue critique*, 42, '83.
- WELHAUSEN, J., Mohammed in Medina. A. Mueller: *Ztschr. f. Voelker-psychol. u. Sprachwissens.*, XIV., 4, '83, S. 434-457.
- WRIGHT, C. H. H., The book of Koheleth. H. L. Strack: *Lit. Centralblt.*, 42, '83. E. M. Gabriel: *The Inquirer*, Sept. 15.
- BRIGGS, C. A., D. D., Biblical Study. *New Englander*, Jan. '84, p. 137.