

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT❖

VOL. VII.

MARCH, 1888.

No. 7.

As those who make use of the "Inductive Bible-studies" must have observed, the question of harmonizing the dates and numbers of Scripture with those of outside writers is a difficult and serious one. No more plausible or satisfactory theory of such a harmony has, in our opinion, been presented than that which Professor Willis J. Beecher has given in these "studies." It is probable that only a few of the thousands who are carrying on this course of studies have patiently and thoroughly investigated the case as presented. The majority of people detest chronology. But what has been the result in the case of the few who have considered the matter? What inference may be drawn from the manner in which our instructor, Professor Beecher himself, presents the case? Is the question yet solved? Turn from this simple and comparatively satisfactory representation, to the wearisome, complex, and (shall we say?) imaginary theory advanced in the last *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Pass in review the countless schemes which from generation to generation have appeared. What must we conclude? That, at all events, the case is doubtful. Perhaps no more interesting collection could be made than that of the forced interpretations which have been offered in order to maintain the strict accuracy of the biblical numerals in certain passages. Every *honest* effort, we feel, should be made to prove, if possible, the universal accuracy of the numbers given in Scripture; but there are two things which may well be kept in mind: (1) that it is better to acknowledge the existence of an error here or there, than to resort to means perhaps dishonest, and certainly in many cases absurd, to disprove it; (2) that the acknowledgment of a numerical error is, after all, not so serious as would at first sight appear.

THE article of the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, published in this number, will surprise some, discourage others. It should not, however, occasion either surprise or discouragement. It is only what one who stops for a moment to think, would beforehand have predicted.

The present Sunday-school methods, however admirable, and however efficient in other regards, do not, in the line of Bible instruction, produce the desired results.

But with no other comment here, we would take this opportunity to enter a protest against the importance attached by Mr. Crafts to the memorizing of the exact words of Scripture. Just as in many cases, children learn the sound of an expression, with no idea whatever of the separate words, so both children and adults often learn the words of an expression, with no idea whatever of the meaning. Now certainly the thought is more important than the words; the spirit, than the letter. A poor statement of a grammatical principle, or of the thought of a given verse, if in the language of the pupil himself, is far better than a word-for-word recitation of the statement contained in the grammar, or of the verse as it is in Scripture, *unless* the student has thoroughly digested the latter; and this not one student in fifty ever does. It may be said that this, though true of human writings, is not true of the divine words. To this we cannot give assent. The fact that sacred writers, when narrating the same event, often differ widely from each other in the words employed, is in itself evidence in favor of this position. If Mr. Crafts will substitute "mastery" for "memorize," if our schools will do the same, the results will be different. There was a time when children merely "memorized;" that time is past, and we hope will never come again. The watchword of the future should be and will be "mastery." No greater mistake has prevailed in the educational work of the past than the idea that "memorizing" means "learning."

ANOTHER word about "memorizing" Scripture. Many of us, doubtless, look back with satisfaction to that good old time, when, even against our will, we memorized Scripture; and naturally such ask, Is there anyone so foolish, so weak, as to cry out against this? Two points are worthy of notice: (1) Is it necessary to go far, in order to ascertain the result of a too strict adherence to the *word*? Do we not see this, clearly, in the conceptions of Scripture current in our Saviour's time? This state of things was the natural, indeed the inevitable, outcome of the method of Scripture-study employed in the preceding generations. (2) "Memorizing" is far better than nothing; and the result, so far as knowledge of the Bible is concerned, of much of the Bible-study of to-day is *nothing*. If no better plan can be devised, let us go back to "memorizing," for all will agree that, in many cases, "memorizing" was really valuable. But, just as "memorizing"

words, even with no adequate conception of their meaning is better than nothing, so "mastery," which means far more than "memorizing," is superior to "memorizing." If, therefore, "mastery" is impossible, then "memorize;" but why should "mastery" *be* impossible?

THERE are two general theories in reference to the interpretation of Scripture. One insists that the sacred words may mean anything anywhere, that they may have two or more distinct meanings according to the option of the interpreter; the other, that an expression, allowing for difference of speaker, age and other attendant circumstances, has *one* meaning, and that determined by the context. Which is "scientific"? One theory insists that a people living before civilization began may have the same ideas concerning life, religion, and the future, which another people possess who live in the full blaze of the light of the risen Messiah; the other, that the religious conceptions of an early age, when compared with those of a later age, after making all needed allowance for the supernatural element, are necessarily dim, hazy, and incomplete. Which is "scientific"? One theory insists that the Bible, assumed to be of divine origin, differs so materially from all other writings, that in its study the ordinary principles of literary composition are to be cast aside as useless, even profane; the other, granting the divine origin, insists that, having likewise been written *by* men and *for* men, there are some aspects at least, in which it deserves to be treated as a *human production*, and that, so far, it is subject to the laws which regulate other human productions. Which is "scientific"? One theory insists that, being divine, it must *therefore* be thus or thus; the other, that, being thus and thus, it is divine. Which is "scientific"? We might go further; this will suffice. "Scientific" Bible-study *is* study in the process of which (1) scientific methods are employed; (2) adherence is maintained to the laws of human speech; (3) allowance is made for all the factors which enter into the problem under consideration; (4) the truth is sought, regardless of previous preconceptions. It is *not* study in the process of which (1) methods belonging to the dark ages are used; (2) the simplest laws of language are violated; (3) only facts favorable to the theory are considered, the others wrested or ignored; (4) a theory must be established, whether by fair or foul means.

It is noteworthy that the term "unscientific" is, in some particulars, as truly applicable to much of the so-called "advanced" criticism and exegesis of our day, as to the older and more staid criticism and exegesis, at which our "advanced" friends are so accustomed to sneer.

MACAULAY'S USE OF SCRIPTURE IN HIS ESSAYS.

BY REV. R. DEWITT MALLARY,

Lenox, Mass.

"Macaulay," says Trevelyan, "was known at one period of his life to say that if by some miracle of vandalism all copies of *Paradise Lost* and *Pilgrim's Progress* were destroyed off the face of the earth, he would undertake to reproduce them both from recollection whenever a revival of learning came." One hardly rises from the first and most superficial reading of his *Essays*, without a more or less firm belief that he might have included the Bible in that statement; and this belief is deepened almost into conviction as we read them with *special* reference to their scriptural style.

The "Welsh Triads on Genius" decree that for the foundations of genius, these three things are necessary: "the gift of God, human exertion, and the events of life." All three found their way into the composition of Lord Macaulay, and made him what he was. What boy of fourteen, other than one in whom literary ability was germinant, would write home, as did the boy Thomas Babington Macaulay to his mother: "All his (Bonaparte's) great projects and schemes which once made every throne in Europe to tremble are buried in the solitude of an Italian isle. How miraculously everything has been conducted! We almost seem to hear the Almighty saying to the fallen tyrant: 'For this purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show in thee my power.'"¹ "Macaulay's childhood was phenomenal; but his life was more so. We perceive in the child a familiarity with the Scripture which was the result of careful reading, and which later years developed into a passion. In parliament, in clubs, in correspondence, in the editor's chair, in the service of the East India Company, in drawing rooms, in the literary offices of the historian, in good-natured banter of his sisters, this atmosphere of the Bible is like an aureole about him. Two instances shall suffice. In Margaret Macaulay's journal for Sept., 1831 (Macaulay was then an M. P.), we read: "Walking in the streets with Tom and Hannah (afterwards Lady Trevelyan), and talking about the hard work the heads of his party had got now, I said: 'How idle they must think you, when they meet you here in the busy part of the day!' 'Yes, here I am,' said he, 'walking with two unideal girls. However, if one of the ministry says to me, 'Why walk you here all the day idle,' I shall say, 'Because no man hath hired me.'"² At another time, Dec. 12, 1832 (after a domestic sorrow), he writes to Hannah, his sister, "I am sitting in the midst of two hundred friends, all mad with exultation and party spirit, and thinking me the happiest man in the world. And it is all I can do to hide my tears and to command my voice, when it is necessary for me to reply to their congratulations. Dearest, dearest sister, you alone are now left to me. Whom have I on earth but thee?"³ It would not be so remarkable that the Script-

¹ Rom. 9:17.

² Matt. 20:6,7.

³ Ps. 73:25.

ure should be so intertwined with the thought and speech of Macaulay, if he had lived in an age when knowledge did not run to and fro; in an age when the Bible was the sole literary pabulum of the day. We do not wonder so much at the scriptural style of Owen and Whitgift and Baxter and Hooker. But Macaulay's knowledge in every direction except that of mathematics, for which he had a pronounced aversion, was well-nigh limitless. And yet, through and over all the exhaustiveness of his encyclopædic mind, the scriptural trend of his thoughts is very evident. He is the best qualified to urge and to illustrate the truth of his own canon of literary criticism, which he wrote to Lady Trevelyan: "A person who professes to be a critic in the delicacies of the English language ought to have the Bible at his finger's ends."

Macaulay's "Essays" appeared at irregular intervals throughout his entire life. They were laboriously composed. They were written mostly for the quarterlies, and in later years, when he ceased to write for the Reviews, for the *Ency. Britannica*. They cover mainly a period of English history coetaneous with that in Macaulay's *History of England*, bringing out into heroic size characters who could not be dealt with at length in the running thread of historical narrative. The "Essays" are historical and biographical; with now and then an essay on the theory of government, on church and state, on questions of the day, on general history, and with a large sprinkling of book reviews. They have been called a "library in themselves." It is, therefore, all the more interesting and significant to note that a scriptural style is sufficiently flexible for the treatment of a large variety of subjects. We have no doubt that the scriptural illustrations, metaphors, and similes which abound in these Essays were, to a slight extent, due to Macaulay's particular historical researches into English history, embracing a period when the language of the people was copiously leavened with biblical images and phrases; but that Macaulay should have given a nineteenth century stamp to such a style is no less a credit to his head than to his heart. A fine rhetorical judgment is revealed in his use of the Bible, that arsenal of the rhetorician no less than of the Christian. If an "eclipse of faith" should ever blot out the Bible from the thought of men, much of the charm of Macaulay's Essays would be gone. When, in 1825, his first contribution to the *Edinburgh Review* appeared, "to have the entry of whose columns was to command the most direct channel for the spread of opinions, and the shortest road to influence and celebrity," the author became the lion of all literary circles, and his style, which set the world agog, the seventh wonder. That first entree into the pages of the most conspicuous periodical of the day, carried Macaulay at once to the dizzy heights of great and sudden success. The subject of that essay was "Milton," and Jeffry, the editor of the *Review*, in acknowledging the receipt of the manuscript, wrote to its author, "The more I think, the less I can conceive where you picked up that style." It is here in this essay that we see the inseparable blending of scriptural language with the thought of the writer; not in a more marked way than in later essays, but in a suggestive way as a happy augury of what was to be a distinctive feature in the style of the great essayist.

And now we may proceed to arrange, with reference to the order of the sacred books rather than to the chronology of the Essays themselves, some of the biblical illustrations which abound in these famous classics. Where the allusions require explanation it will be given, but in the main they will be permitted to speak for themselves.

I. ALLUSIONS TO EVENTS NARRATED IN SCRIPTURE.

[*On Mirabeau.*] "The whole political world (at the time of the French Revolution) was 'without form and void,'¹—an incessant whirl of hostile atoms, which, every moment, formed some new combination. The only man who could fix the agitated elements of society in a stable form was following a wild vision of glory and empire through the Syrian deserts. The time was not yet come, when

'Confusion heard his voice; and wild uproar stood ruled;

when out of the chaos into which the old society had been resolved, were to rise a new dynasty, a new peerage, a new church, and a new code."

The following passage aptly illustrates for us, in these days, the difference between the attitude of the United States, and that of Russia, towards anarchy; in the former of which countries where, by the operation of a laissez-faire principle, anarchy dies from inanition, and in the latter where, by a system of military espionage, it is fed and feared:

[*A Conversation between Cowley and Milton.*] Milton speaks: "So it is in politics: where the people is most closely restrained, there it gives the greatest shocks to peace and order; therefore would I say to all kings, Let your demagogues lead crowds, lest they lead armies; let them bluster, lest they massacre; a little turbulence is, as it were, the rainbow of the state; it shows indeed that there is a passing shower, but it is a pledge that there shall be no more deluge."²

[*On Temple.*] In this essay the prevalent tergiversation in the times following the Restoration is thus described: "In a country in which many very honest people had, within the space of a few months, supported the government of the Protector, that of the Rump, and that of the King, a man was not likely to be ashamed of abandoning his party for a place, or of voting for a bill which he had opposed. The public men of the times which followed the Restoration were by no means deficient in courage or ability, . . . but the curse of Reuben was upon them all: 'Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel.'"³

[*On Byron.*] "Never had any writer so vast a command of the whole eloquence of scorn, misanthropy, and despair. That Marah was never dry; no art could sweeten, no draughts could exhaust its perennial waters of bitterness."⁴

[*Review of Mill's Essay on Government.*] "So ends this celebrated essay. And such is this philosophy for which the experience of three thousand years is to be discarded. . . . We are sick, it seems, like the children of Israel, of the objects of our old and legitimate worship. We pine for a new idolatry. All that is costly and all that is ornamental in our intellectual treasures must be delivered up and cast into the furnace—and there comes out this Calf!"⁵

[*On Burleigh.*] "Nations made war on each other with new arms, with arms which no fortifications, however strong by nature or by art, could resist, with arms before which rivers parted like the Jordan, and ramparts fell down like Jericho."⁶

[*On Temple.*] "On those who resisted, he (Cromwell) had made war, as the Hebrews made war on the Canaanites. Drogheda was as Jericho; and Wexford as Ai. To the remains of the old population the conqueror granted a peace, such as that which Israel granted to the Gibeonites. He made them hewers of wood and drawers of water."⁷

¹ Gen. 1:2. ² Gen. 9:13. ³ Gen. 49:4. ⁴ Ex. 15:23. ⁵ Ex. 32:4. ⁶ Josh. 6:20. ⁷ Josh. chs. 6 and 8.

[*On Sadler's Law of Population.*] "A man who wishes to serve the cause of religion ought to hesitate long before he stakes the truth of religion on the event of a controversy respecting facts in the physical world. . . . Like the Israelites in their battle with the Philistines, he has presumptuously and without warrant, brought down the ark into the camp as a means of insuring victory; and the consequence of this profanation is that, when the battle is lost, the ark is taken."¹

[*On Southey's Colloquies.*] The church nothing to gain, but everything to lose by alliance with the state: "The ark was never taken till it was surrounded by the arms of earthly defenders. In captivity, its sanctity was sufficient to vindicate it from insults, and to lay the hostile fiend prostrate upon the threshold of his own temple."²

[*Von Ranke.*] Alluding to the high moral character of the movement organized and carried forward by the Encyclopædists of France, Macaulay says in this essay: "If the Patriarch of the Holy Philosophical Church had contented himself with making jokes about Saul's asses,² and David's wives, and with criticizing the poetry of Ezekiel in the same narrow spirit in which he criticized that of Shakspeare, Rome would have had little to fear. . . . But while this new sect was laughing at the Scriptures, and shooting out the tongue³ at the sacraments, it was ready to encounter principalities and powers⁴ in the cause of justice, mercy, and toleration."

[*Mackintosh.*] "You never saw his (Mackintosh) opinions in the making. They came forth like the pillars of that temple in which no sound of axes or hammers was heard, finished, rounded and exactly suited to their places."⁵

[*Id.*] "And was it not plain that by so doing (i. e., by joining the king and the Catholics against the Church of England) he would assist in setting up a spiritual despotism compared with which the despotism of the Establishment was as a little finger to the loins, as a rod of whips to a rod of scorpions."⁶

[*Lord Clive.*] "They (the natives of India) had been accustomed to live under tyranny, but never under tyranny like this. They found the little finger of the company thicker than the loins of Surajah Dowlah."⁶

[*Milton.*] "In every high place worship was paid to Charles and James, Belial and Moloch."⁷

[*Burleigh.*] "The religion of the English (in the Elizabethan age) was a mixed religion, like that of the Samaritan settlers described in the second book of Kings, who 'feared the Lord and served their graven images.'"⁸

[*Milton.*] "The latter (*Æschylus*) often reminds us of the Hebrew writers. The book of Job, indeed, in conduct and diction, bears a considerable resemblance to some of his dramas."

[*Sadler's Refutation refuted.*] "If revelation speaks on the subject of the origin of evil, it speaks only to discourage dogmatism and temerity. In the most ancient, the most beautiful and the most profound of all works on this subject, the book of Job, both the sufferer who complains of the divine government and the injudicious advisers who attempt to defend it on wrong principles are silenced by the voice of supreme wisdom, and reminded that the question is beyond the reach of human intellect."

¹ 1 Sam. 4:11.

² 1 Kgs. 6:7.

³ 1 Sam. 9:3.

⁴ 1 Kgs. 12:10.

⁵ Ps. 22:7.

⁶ 2 Kgs. 17:41.

⁷ Eph. 6:12.

⁸ 2 Kgs. 17:41.

[*Von Ranke.*] "It is a mistake to imagine that subtle speculations touching the Divine attributes, the origin of evil, the necessity of human actions, the foundation of moral obligation, imply any high degree of intellectual culture. The book of Job shows that long before letters and arts were known to Ionia, these vexing questions were debated with no common skill and eloquence, under the tents of the Idumean Emirs."

[*On the Athenian Orators.*] "To require that a critic should conceive classes of composition which never existed, and then investigate their principles, would be as unreasonable as the demand of Nebuchadnezzar, who expected his magicians first to tell him his dream and then to interpret it."¹

[*Lord Clive.*] "Towns spring up in the East, with the rapidity of the prophet's gourd."²

[*Leigh Hunt.*] "The nation (in the times following the Restoration) resembled the demoniac in the New Testament.³ The Puritans boasted that the unclean spirit was cast out. The house was empty, swept and garnished; and for a time the expelled tenant wandered through dry places, seeking rest and finding none. But the force of the exorcism was spent. The fiend returned to his abode and returned not alone. He took to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself. They entered in and dwelt together, and the second possession was worse than the first."

[*Conversation between Cowley and Milton.*] Milton speaks: "When the devil of tyranny hath gone into the body politic he departs not but with struggles and foaming and great convulsions."⁴

[*On Civil Disabilities of Jews.*] "We have not so learned the doctrines of Him who commanded us to love our neighbors, and who when He was called upon to explain what he meant by 'a neighbor,' selected as an example a heretic and an alien."⁵

[*Southey's Colloquies.*] "The whole history of Christianity shows that she is in far greater danger of being corrupted by alliance with power, than of being crushed by its opposition. Those who thrust temporal sovereignty upon her do but treat her as their prototypes treated her author. They bow the knee and spit upon her; they cry 'Hail,' and smite her on the cheek; they put a sceptre in her hand, but it is a fragile reed; they crown her, but it is with thorns; they cover with purple the wounds which their own hands have inflicted upon her; and inscribe magnificent titles over the cross on which they have fixed her to perish with ignominy and pain."⁶

[*Conversation between Cowley and Milton.*] In this essay we get an estimate of the Puritan movement from the stand-point of an opponent. Cowley says: "Religion had been a pole-star to light and guide. It was now more like to that ominous star in the Book of the Apocalypse, which fell from heaven upon the fountains and rivers and changed them into wormwood; for even so did it descend from its high and celestial dwelling-place to plague this earth, and to turn into bitterness all that was sweet, and into poison all that was nourishing."⁷

¹ Dan. 2:5. ² Jonah 4:6. ³ Matt. 12:43-45. ⁴ Mark 9:20. ⁵ Luke 10:29-37. ⁶ Gospels. ⁷ Rev. 8:10.

SABBATH-SCHOOLS EXAMINED ON THE BIBLE.

BY REV. WILBUR F. CRAFTS, D. D.,

New York City.

In order that Christian workers might know in what lines their help is most needed, written examinations of the older scholars (those above twelve) in representative Sabbath-schools of all denominations in all parts of the nation and Canada, were arranged for the June and September review days of 1887, not on the current lessons but on "First Principles." About three thousand printed blanks were accepted by the superintendents of thirty Sabbath-schools. Eighteen of these superintendents, on second thought, concluded that discretion was the better part of valor, and stayed out of the contest. A thousand blanks were accepted by the older pupils in the other dozen Sabbath-schools. Five hundred and seventy-seven were ashamed to hand in their replies. The four hundred and twenty-three blanks were returned. None of the dozen Sabbath-schools were missions, so that the result shows how much is known of the Bible and of Christian doctrines by the best half of the older scholars in our church schools.

The first question in the blanks, "Why do we call the Bible the Word of God?" is first in importance as well as in place, since inspiration is the doctrine now the most debated and always most fundamental to the whole structure of Christian faith. (In the replies to this and all the other questions, answers whose errors are only in spelling, capitalization and grammar are counted "correct," although these errors are sometimes noted, and should have due attention.) Many answer the first question (with varying spelling), "Because God inspired men to write it," "Because it was given by divine inspiration," "Because it is a revelation of God's will;" but "inspiration" and "revelation" need defining even more than what they are used to define. The same is true of the answer, "Because it was ordained by God." A large number think the Bible is the Word of God "because it tells all about God;" but that definition belongs to the creeds, catechisms and theologies, which tell far more about God's decrees and plans than the Bible does. Many agree (except in spelling) in the answer, "Because the Bible is the Book of truth;" but it is a lie to assume that all other literature is made up of lies. "Because it was wrote by God," "Because it is a collection of words spoken by God," "Because it comes direct from God," "Because it came down from Heaven," "Because it came from our dear Lord," and many answers of the same import recall the fact that in a large town where there were many churches, a lady who was speaking to a union meeting of children about the Bible, on asking how it came to us, got these same answers in substance from all the children, except one who had just returned from daily drill in the "Children's Hour" at one of the Chautauquas. He alone knew that God used men in making the Bible.

In only one of the examination papers is there even an attempt to quote the catechism in answering this question about inspiration, and that one calls the Bible, "the infallible rule of faith and guidance." Better miss in memory than meaning, but best of all not miss in either.

Attempts at a Bible answer to this question about inspiration come within one of being as rare as attempts at a catechism answer.

Several answer (with the usual variety of spelling), "Because it was written by the dictates of God." Two boys, by a remarkable (?) coincidence, answer, without even a letter of variation, "God made the words but told different men to write it." A kindred answer is, "Though written by men we believe God put the words in their mouths." This erroneous idea of inspiration as divine dictation appears in many definitions. Those who know that men had something to do with making the Bible seldom know enough to give a correct answer. Instead of exact knowledge they show only disturbed ignorance. Many say (with deformed spellings of various kinds) that "God told his disciples to write it." Others say that it was the "apostles," others that it was "Moses," others that it was the "prophets," who were told to write the Bible. One says "Prophets and disciples," an answer which is right if both words be taken in a wider sense than the writer probably meant them. He doubtless thought the same as another who answered, "Prophets and apostles," not knowing that Mark and Luke were neither. From three schools come five papers giving for answer that pernicious phrase by which the prophets of the New Theology seek to put the Bible on probation, "We call the Bible the Word of God because it *contains* the Word of God" (italics ours). Several declare that they think the Bible is the Word of God, "Because it is," which is improved by one who thinks it is "Because." "Because it is truly the Word of God" comes from a boy who evidently wishes to make the impression that he always calls a thing what it "truly" is, but to speak "truly" of him we must say that this answer, all but the "truly," and some of his other answers entire, was stolen from the boy who sat next to him.

The Sabbath-school which gave the best answers to this first question is one which had been trained, in the "Memory Episode" of its general exercises and its week-day children's meeting, to understand and memorize this definition: "We call the Bible the Word of God because God guided the hearts of the writers so that they would not write anything He did not wish them to write. 'No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God being moved by the Holy Spirit.'"

It is a significant illustration of the fact that the simplest definitions need explanations to prevent their being parroted in unmeaning phonetics, that the above definition reappears in two papers as follows: "So that he called the hearts of the writers the hat did not wish them to write." "No prophecy ever came before God by the will of man." But all the other variations of this definition that appeared were such as to prove that the writers had not missed the meaning. Thirty-three gave it with substantial accuracy, and twenty-four others gave correct definitions, making fifty-seven out of ninety-six, leaving thirty-nine inadequate answers even in the Sabbath-school whose record on this question (though not on some others) was the best. In no other Sabbath-school do the answers indicate that even a majority of the older scholars (much less of all) have a correct and clear idea of inspiration. Three-fourths of the four hundred and twenty-three papers either gave no answer at all, or an erroneous one.

Here it will be appropriate to say that no school answers even fairly well on any topic that has not been a subject of special memory drill.

The second question, "What is the first verse in the Bible?" though the easiest in the list, has served a good purpose in the blanks as a test of accuracy,

which is closely related both to truthfulness and honesty. Those who quote for the first verse of the Bible, "In the beginning the Lord made heaven and earth," or "In the beginning was the Word," or leave out "the" before "heaven" or "earth" or both, will need watching when they come to keep accounts or make reports, unless their parents or teachers previously train them to greater accuracy. He who does not report God correctly can not be relied upon to report exactly the conversation of his fellows. In the four hundred and twenty-three papers returned, this easy opening verse of the Bible appears correctly only one hundred and twenty-five times, most of the others not being blanks but misquotations. "Little things are little things, but to do little things faithfully is a great thing."

The third question, "What is God's Commandment about the Sabbath?" by calling for one of the longer commandments as a sample, shows through the replies whether the commandments have been generally and correctly memorized. Many knew this commandment well enough to keep step with a crowd in repeating it, but cannot write it correctly. In the four hundred and twenty-three papers, this commandment is given correctly but thirty-eight times. The papers of an Episcopal school show but two accurate out of thirty-seven, many of the mistakes being due to mixing up the Bible version with the Prayer-book version, which this examination furnishes a good reason for displacing. The only Sabbath-school in which there are more correct than incorrect answers is one that took the blanks home to answer "upon honor." In the attempt to write this commandment the same mistakes often appear and may be consolidated, except a part of the omissions, in the following "reversed version:": "Honor the Sabbath to keep it holy. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them. Six days shalt thou labor and perform all thy work, but the Sabbath is the Lord thy God's; in it thou shalt do no work, thou, nor thy wife, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's. Wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it."

Many who have not been taught to say, "I don't know," instead of proving it, who have not learned that a blank is better than a blunder, that room is better than rubbish, that an acknowledgment of ignorance is more creditable than a pretense of knowledge, extemporize rather than memorize. The following is a sample: "Said that ye should not spend the Sabbath day with pleasure but keep it holy and not visiting for the sake of see a friend. If you want to keep the Sabbath Day holy go to church and keep away from bad company." Another sample is the following: "Thou shalt not forget the Lord and on the Sabbath thou shalt remember me not pleasure or picnics." Another of these improvised commandments is, "Don't let the Sabbath day profane for the Lord made heaven and earth and all that is in the midst for the Lord rested the seventh day and hallowed it." Another of these papers furnishes a commandment that would suit those who are at ease in Zion, namely, "On the seventh day thou shalt do nothing." Another of these "new" commandments—the only reply to this question about the Sabbath in which the extemporizing has even the smell of catechism—is: "Though shalt remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy. Though shalt not do any work on the Sabbath. Six days shalt though do all thy work and on the seventh rest from all worldly care and *think on God* our maker." We may rejoice that even these blunderers understand so well how to keep the Sabbath; but the fact that the young people of twelve and more in our Sabbath-schools are so many of them

unable to quote the commandments correctly, after ten years in a Sabbath-school or in a Christian home, or in both, ought to be regarded as great a disgrace to all concerned as if the same youth could not say the multiplication table after ten years in a public school. In the answers to this question and to every other in the list, the schools of the various denominations and of the various sections of the country are as alike as peas in a pod in their deficiencies. Even the British school which was one of the dozen replying, fits into the pod with no mark of superiority. The defects discovered are international.

One requirement of the examination-papers was, "Write some Bible verse that shows how a sinner may be saved from sin and hell." Surely that ought to be answered by any one who has been ten years or more in a Christian home or Sabbath-school, or both, as quickly as a grammar-school pupil would answer a call for the first three letters of the alphabet. Especially ought the many young Christians who worked on these papers to have been as ready to answer this question with a dozen texts as a carpenter to give the names of his tools. What are the facts? The papers abound in such improvised Scripture as the following: "Jesus said, Let the sinners come to me and I will save them." "Believe in the cross and thou shalt be saved from sin and hell." "Believe on the Lord with all thy sole all thy heart and all thy Body."

It is a matter of congratulation that only three speak of being *saved by works*, "by going to Sunday-school, not getting in bad company, not going and playing instead of going to Sunday-school," "by keeping the ten commandments," "by doing his commandments," as if the Bible did not say that such an idea, which is not confined to children, is charging Christ with dying for nothing at all (Gal. 2:21). But even when an answer contains the correct idea, it is no trifle to misquote God. When one is seeking to be saved, he needs, not "some little word of mine," not a diluted tincture of Scripture, but the very Word of God to rest upon. The total result on this question is, that the four hundred and twenty-three papers yield only eighty-four appropriate texts, correctly quoted. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," is the favorite, and appears fifty-seven times. The next most frequent text is, "God so loved the world," etc. But both of these are misquoted as often as they are given correctly in every school except the two which took the papers home "upon honor," which make no mistakes on either text, but are not counted in the total given on this topic. The passage which affords the simplest and fullest answer to this question, for children, is John 1:7-9, which is not given at all in the replies except a fragment or two in several papers. This needs to be supplemented by such clear words as Romans 10:9,10 and Hebrews 12:1,2, most of which a child can understand.

Another requirement of the examination, "Write one or two Bible verses that tell why Jesus died on the cross," brings to view the same class of mistakes as have just been noted, inaccuracy in quotations, improvisations of Scripture, and pious platitudes. The most frequent answer is, "Jesus died to save sinners," which certainly is not "one or two Bible verses." The passage which ought to be quoted oftenest, as it is the clearest and completest and best adapted to the comprehension of childhood, Romans 5:8-10, does not appear at all, except in a fragment or two, nor does the next best statement of this subject for childhood, Isa. 53:5,6, appear with any frequency.

Two other requirements of the examination were as follows: "Write some Bible verse that tells what becomes of the wicked after death." "Write some

Bible verse that tells what becomes of God's people after they die." Appropriate texts, correctly written, are the exceptions; blanks, or worse, the rule. The strongest answer both in regard to heaven and hell, Matt. 25:46, is given a few times correctly, oftener imperfectly. A frequent answer to the first of the questions is, "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God," which the Revision now shows, as commentaries have shown before, is only a reference to the fact that the vices of the wicked, whether individuals or nations, hurry them prematurely to the grave, to "Sheol." Texts about Heaven are much more frequent in these papers than texts about Hell, though it is not so in the Bible, a fact whose significance is not uncertain. Extemporizing Scripture on this crucial doctrine of hell is peculiarly unfortunate; but the following are only samples of what is found, in place of God's exact warnings, in many papers: "Depart from me ye workers of iniquity into a lake of everlasting fire prepared for you." (The Bible says that the fire was prepared for the "devil and his angels," and the "mansions" for men.) "The wicked shall go away into everlasting death." "They are cast into everlasting eternity." "They are cast into Hell's fire and the devil's hands." "The wicked shall go to the devil and his angels." (Now we know who gets up "corners.") Such crazy quilts, made up of texts imperfectly remembered and teachings imperfectly understood, occur in scores of papers under each of the questions that call for Scripture answers.

Are the results of the examination discouraging? Nay, they should be only arousing. To use a medical figure, if one finds, by an insurance examination, that he has dangerous symptoms, for which, however, a sure cure is at hand, he congratulates himself that he has been warned in time. Deficient as our Sabbath-schools are in knowledge of the Bible, there is no proof that the youth of our land ever understood or practiced its truths more than to-day, and so, in the face of the facts given, we should go forward to better things, with the motto, "Always encouraged, never satisfied."

SOME LEVITICAL USAGES.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN G. LANSING, D. D.,

New Brunswick, New Jersey.

The Hebrew word *Kaf* used in connection with the offering of incense, is, in the A. V., translated "spoons" twenty-four times: as, e. g., Exod. 25:29; Num. 7:14; 1 Kgs. 7:50, *et al.* The R. V. follows the A. V., translating "spoons." Thirteen times out of these twenty-four it occurs in the seventh chapter of Numbers. Elsewhere this Hebrew word *Kaf* occurs frequently, and always has reference to the palm of the hand or the sole of the foot. We have precisely the same word in Arabic, *Kaf*, which is used with the same meaning of the palm of the hand or the sole of the foot. The rendering of this word *Kaf* by "spoons" is misleading. It has reference properly to a kind of *censer*. What kind of *censer* this was, and why it was so called, we are clearly informed by the old Egyptian sculptures and inscriptions. In the temple of Seti I. at Abydos, King Seti is represented in the act of offering incense. The vessel in which he offers the

incense consists of a rod, about the length of the fore-arm, and evidently intended to represent the fore-arm. This fore-arm, or rod, after a slight curvature at one end intended to represent the joint of the elbow, another further on representing the wrist, terminates at the other extremity in a hand with the palm, *Kaf*, upward. In the hollow of the palm is a small basin in which is the smoking incense. The whole constitutes the censer, and is held forward by the extended hand of the king in the act of offering incense. The king is also sometimes represented as throwing balls or pastilles of incense into the basin with the other hand. In the temple of Denderah another king appears offering incense with the same kind of censer to the goddess Hathor. The same censer appears frequently in a long inscription on a fine tablet in the Egyptian Room of the Boulak Museum. Again the same censer appears in a superscription of one of the oldest parts of the *Book of the Dead*, as on a papyrus of the same recently brought by the writer from Egypt. Such was the Hebrew censer called *Kaf*. In further proof of the identity of the Hebrew *Kaf* and this old Egyptian censer, we have the old Egyptian names *Kef*, *Kep*, *Kheb*. And not only the Egyptian names of this censer, but the name also of one of the principal compounds, of sixteen ingredients, used for incense in this censer, was the closely related name of *Kuphi*. Why this censer was called *Kaf*, the same word as that for the palm of the hand, is evident from its very shape, as described.

Another word which seems to have received an inaccurate rendering is the Hebrew word *Hazah*, used thirteen times in the Old Testament. It occurs first in Exod. 29:26 in connection with the ram of consecration, and the wave offering. The word is translated "breast" both in the A. V. and R. V. The more correct rendering would be *shoulder*, as it has reference to the fore-quarter of the animal. This is explained and confirmed by Eastern etymology and usage. The corresponding Arabic word is *Khadda*, which, in an animal, has reference particularly to the upper or principal part of the fore-quarter. In Egypt and like countries the sheep or lamb is the favorite animal for food. And in the sheep or lamb it is always the fore-quarter or shoulder that is esteemed above every part of the animal. A person may visit an Egyptian house, as a guest, for years, and while, in honor of the occasion, a quarter of mutton will be the principal meat, still the guest will never have set before him the hind-quarter, but always the fore-quarter or shoulder, as it is esteemed far more highly than any other part. So it was with the ancient Egyptians. In their religious offerings it was the fore-quarter of the sheep or lamb that was presented in offering. This is shown by old Egyptian paintings, inscriptions, and in the mummied remains of several fore-quarters to be seen in the Boulak Museum, and one recently brought by the writer. And with ancient Egyptians the reason for offering the fore-quarter was also because this was the best, the most highly esteemed part of the animal. So in the Levitical wave offering, the shoulder or shoulders, as the most highly esteemed parts, as the best, were offered to the Lord. In the following passages, viz.: Lev. 9:21; 10:14; Num. 6:20; 18:18, the word which is rendered "right shoulder" and "heave shoulder" does not have reference to the fore-quarter or shoulder, but to the hind-quarter. The Hebrew word is "Shok." The precisely corresponding Arabic word is "Sak" from "Sok," which always has reference to the hind-quarter, and is never properly used of the fore-quarter of an animal.

Once more, the divine command is uttered three times, in the same words, and without note or qualification,—“Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's

milk." What does it mean, and why was the command given? An incident related to me when recently in Egypt will best explain. A small company were for a few moments unwilling spectators of a cruel scene. Among the company was a native servant, an excellent hearted fellow, but not knowing how to read or write. After looking upon the scene for a few seconds, he turned around and exclaimed, in Arabic,—“That is as cruel as seething a kid in its mother’s milk,”—precisely the biblical expression; but he had not derived it from the Bible. It is an oriental expression or simile used to describe an act of great cruelty. Upon inquiring later what the expression meant, the information was given that seething a kid in its mother’s milk meant the taking of the kid from its mother while it was yet sucking, and killing and eating it. And the reason why this was such an act of cruelty, or described an act of great cruelty, was because of the fact that, as with the dove among birds, so with the goat among animals, there is no animal which seems to feel so keenly, and expresses so painfully and humanly its sorrow over the loss of its young as a goat. The divine command was thus in this case, as in so many others, a humanitarian law.

The same humanitarian principle is seen operating in the divine, and at first strange, instructions given in Deut. 22:6,7. The parent bird will soon comfort itself with other eggs or other young, but it will not soon comfort itself with another mate. In the animal kingdom these are matters of actual observation.

AN OLD TESTAMENT LIBRARY.

BY THE EDITOR.

In fulfillment of a promise made in the December *STUDENT*, the following suggestions are offered, in reply to the question, “Having two hundred dollars to invest in Old Testament literature, what books shall I purchase?” In order to economize space, the list of Professor Peters, as being the simpler and the better of the two, will be taken as a basis. The suggestions offered will be under three heads: 1) Books in Professor Weidner’s list which, in the opinion of the writer, should have been included in the list of Professor Peters; 2) Books in Professor Peter’s list which, perhaps, might well have been omitted; 3) Books omitted by both Professors Weidner and Peters which the writer would have included in such a list.

I. BOOKS IN PROFESSOR WEIDNER’S LIST, BUT OMITTED BY PROFESSOR PETERS.

Gesenius (Robinson), *Hebrew Lexicon*.—Very old, it is true, yet everything considered, superior to Davies, which, it must be confessed, does not give the student the information which is needed.*

Keil, *Biblical Archaeology*, 2 vols.—Old-fashioned, but, nevertheless, very valuable for the collection of facts which it contains.

Curtiss, *Levitical Priests*.—A presentation of the subject, severely criticised by many critics, highly appreciated by the more conservative critics; perhaps

* It is a matter for congratulation that we are soon (within two years, perhaps) to have an edition of Gesenius worthy of the name.

unfair in some respects, but well worth study, because of the intrinsic importance of the subject.

- Oehler**, *Old Testament Theology*.—Containing much forced exegesis, and poorly arranged; but the only book in English treating, with any satisfaction, a department of study which, to-day, is recognized as one of the foremost in biblical and theological lines.
- Orelli**, *Old Testament Prophecy*.—Traversing the same ground as Briggs' "Messianic Prophecy;" differing from the latter not only in the special interpretation of many passages, but also in the general method of classifying results; very stimulating and suggestive.
- Rawlinson**, *Five Great Monarchies*.—Popular, somewhat behind the times, containing much material which a specialist would have omitted, but well presented and best calculated of any English work to give one a general view of the field covered.

II. BOOKS TO BE OMITTED FROM PROFESSOR PETERS' LIST.

- Davies**, *Hebrew Lexicon*.—See above.
- Septuagint**, with notes, etc. (Bagster).—A copy of the text is sufficient for ordinary purposes.
- Bleek**, *Introduction to the Old Testament*.—In some respects the best in English, but the English translation is now too much behind the times.
- Duncker** (Abbot), *History of Antiquity*.—Thoroughly rationalistic, and too expensive; far better add fifty or sixty dollars and purchase the "Encyclopædia Britannica," which contains articles written from the anti-traditional point of view on all important topics of Ancient History.
- Josephus** (text).—The average minister gets along with little or no knowledge of the original languages of Scripture, satisfying himself with a translation; under these circumstances it is hardly worth his while to spend money for a text of Josephus.
- Cheyne**, *Translation of Psalms*.—A good translation, but the notes are too meagre.
- Ewald**, *Prophets of Israel* (5 vols.).—Very valuable to a scholar, but containing too few notes, too arbitrary in treatment, and too expensive.
- Tylor**, *Primitive Culture*.—Too remotely connected with the matter in hand, a score of books should have the precedence.
- Septuagint**, Tischendorf or Van Ess. See below.
- Hosmer**, *Story of the Jews*.—One-sided and entirely unsatisfactory.

III. BOOKS NOT MENTIONED IN EITHER LIST.

- Swete**, *Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 1, Genesis-4 Kings.—Just issued, the second volume soon to follow. \$2.50.
- Cremer**, *Biblico-Theol. Lexicon of N. T. Greek*.—For those who already possess a classical Greek Lexicon.
- Ewald**, *Hebrew Syntax*.—The only really valuable work ever written on the subject as a whole.
- Harmon**, *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures* (\$4.00).—Following too slavishly the traditional stand-point, giving too much attention, comparatively, to the Pentateuch; but full of valuable material which every student should have close at hand.

- Toy**, *Quotations of the Old Testament in the New* (\$3.00).—Quite too liberal, needlessly offensive in places, but the only scientific treatment of the subject in existence; (a second volume is soon to appear).
- Blakie**, *Manual of Bible History* (\$1.50).—Brief, but well-arranged; fresh and abreast of the times; truly excellent.
- Dod**, *Genesis* (Hand-book for Bible-classes), (.90).—Accepting the existence of different documents; constructive, not destructive; clear, and very practical.
- Stuart**, *Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, Daniel*, (3 separate vols.).—Critical, definite, and hardly surpassed.
- Curtiss and others**, *Current Discussions in Theology* (4 vols. \$6.00).—Recent, well-systematized, giving just the information which a non-specialist needs, but cannot obtain without the expenditure of a large amount of labor.
- Ragozin**, *Story of Chaldæa* (\$1.50).—Popular, and generally reliable.
- Ragozin**, *Story of Assyria* (\$1.50).—Same series as above, and of equal value.
- Terry**, *Hermeneutics* (\$4.00).—Full, able, and scholarly; not intended for classroom, but for reading and reference; no biblical library complete without it.
- Spurrell**, *Notes on Genesis* (\$2.50).—For use in connection with the original text.
- Simon**, *the Bible the outgrowth of theocratic life* (\$1.75).—Liberal yet conservative; emphasizing strongly, but none too strongly, the historical stand-point.

In closing, it may not be out of place for the writer to express it as his opinion that the time has past when certain books should be purchased, or indeed be accepted as gifts. In this category there may be classified the following, taken from Professor Weidner's list: **Bagster**, *Chaldee Reading Lessons*; **Bagster**, *Hebrew English Bible*; **Horne**, *Introduction to the Bible*; **Roberts**, *Old Testament Revision*; **Fairbairn**, *Typology*; **Gloag**, *Messianic Prophecies*; **Riehm**, *Messianic Prophecies*; **Leathes**, *O. T. Prophecy*; *Homiletical Commentaries* of most classes, although the *Pulpit Commentary* is by all odds the best; **Bonar**, *Leviticus*; **Cox**, *Job and Ecclesiastes*; **Fairbairn**, *Ezekiel*; **Pusey**, *Minor Prophets* ("too many bushels of trash to a single kernel of wheat").

The writer would also say that his experienced has tallied with that of Professors Weidner and Peters; it is easier to *feel* that a given book is or is not to be included in such a list, than to give reasons for the feeling. It is to be understood that these suggestions have no other possible value than that which belongs to them as the expression of the opinion of a single individual. In general, it might be added that the man who proposes to invest so much money in Old Testament books, would do well to study German.

INDUCTIVE BIBLE STUDIES.

[Copyright by W. R. HARPER, 1887.]

PREPARED BY

PROFESSORS W. R. HARPER (Yale University), W. G. BALLANTINE (Oberlin Theol. Sem.), WILLIS J. BEECHER (Auburn Theol. Sem.), and G. S. BURROUGHS (Amherst College).

TWENTY-FIFTH STUDY.—THE PROPHECY OF JOEL.

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professor Burroughs. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

I. PRELIMINARY NOTES.

1. Having completed the study of the written prophecy of the northern kingdom,—considered in its progressive character and yet viewed as a unit,—we are now prepared to advance to the study of written prophecy in Judah.
2. In so doing, we should note carefully the special characteristics of this prophecy, as distinguished from that of the ten tribes, viz., as standing in relation to and conditioned by (1) the character of the kingdom, not schismatic yet inclined to idolatry, (2) the peculiar purpose and providence of God toward Judah,—severity mixed with mercy, the exile to be followed by the restoration,—(3) the development of the Messianic hope and promise in their peculiar relation to the history and mission of Judah.
3. Special attention, therefore, should be given to the study of Messianic prophecy, as developed, in the progress of general prophecy, in the southern kingdom and disclosed in its written forms, e. g., in particular, its positive, explicit and personal character.
4. The prophecy of Joel may well be regarded as the point of departure in this southern prophecy, and as containing, both negatively and positively, the germs found more fully developed in its subsequent manifestations.

II. BIBLICAL LESSON.*

1. *Read, slowly and carefully*, using the Revision, the prophecy of Joel. Note any expressions which are not clear to you. Guided by the impressions gained from this reading, answer, tentatively and *only* so far as you can *clearly* do so, the following questions:
 - (1) What was the occasion of the prophet's utterance?
 - (2) What influence does this occasion appear to have upon the entire thought of the book? How do its contents stand in relation to it?
 - (3) What is the general line of thought of the prophecy?
 - (4) Into what portions does it readily divide itself? Into what several *movements* is the general progress naturally resolved?
 - (5) What is the general character of the entire utterance, as disclosed in the style? Is it, or is it not, realistic?
2. *Re-read* 1:1-2:17. Consider the following questions:

* The following literature may be noted; Briggs, "Messianic Prophecy," pp. 153-160; von Orelli, "O. T. Prophecy," pp. 191-196, 204-223; Ewald, "Prophets of O. T.," vol. 1, pp. 107-142; Delitzsch, "O. T. Hist. of Redemption," p. 112 seq.; "Messianic Prophecies," p. 110; Keil and Delitzsch, "Minor Prophets," Joel, C. F. Keil, vol. 1, pp. 169-232; Schaaf, "Lange's Com.," Joel, O. Schmolzer and J. Forsyth; Gelkie, "Hours with the Bible," vol. 4, pp. 154-164; attention is also called to "The Prophecy of Joel; Its Unity, its Aim and the Age of its Composition," W. L. Pearson, Leipzig, T. Stauffer, 1885.

- (1) How are the locusts, spoken of in 1:4 seq. to be thought of, *literally* or *allegorically*? Consider any expressions in the prophecy which are unfavorable to a literal interpretation, e. g., 1:6, "nation"; 2:2, "great people"; 2:17, "that the nations should rule over them"; 2:20, "northern army"; "hath done great things," etc. Are these more than counterbalanced by the general tenor of the narrative? Does the description 2:2-10 seem to apply the better to an army of locusts or of human warriors?
 - (2) What as to 1:8-12, 17-20? Are we to find here a visitation of drought coming in addition to the plague of the locusts?
 - (3) How does the prophet view the calamities of which he speaks? See 1:14, 15; 2:1. Are they the precursors of a still more terrible visitation? What is the meaning of the expression "day of the LORD," 1:15; 2:1? Compare other instances of its use in the prophetic writings, e. g., Obad. 15; Amos 5:18; Zeph. 1:14, etc. What is its weight and influence in the interpretation of Joel's prophecy?
 - (4) How does the prophet regard the worship of Jehovah—its ministers, its seat of ministration, and its ministrations—both generally, and also in relation to the present calamities? See 1:9, 13, 14, 19; 2:1, 12-17.
3. *Re-read* 2:18-3:21. Consider the following matters:
- (1) What is the relation of 2:18-27 to 2:28, 29? Does the prophet here pass from the nearer blessing, which results from repentance and the divine mercy, to the more remote, which flows from the same sources? from that which is outward and of the earth to that which is inward and spiritual? Compare 2:23, "causeth to come down for you the rain," with 2:28, "pour out my spirit." Compare, also, with this progress that seen in the previous section, the visitation of the locusts and the drought, 1:4-20, and "the day of the LORD," 2:1, cf. 1:15. Do the separate sections of the book thus assist in interpreting one another.
 - (2) What is the relation of 2:28, 29 to 2:30-3:21? Is Judah, individually repentant and, therefore, individually blessed with spiritual gifts, a refuge (2:32, "those that escape") in the time of judgment? Is the blessing, inward and spiritual, poured-out upon the church, related to the world-judgment, in that it both delivers from it and also opens the eye to see it? Is redemptive history in close connection with world-history?*
 - (3) What is the relation of 3:2b-6, 21 to 3:2a, 7-11? Are the political circumstances of the time lately passed, wherein injustice and injury were inflicted upon Judah, now repentant, the occasion of describing the judgments of Jehovah upon the nations?†
 - (4) Is there a relation between the destruction of the enemies of Zion (3:9-19, specially vv. 16, 17) and the destruction of the locusts (2:18-20); also, between the great blessing brought to Judah in connection with the judgment of the nations (3:18, 20) and the blessings following the locust-plague (2:19, 21-27)? Are the former counterparts of the latter? Do the separate sections, here again, assist in mutual interpretation?
4. *Make a special study* of 2:28, 29. (1) Force of "my spirit." Is there an advance here, in any particular, upon the general O. T. conception of the "spirit of Jehovah"? (2) Meaning of "all flesh"? How comprehensive is the expression? (3) Meaning of "shall prophesy," "dream dreams," "see visions"? Cf. Num. 11:24-29. How far have we here a high and

* See, especially, von Ordlif, pp. 205-209.

† See 2 Kgs. 8:20; 2 Chron. 21:16, 17; also, consult "study" twentieth, V. 2, 3.

- spiritual conception of the church of Jehovah, as consisting of individuals in personal relation with God? (4) Consider the N. T. use of this passage, Acts 2:16-18.
5. *Make a special study of 2:30-32.* (1) How closely are the phenomena of vv. 30,31 to be defined? (2) What is the basis or personal condition of deliverance in "Jehovah's Day"? See v. 32a; cf. Gen. 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; Micah 4:5; Zech. 10:12. (3) How is "Mount Zion" regarded in 32b; compare Obad. 17. (4) Who are those "whom Jehovah doth call"? Are the heathen here spoken of? (5) Note the N. T. use of this passage, Acts 2:19-21; Rom. 10:13.
 6. *Make a special study of 3:1-21.* (1) "The valley of Jehoshaphat" (vv. 2,12), meaning? Is this an ideal valley, or has the prophet a definite location in mind, and, if so, what? What historical occurrence may lie at the basis of the scene? See 2 Chron. 20:14-30. (2) What is the figure here used to represent the divine judgment? Cf. Isa. 63:1-6; Matt. 3:12; 13:30, 39-43; Rev. 14:15-20, etc. (3) What is the result of this judgment? See vv. 18-21. How is the blessing of Judah represented? (4) Meaning of v. 21? Is there here a divine removal of blood-guiltiness and a divine purification, which render possible the height of blessing, viz. *the permanent divine fellowship*?
 7. *As the conclusion of the above study* (1) write out concisely the leading thoughts of the prophecy; (2) unify them, and state the *message of the book*, considered as a whole.

III. SPECIAL TOPICS.

1. **Date of the Prophet.** (1) What may be inferred from the historical situation? What is the character of the political horizon? Who are the foes of Judah? See 3:4,19, and compare with the situation in Amos and Hosea.* See (a) 2 Kgs. 8:20; 2 Chron. 21:16,17; (b) 2 Kgs. 14:7; 2 Chron. 26:6-8; (c) 2 Kgs. 12:17,18; 2 Chron. 24:23,24; (d) 2 Kgs. 11:17; 12:2; 2 Chron. 23:16; 24:14. Assuming, on the basis of the above passages, the earlier years of Joash as the period of this prophecy, how does the book itself fall in with the assumption?
 - (2) What may be inferred from the relation of Joel's prophecy to prophecy in general? See Amos 1:2 (cf. with Joel 3:16); 4:9 (cf. with Joel 1:4-2:12); 5:18,20 (cf. with Joel 1:15; 2:1,2,30,31); 9:13 (cf. with Joel 3:18); Isa. 13:6,9, seq. (cf. with Joel 1:15; 2:1,2,10,11,30,31); Zeph. 1:14,15 (cf. as above); Ezek. 47:1-12 (cf. with Joel 3:18); Ezek. 38:17; 39:8 (cf. with Joel 3:9 seq.); (see, also, Ezek. 38, 39 throughout), etc.
 - (3) What may be inferred from the general character and style of the book? †
2. **The Style of the Prophet.** (1) Compare the style of the book, as discoverable in the reading of the Revised Version, with (a) that of the book of Jonah, (b) of Amos, (c) of Hosea.
 - (2) State its peculiarities and excellences, and, as far as you are able to do so, compare it with that of subsequent prophets.
3. **Comparisons as to Religious Worship and Conceptions of God.** (1) Compare the view of the divine worship afforded by the book of Joel with that disclosed in Amos and Hosea. ‡ How do you account for the difference?
 - (2) Compare the view of the divine character given in the prophecy of Joel with that of (a) Jonah, (b) Amos, (c) Hosea, and (d) with all combined. Consider these conceptions of Jehovah in connection with the *national character* of Israel and Judah, as disclosed in these several books.
4. **Comparisons as to Messianic Prophecy.** Contrast the Messianic prophecy found in the writings of Amos and Hosea, of the northern kingdom, with that found in Joel. Show how these contrasts stand related to contrasted national circumstances, religious character and divine mission.

* See "studies" twenty-third and twenty-fourth.

† See Ewald, "Prophets of O. T.," vol. 1, pp. 109-114.

‡ See "studies" twenty-third and twenty-fourth.

**TWENTY-SIXTH STUDY.—ISRAEL AND JUDAH DURING THE
REIGNS OF PEKAHIAH, PEKAH AND HOSHEA.**

[The material of this "study" is furnished by Professor Beecher. The "editing" of this material would strictly involve a series of notes indicating the points in reference to which the editor differed in his opinions from the author of the "study." The space at command forbids this. For this "study" and for others in which, in order to be consistent, the same chronological plan is adopted, the author, not the editor, will be responsible.]

I. BIBLICAL LESSON.

Prepare for recitation 2 Kgs. 15:22-18:12, and parallel passages, in the order of the following topics:

1. **Reign of Pekahiah**, two years, 50th and 51st of Uzziah, 15:22-26.
2. **Reign of Pekah**, twenty years, 52d of Uzziah to 20th of Jotham, 15:25-31,32,37; 16:1,5; 2 Chron. 28:5-15; Isa. 7:1-9; 1 Chron. 5:6,26.
3. **Closing Years of Uzziah**, 15:5; 2 Chron. 26:21-23; Isa. 6.
4. **Reign of Jotham**, sixteen years, 2d of Pekah to 17th. 2 Kgs. 15:7,30,32-38; 2 Chron. 27; 26:21,23; 1 Chron. 3:12; 5:17; Isa. 7:1; 1:1; Hos. 1:1; Mic. 1:1.
5. **Reign of Ahaz**, sixteen years, 17th of Pekah to 3d of Hoshea, 2 Kgs. 16:1,2; 17:1; 18:1. (1) 2 Kgs. 16:3,4; 2 Chron. 28:1-4, his policy; (2) Isa. 38:8; 2 Kgs. 20:11; 23:12, his "dial" and "chamber;" (3) 2 Chron. 28:6-15, invasion by Pekah; (4) 2 Kgs. 16:6; 2 Chron. 28:5, by Rezin; (5) 2 Kgs. 16:5; Isa. 7:1-16, by Rezin and Pekah; (6) 2 Chron. 28:17,18, by Edomites and Philistines; (7) 2 Chron. 28:16,21; 2 Kgs. 16:7,8,10, tributary to Tiglath-pileser; (8) 2 Kgs. 16:9,10; Isa. 8:4, Tiglath-pileser conquered Damascus, and ravaged Samaria; (9) 2 Chron. 28:20,21,24; 2 Kgs. 16:17,18; Isa. 7:17-25, he distressed, rather than helped Ahaz; (10) 2 Kgs. 16:10-16; 2 Chron. 28:22-25; Isa. 8:6; 10:20, etc., Ahaz worshipping the Syrian gods "that had smitten him."
6. **Reign of Hoshea**, nine years, from 12th of Ahaz to 6th of Hezekiah, 17:1,6; 18:1,9,10. (1) 17:3, invaded and made tributary by Shalmaneser; (2) 17:4; imprisoned for conspiracy with So; (3) 18:9; 17:5, Samaria besieged by Shalmaneser, 4th of Hezekiah; (4) 18:10-12; 17:6, captured after three years, 6th of Hezekiah; (5) 17:24-41, inhabitants deported,* and replaced by immigrants; (6) 17:7-23, reflections on the history.
7. **The Prophets of this Period.** Hos. 1:1; Isa. 1:1, etc.; Mic. 1:1; 2 Chron. 28:9, etc., the names; some of them surviving from the times of the previous study. (2) From Hosea, Micah, and the first thirty-five chapters of Isaiah, gather such additional facts of the history as you can. (3) Are the severe rebukes found in the prophetic books contradictory to what is said in Kings and Chronicles, of the goodness of Uzziah and Jotham, so as to be an argument against the historicity of these books?
8. **Biblical Statements concerning Pul or Tiglath-pileser.** (1) 2 Kgs. 15:19,20, Pul invaded Menahem, and levied tribute; (2) 1 Chron. 5:6,23,26, Pul and Tiglath-pileser—perhaps at different dates—deported the two and a half tribes, especially the settlers of the Anti-Lebanon regions; (3) 2 Chron. 28:16,21; 2 Kgs. 16:7,8,10, Tiglath-pileser took tribute from Ahaz; (4) 2 Kgs. 16:9; Amos 1:5, captured Damascus, deporting the inhabitants; (5) 2 Kgs. 15:29, in the time of Pekah, ravaged the region near the waters of Merom, Galilee, Gilead, Abel-beth-maachah, etc., deporting the inhabitants; (6) during his reign and those of his successors and predecessors, the Israelites and their neighbors were kept in a condition of perpetual intrigue with one another, the Assyrians, and Egypt; to fill out this statement, collect from the prophets of the period the passages that mention Assyria or Egypt.

* The deportation had begun previously, in the times of Pekah, or perhaps, of Menahem, 2 Kgs. 15:29; 1 Chron. 5:6,26. Some importation to the Samaritan country continued as late as the times of Esarhaddon, Ezra 4:2,10. But the Bible certainly represents the capture of Samaria in the ninth year of Hoshea, with the change of inhabitants then made, as being the sudden and complete extinction of Samaria as a political power.

9. **Statements of Bible concerning the King who took Samaria.** (1) Mentions Shalmaneser, see 6. (1) and (3); (2) names Sargon only once, and that in connection with a later date, Isa. 20:1; (3) does not say that the king who took the city was Shalmaneser; (4) mentions the breaking of the rod that had smitten Philistia (Palestine?), in the year of the death of Ahaz, and the substitution of a worse enemy in its stead, Isa. 14:28-32.

II. THE MONUMENTAL HISTORY OF THIS PERIOD.*

1. **Tiglath-pileser.** (1) From Smith's "Canon" pp. 64-65, 121-124; "Assyrian Discoveries," pp. 282-286; "The Records of the Past," vol. V., p. 51 seq., or any other sources at your command, verify and fill out the following statements: (a) Tiglath-pileser II. was the founder of a new dynasty. He came to the throne B. C. 745, so that, by the most usual mode of counting, his "first year" was B. C. 744. (b) The notes of one copy of the canon attribute to him expeditions to Arpad, B. C. 743-740, and expeditions to Philistia (Palestine?) 734 B. C., and to Damascus, 733 and 732 B. C. Certain fragmentary inscriptions, describing the events from his first to his seventeenth year, without intermediate dates, mention two or more expeditions to these regions. (c) In one of these occurs the statement, "Hoshea to the kingdom over them I appointed." This is immediately preceded by some statement concerning Pekah, conjectured to be an account of Pekah's death. (2) Compare these inscriptions with the biblical accounts, especially with this biblical lesson under 8. in the following particulars: (a) Ahaz then king of Judah, and tributary to Tiglath-pileser; (b) Pekah the contemporary king of Israel; (c) Hoshea his successor; (d) Menahem not mentioned in the contexts that mention Ahaz; (e) Rezin then king of Damascus; (f) his conquest of Rezin and Damascus; (g) his capture of Marum, Gali, Abil, etc., on the border, and receiving tribute from the whole land of Bitumri; (h) his frequent mention of Hadrach, cf. Zech. 9:1; (i) his habit of deporting captives; (j) his subjugation of Gaza, Ashkelon, etc.
2. **Shalmaneser IV.** He is named in the canon as succeeding Tiglath-pileser, B. C. 727, and reigning five years. He made expeditions B. C. 725, 724, 723, but the names of the places are lost.
3. **Sargon.** From Smith's "Canon," pp. 125-130; "Assyr. Disc.," ch. 15; "Records of the Past," vols. VII., IX., XI.; Lyon's "Keilschrifttexte Sargon's," or other sources, verify and fill out the following, comparing the particulars with those given in the Bible, and especially with biblical lesson, under 6: (a) The inscriptions concerning him are numerous and full. He was the founder of a new dynasty. (b) The canon and most of the records count his reign as beginning B. C. 722, the following year being his "first year." One cylinder described by George Smith, "Canon," p. 129; "Assyr. Disc." p. 289, counts his reign as beginning two years later, thus perhaps giving seven years to Shalmaneser IV. (c) Sargon says: (1) that "in the beginning" of his reign, he took Samaria by siege, capturing 27,280 persons, and appointing tribute; (2) that having spent his first year in a Babylonian campaign, he, in his second year, defeated an alliance formed against him, including Hamath, Damascus, Arpad, and Samaria, with their allies, Sebech (called So, in the Bible) of Egypt, and Hanun, king of Gaza;

* Owing to the great importance of the chronological material, the "textual," "special," and "geographical" topics are omitted.

(3) that later, this Hamath-Samaritan alliance was still in existence, but that he at length entirely destroyed it; (4) that he "swept away Samaria and the whole house of Omri"; (5) that at several dates, up to his seventh year, he deported the inhabitants, and replaced them with others. (d) Was Sargon's capture of Samaria, B. C. 722, the final overthrow of Samaria described in the Bible (the view commonly held)? Or was this an earlier event in the series that culminated in the overthrow? It is quite commonly supposed that Sargon, when he began operations against Samaria, was a general of Shalmaneser, becoming king before the final capture.

III. THE CHRONOLOGY.

1. We have now reached certain disputed questions as to the chronology, which it is important for every one to understand, and to decide for himself, or leave undecided, according as the evidence seems to him to warrant. The great sources of information for the chronology before the Persian period are the following:

- (1) *The Canon of Ptolemy.* Ptolemy was an Alexandrian astronomer, living after the Christian era. His canon is a list of sovereigns, Roman, Persian, Grecian, and Babylonian, arranged in a single list, back from the time of the author, so that each calendar year is named as such a year of such and such a king. For example, the year that began with the spring equinox of 539 B. C. is the first year of Cyrus; 539 B. C.; is the seventeenth and last year of Nabonadius, the predecessor of Cyrus on the throne of Babylon. This list goes back to Nabonassar king of Babylon, whose first year corresponded with 747 B. C.
- (2) *The Assyrian Eponym Canon.* This is a list of names of officers, an officer for each year, enabling us to name any given calendar year as the year when so and so was Eponym, in the reign of such and such a king. Several copies of this list have been exhumed, none of them complete, some of them mere fragments. They differ slightly among themselves. Some of them have notes of important events that occurred in certain years. The different copies bring up the list to B. C. 650 or later, and gave a continuous list for about 250 years before that date.
- (3) *The Hebrew chronology,* as given in the Bible and Josephus.
- (4) *Additional statements of dates.* From the records of different peoples.
- (5) *Astronomical calculations.*

2. Several different kings were kings both of Babylon and of Assyria. This brings the canon of Ptolemy and the Assyrian canon into contact. For example, Sargon's first year as king of Babylon is known to have been his thirteenth year as king of Assyria. This was 709 B. C. It follows that Sargon's first year in Assyria was 721 B. C., his actual accession having taken place the previous year. Counting from the "first year" of each king, the reigns with which we have to do are given in the Assyrian list as follows:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sargon, 17 years. | B. C. 721-705, | Shalmaneser III., 10 years, |
| Shalmaneser IV., 5 years, | 726-722, | Rimman-nirari III., 29 years, |
| Tiglath-pileser II., 18 years, | 744-727, | Samas-rimman, 13 years, |
| Assur-nirari II., 10 years, | 754-745, | Shalmaneser II., 35 years. |
| Assur-daan III., 18 years, | 772-755, | |

Counting from the actual accession, in each case, the left hand numeral would be one unit larger.

3. The chronology of the marginal Bibles gives 721 B. C. as the date of the final capture of Samaria. Common opinion now identifies this with the capture of Samaria made by Sargon, "in the beginning of" his reign, dating the event the latter part of 722 B. C. If you will carefully work up the biblical numbers, by the process of parallel columns, you will probably obtain the date 719 B. C., with a possible variation of a year either way, instead of 721, as the biblical date; and with this the Assyrian accounts agree, if we regard that first capture as a preliminary event, and not as final.
4. From this point back, the chronology is in dispute. The following will give some idea of the opinions that are current:
First. On the assumption that the sixth year of Hezekiah was 719 B. C., and that the biblical numerals are correct, and are to be understood in the sense in which they most naturally check one another, we obtain the following:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>B. C. 724, First year of Hezekiah, 739-724, Ahaz, 16 years, 727-719, Hoshea, 9 years, 736-728, Int. between Pekah and Hoshea, 758-737, Pekah, 20 years, 755-740, Jotham, 16 years, 758-757, Pekahiah, 2 years, 807-756, Uzziah, 52 years, 768-759, Menahem, 10 years, 770, 769, Zeechariah and Shallum, This would give 894 B. C. as the accession year of Jehu, the 18th year of Shalmaneser II., and, counting from the actual accession (not from the "first year,") would give:</p> | <p>792-771, Int. between Jeroboam II. and Zeechariah, 833-793, Jeroboam II., 41 years, 818-808, Int. between Amaziah and Uzziah, 847-819, Amaziah, 29 years, 848-833, Jehoash of Israel, 16 years, 865-849, Jehoahaz, 17 years, 893-886, Jehu, 28 years,</p> |
| <p>B. C. 912-877, Shalmaneser, 35 years, 877-864, Samas-rimman, 13 years,</p> | <p>B. C. 864-835, Rimman-nirari, 29 years.</p> |

5. This table represents one view of the chronology. The marginal Bibles give a variation of the same view; several variant forms of it have been proposed. Many living scholars treat this view as if it were worthy of no more respect than a puff of smoke; but it can hardly be shown to contradict any point of detail given either in the Bible or in the Assyrian inscriptions. It makes Ahaz, Pekah, and Hoshea contemporaries of Tiglath-pileser. It locates the events when Menahem and Uzziah were contemporary, as in the reign of Assur-daan; but if the mutilated Assyrian records were completely restored, it is supposable that they might do the same, in any one of half a dozen different ways. But this cast of the chronology, in its various forms, gives an interval of from fifty to sixty-two years between the close of the reign of Rimman-nirari and the accession of Assur-daan. For this interval, the Assyrian list has only the ten years of the reign of Shalmaneser III. This is a difference that seriously affects all chronological problems for western Asia and Egypt, from this period and earlier.
6. Not to argue the matter at length, it is essential to an intelligent understanding of the question to notice that, back to the times of Tiglath-pileser, the Assyrian Eponym list is one strand of a rope of five strands; but the canon of Ptolemy closes at 747 B. C.; the earliest eclipse mentioned in the Eponym list is that of 763 B. C.; for the times of Tiglath-pileser and later, and for the times of Rimman-nirari and earlier, we have abundant documents, giving genealogical facts and dates of events, but substantially none for the times between the two; the interval itself, as we have seen, included a time of decadence of the Assyrian empire; if the biblical numbers are here correct, in the meaning in which they have commonly been understood, then the writers or the copyists of the Assyrian canon, for some reason or other, either by accident or by design, omitted forty or fifty years from their list; the simple question as to the evidence is: Is the presumption against their having done this so strong as to compel us either to reject the biblical numerals, or to find new meanings for them?
7. A second view of the chronology is that held by most Assyriologists, and by most of the writers for Smith's Bible Dictionary, and their followers. The variations among the different forms of it are very great, but there is a pretty general agreement on the following points: (1) The lists in the Eponym canon are strictly continuous, so that the dates given above for the accession of Shalmaneser II. and his two successors should be B. C. 860, 835, and 812. (2) The Assyrian contact with Azariah and Menahem, as well as that with Ahaz, Pekah, and Hoshea, occurred within the years of the reign of Tiglath-pileser, as given in the Eponym list. (3) All biblical statements that are inconsistent with this—including a pretty large proportion of those biblical statements that are exact, and not merely general—must be regarded as incorrect.
8. A third view of the chronology attempts so to interpret the biblical numerals as to reconcile them with the hypothesis that the Eponym list is continuous. That this can be done, hypothetically, at least, is conclusively shown by Mr. L. F. Badger, in THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, for June, 1886.

It would be well, in the circumstances, for the average student to count the chronological question an open one, except so far as he has settled it for himself, by examining the evidence. Probably, the evidence is not yet all in. For the purposes of these "studies," it is not necessary to decide between the conflicting opinions. To prevent misapprehension, however, I wish to put two points on record: (1) I see no reason to regard the biblical and Assyrian records as hopelessly in conflict. (2) As the matter now stands, I see no reason why a fair historical critic should, in case of conflict, prefer the Assyrian records to the biblical.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AND TWENTY-EIGHTH STUDIES (IN ONE).—
HEZEKIAH'S REIGN.

[The material of these "studies" is furnished by Professor Beecher. It is edited by Professor Harper.]

I. BIBLICAL LESSON.

Prepare for recitation 2 Kgs. 18-20; 2 Chron. 29-32, with parallel passages, in the order of the following topics:

1. **Hezekiah's Accession Year.** The first of his twenty-nine years: (1) 2 Kgs. 16: 2,20; 17:1; 18:1-2, sixteenth of Ahaz, following the third of Hoshea; (2) 1 Chron. 5:26; 2 Kgs. 15:29; 17:3; 2 Chron. 30:6-9, relations of Israel to Assyria, at the time; (3) 2 Kgs. 16:8,10; 18:7, relations of Judah to Assyria; (4) 2 Chron. 28:18, to Philistia; (5) 2 Chron. 28:19; 29:8,9, condition of Judah (captivity, not exile).
2. **His First Year** (not counted as in 2 Kgs., but beginning the new year after his accession—the fifth of Hoshea). (1) 2 Kgs. 18:3-6, etc., religious policy of Hezekiah; (2) 17:2, religious policy of Hoshea; (3) 2 Kgs. 16:10,14-18; 2 Chron. 28:21,24; 29:3,5,7,16,19, condition of the temple; (4) 2 Chron. 29:3-36, cleansing of the temple; (5) 2 Chron. 30, the great passover, the second month; (6) 31:1, breaking down the altars of false worship in Ephraim, Manasseh, etc.; (7) 2 Chron. 31, provisions for the service at Jerusalem; 31:7, third to seventh month.
3. **Certain Important Questions.** (1) Does 2 Chron. 29-31 presuppose (a) the pentateuchal laws of worship, generally; (b) additional arrangements for worship, made in the times of David, 28:25-26; 31:11-15; (c) the continued existence, in Hezekiah's time, of David's three guilds of singers, 29:13,14. (2) Was Hezekiah's reform in northern Israel before the deportation by Sargon, 31:1. (3) Does this attempt at reform seem to have been permitted by Hoshea, 2 Kgs. 17:2. (4) Who are "the kings" of Assyria, 2 Chron. 30:6?
4. **Hezekiah's Prosperity.** (1) Rebellion against Assyria, 18:7; (2) smiting of Philistines, 18:8; (3) his riches and power, 2 Chron. 31:20-21; 32:27-29; 2 Kgs. 20:13; (4) connected with the rebellion of Hezekiah, Hoshea's refusal of tribute, and sending messengers to So, 2 Kgs. 17:4; (5) connected with this, the breaking of the rod that smote "Philistia, all of it," Isa. 14:28,29; (6) probable connection of these facts with the accession, about this time, of Sargon, the founder of a new Assyrian dynasty?
5. **Up to Hezekiah's Fourth Year,** 2 Kgs. 17:4; the king of Assyria imprisons Hoshea, for refusing tribute, etc. (Cf. what is said of Sargon, twenty-sixth "study.")
6. **Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Years of Hezekiah.** 2 Kgs. 17; 18:9-12, the siege and overthrow of Samaria.
7. **Sargon's Expedition to Ashdod,** B. C. 711, Isa. 20. (1) Have the three years, Isa. 20:3, any chronological significance? (2) What have Egypt and Ethiopia to do with the expedition against Ashdod? Vs. 3-6.
8. **The Assyrian Invasion in Hezekiah's Fourteenth Year,** 2 Kgs. 18:13-16; Isa. 36:1. At this time, (1) Sennacherib took the cities of Judah; (2) he received submission from Hezekiah, v. 14; (3) apparently, the fine was actually paid, vs. 15,16; (4) presumably Sennacherib took his departure, according to agreement.
9. **Hezekiah's Illness,** 2 Kgs. 20:1-11; Isa. 38. (1) 2 Kgs. 18:13,2; 20:6, the date of it; (2) 2 Kgs. 20:1-7, the prayer and healing; (3) 20:6, the promise of

deliverance from Assyria; (4) 2 Kgs. 20:8-11, the shadow on the dial; (5) Isa. 38:9-20, Hezekiah's "writing."

10. Hezekiah and Merodach-baladan, 2 Kgs. 20:12-19; Isa. 39.

11. Sennacherib's Great Invasion. (1) 2 Chron. 32:1-2, his coming; (2) 2 Chron. 32:3-4,30; 2 Kgs. 20:20, Hezekiah's water-works; (3) 2 Chron. 32:5-8, his other arrangements for defence; (4) 2 Chron. 32:9-15; 2 Kgs. 18:17-35; Isa. 36:2-20, Sennacherib's message from Lachish; (5) 2 Kgs. 18:36-19:7, resulting acts of the officers, the king, and Isaiah, noting, especially, the form of the promise, v. 7;* (6) 19:8,9, Tirhakah; (7) 2 Chron. 32:16,17,13-14; 2 Kgs. 19:9-13, Sennacherib's written messages; (8) 2 Chron. 32:20,19; 2 Kgs. 19:14-34, the prayer over these messages, and its answer; (9) 19:35-37; † ‡ 2 Chron. 32:21, Jehovah's vengeance on Sennacherib.

12. Death of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. 32:32,33; 2 Kgs. 20:20,21.

13. The Prophets of the Period. See Isa. 1:1, etc.; Mic. 1:1, with Jer. 20:18 and Mic. 3:12; Nahum the historical situation. Gather items from these books to fill out the history, and consider whether the rebukes to prevalent wickedness, as found in these books, are contradictory to what the historical books say of the goodness of Hezekiah, so as to prove the historical books to be untrue.

II. ASSYRIAN SYNCHRONISMS.

The records of Sargon and Sennacherib are full, and present many points of contact with the Bible history. From such sources as are at your command, verify and fill out the following points, and also those given below, in the treatment of the chronology of the period. These are only a few among many possible points:

1. Sargon reigned, counting from his accession year, B. C. 722-705, and was succeeded by his son Sennacherib, 705-681.
2. In the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, by any possible adjustment of the chronology, Sargon was king of Assyria. Is it incredible, however, that Sennacherib may that year have led an expedition into Judah? Or that the Bible historian might then call him king, anticipatively?

* Points in the promise of deliverance: (a) "He shall hear a rumor," 19:7; he heard the rumor of Tirhakah's approach, and, as his inscriptions show, other rumors after that, demanding his presence elsewhere; (b) "shall return to his own land," 7; return the way he came, 28,33,36; (c) shall not besiege Jerusalem, 32,33; (d) the withdrawal of the Assyrian forces will permit agriculture to be resumed "the third year," 29; (e) Judah that escapes will be a weak "remnant," 30,31; (f) Sennacherib will fall by the sword, 7; (g) (perhaps) "I will give, in his case, a wind," 7.

† "That night," 2 Kgs. 19:35, is commonly assumed to be the night after Isaiah gave the message; but this assumption cannot be correct; for, according to v. 29, the country was not to be free for agriculture till the third year. 2 Kgs. 19:36,37 and 2 Chron. 32:21 might easily be understood to mean that he was assassinated on his return from Palestine; but they do not expressly say that; and the Assyrian records place his death many years after that of Hezekiah. The historian means to be understood that the death of the 185,000 occurred "in that night" in which Jehovah fulfilled his threat; he says nothing as to the time, or the place, or the physical agency by which the destruction was accomplished, but he speaks of it as a familiarly known historical fact.

‡ This invasion is not dated in the Bible. It is very different from that in Hezekiah's fourteenth year, 2 Kgs. 18:13-16; Isa. 36:1. The apparent continuity of the narrative, though the events are different, is a thing not foreign to biblical style. In the invasion of the fourteenth year there appears to have been no desperate resistance, and no great weakening of the power of Judah; in the second invasion, the resistance appears to have been determined, Judah being reduced to a remnant, and that remnant threatened with deportation, 19:30-32. Sennacherib's date for it is 701 B. C.

3. Sennacherib is a braggart. The son of a usurper, he boasts the exploits of his ancestors, 2 Kgs. 19:12. In his records, he claims to have taken tribute from kings who were dead before he was born, Menahem of Samaria, for example. But his account of the campaign against Hezekiah, several copies of which are extant, is presumably correct in most particulars. He says that Hezekiah had interfered in Philistine affairs, and was holding Padi, the king of Ekron, favored by Assyria, a prisoner. Sennacherib made his approach along the Mediterranean coast. He captured Joppa, Benerak, and Beth-dagon. Then, apparently, he marched south, leaving Ekron to his left, and received the submission of Ashkelon. This accounts for his being at Lachish (2 Kgs. 18:17) when he sent his officers, "with a heavy force," against Jerusalem.
4. Sennacherib says nothing about being at Lachish or Libnah, but mentions a great battle with the kings of Egypt and Meroe (cf. 2 Kgs. 18:24; 19:9), near Altaku—apparently Eltekon, near Timnah, Josh. 15:59—nearly midway between Lachish and Jerusalem, but a few miles west of the direct line between them. Apparently, the Ethiopian king was marching to the relief of Jerusalem. Sennacherib was obliged to concentrate his forces for a great battle. He left Lachish, and invested Libnah, a few miles further north; his officers, with the army that had been sent against Jerusalem, joined him there, 2 Kgs. 19:8,9.
5. Hezekiah, of course, was expecting the approach of his allies. He had long been preparing for the crisis that was upon him; but the movements of the Assyrian had been too prompt, and, the Egyptian forces not having come up, there was no adequate strength for carrying out his plans, 2 Kgs. 19:3.
6. Sennacherib says that he defeated the Egyptians decisively, then besieged and captured Atalku and Timnah, then turned to the west and sacked Ekron, bringing Padi out of Jerusalem, and putting him again on the throne of Ekron, then took by siege forty-six strong cities of Judah, and a multitude of lesser cities, taking as part of the spoil 200,150 people of both sexes and all ages. Compare this with 2 Kgs. 18:32; 19:30,31,29. He says something not very intelligible about shutting up Hezekiah in Jerusalem, and says that he gave many of Hezekiah's cities to the kings of Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza, and that Hezekiah *sent after him to Nineveh*, making his submission, and paying tribute. The following year his energies were devoted to overthrowing Merodach-baladan once more. How do these statements agree with 2 Kgs. 19:29? With 19:32? With 19:7,28,33,36?
7. Is it consistent with the two accounts to hold that the Assyrian army remained in Judah, after the Rabshakeh withdrew from Jerusalem, long enough to interrupt agriculture that year and the next; that Sennacherib was fighting to accomplish the deportation of the Jews; that they resisted, compelling him to take city by city, until he was forced by the disturbances in Babylonia, and perhaps by other causes, to return suddenly to his capital; that he then granted Hezekiah terms, which were accepted? With this view of the case, the tribute which Sennacherib says he laid upon Hezekiah is a different fact from that mentioned in 2 Kgs. 18:16-16; and his account of his capturing the cities of Judah is of a different capture from the one there described; do you find conclusive objections to this?
8. Some scholars insist upon the translation "wind" or "blast," in 2 Kgs. 19:7, and think the agent of destruction was a simoon, and look for traces of the event in the traditions of Egypt and the desert. But if any event mentioned elsewhere in history is to be identified with this, the mountain storm which broke up Sennacherib's seventh expedition, and drove him back to Nineveh, C. B. 607, has a claim that should be considered.

9. From the references given, or other information within reach, verify the following statements concerning Babylonia, and Merodach-baladan: (1) The civilization of Babylonia was older and more cultured than that of Assyria. (2) Tiglath-pileser prominently claims to be king of Babylonia, as well as of Assyria, *Ass. Disc.* pp. 255, 11; 258. 12, 13. Sargon counted his regnal years for Babylonia, as well as for Assyria, *Smith's Canon*, pp. 86, 87. Sennacherib made his eldest son king of Babylonia, *Ass. Disc.*, p. 308, 5. Do the Assyrian kings distinguish any other nation in this way?
10. Trace the history of Merodach-baladan in the records of Tiglath-pileser, *Ass. Disc.* pp. 256.19; 260.26, 27, and context, and in the records of Sargon and Sennacherib. How many times did Sargon and Sennacherib find it necessary completely to overthrow Merodach-baladan? Do you believe that his account of these overthrows, if we had it, would entirely agree with theirs?
11. From all you can learn, how much of a power was Babylonia, in the period we are studying? What light does your study of these matters throw upon Isa. 39? Does the fact that a passage in the book of Isaiah speaks of Babylon as a great power, or speaks of a king of Babylon as a great conqueror or oppressor, prove the passage to have been written some generations later than the times of Isaiah, the son of Amoz? Look through the book of Isaiah for passages that mention Babylon, Elam, or the Medes, and decide which belong to these times, and which to the times of Cyrus of Persia.

III. THE CHRONOLOGY.

Solve the following problem in arithmetic: The year that is counted the first year of Cyrus is the year beginning with the spring equinox, B. C. 538. According to the Canon of Ptolemy, which is now generally accepted as correct, and which lies at the basis of all the Assyrian dates, as commonly given, this year was preceded by the seventeen years of Nabonidus, the four years of Neriglissar, the two years of Evil-merodach, and the forty-three years of Nebuchadnezzar. What was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar? You will, of course, reach the answer 604 B. C. But this date is given in the margins of our standard Bibles, Jer. 25:1, etc., as 606 B. C., and this excess of two years is carried all the way back, in the marginal chronology.

Applying this correction, the sixth year of Hezekiah, the year of the downfall of Samaria, was, by the biblical chronology, the year beginning with the spring equinox, 719 B. C., and not 721. The Hebrew text, Josephus, and the Septuagint variously describe this as the sixth year, the seventh year, and the end of the sixth year; this last expression reconciles the other two, and doubtless gives what the biblical writer regarded as the exact fact. Samaria fell at the close of the natural year 719 B. C.; that is, if we count the year from the first of January, in March, 718 B. C. To make this agree with the Assyrian dates, we must hold, as we have seen in the twenty-sixth "study," that Sargon's account of the siege and capture of the city, in the beginning of his reign, is either an account of a preliminary event, occurring 722 B. C., or else a general account of events belonging to the early years of Sargon.

The biblical date here given might, without violence, be either increased or diminished by one, by different ways of counting the two years of Amon, 2 Kgs. 21:19.

Beginning a little way back, and following the most natural interpretation of the biblical dates, we have the following:

B. C. 728, accession of Hoshea, by appointment of Tiglath-pileser, whether made at this time, or some years previously, 2 Kgs. 15:30; 17:1; 18:1, etc., and the Assyrian records.

727, last year of Tiglath-pileser; accession of Shalmaneser; first year of Hoshea, who, apparently, regards himself as independent, on the death of Tiglath-pileser; thirteenth year of Ahaz.

725? invasion by Shalmaneser, compelling Hoshea to yearly tribute, 2 Kgs. 17:3, 4.

- B. C. 724, sixteenth year of Ahaz; year of the breaking of the rod that smote "whole Palestina," Isa. 14: 23, 29; the first of Hezekiah's twenty-nine years.
- 723, Hezekiah's temple reform, in his first year, as counted in 2 Chron. 29: 3; Hoshea refuses tribute?
- 722, Accession year of Sargon, and of Merodach-baladan; Sargon captures Samaria, imprisons Hoshea (17: 4), carries off many captives, and reimposes the tribute.
- 721, first year of Sargon; Babylonian campaign, in which he annihilates Merodach-baladan; seventh year of Hoshea, and fourth of Hezekiah; siege of Samaria begun.
- From this time and on, anti-Assyrian alliances of Hamath, Arpad, Damascus, etc., with Samaria, aided by Sebech of Egypt (see the various records of Sargon; cf. 2 Kgs. 18: 34, and many passages in the prophets).
- 720, Sargon defeats Sebech, and Hanun of Gaza, carrying off many people.
- 719, and on, Sargon in Armenia; fragmentary mention of operations on a large scale against the Hamath alliance; at several different dates, deportations of inhabitants both from and into these regions; fall of Samaria, close of 719.
- 711, eleventh year of Sargon; fourteenth of Hezekiah; Sargon's expedition to Ashdod, Isa. 20, and Assyr. records; Sennacherib's first expedition to Judah, 2 Kgs. 18: 13-16; Sargon says that Philistia, Judah, Moab, Edom, tributaries of Assyria, were at this time in treasonable correspondence with Egypt, cf. Isa. 20, etc.; apparently, the Assyrian king met no exasperating resistance from Hezekiah, was mindful of the war with Merodach-baladan then impending, and let Hezekiah off easily; later, Hezekiah's illness.
- 710, Merodach-baladan's ambassadors to Hezekiah; Sargon annihilates Merodach-baladan in alliance with Elam, and with many Mesopotamian peoples, the struggle being desperate and protracted.
- 709, Sargon's first year as king of Babylon; still contending with Merodach-baladan.
- 705, death of Sargon; accession of Sennacherib; Merodach-baladan redivivus, with Syrian allies; general rising of the peoples on the Mediterranean; Hezekiah dethrones Padi of Ekron?
- 704, Sennacherib annihilates Merodach-baladan.
- 701, expedition to Judah; Sennacherib himself returns; to Nineveh?
- 700, annihilates Merodach-baladan again; Assyrian troops still in Judah.
- 699, agricultural operations resumed in Judah.
- 696, death of Hezekiah.
- 681, death of Sennacherib.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

The expedition to excavate one or more of the ancient sites of Babylonia organized in Philadelphia, is the heir and successor of the Wolfe expedition, which was sent out from New York by the liberality of the late Miss Catherine Lorillard Wolfe. That expedition, headed by the Rev. Dr. W. Hayes Ward of the *Independent*, did a preparatory work with a view to future developments. As a result of its labors this American expedition has been organized in Philadelphia, which proposes to excavate what the Wolfe company was able only to explore. The money for the present occasion has been contributed by public-spirited citizens of Philadelphia, working in connection with the University of Pennsylvania, the latter institution having accepted responsibility for the expedition, and arranged for a proper working up of the results. The director of the expedition is the Rev. Prof. Peters of Philadelphia. Dr. Hilprecht, Professor of Assyrian in the University of Pennsylvania, represents what may be called the home staff, charged with the duty of scientific publication of all texts found. Dr. Robert F. Harper, of Yale University, and Prof. Rogers, of Haverford College, will also be of the company. Names of other members of the staff have not yet been made public, nor has the exact locality been designated where it is proposed to excavate. Further details will probably be furnished later. It is understood, however, that the plan of operations determined upon by the University of Pennsylvania is so broad and liberal as to allow all American institutions, so desiring, to avail themselves of the advantages offered by this expedition.

The death is announced of Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, Professor of Semitic languages in the University of Leipzig, Germany. He was born in 1801 and studied at Paris under Silvestre de Sacy, who with Fleischer may be considered the founders of the Modern School of Arabic Philology. Fleischer published in 1831 Abulfeda's pre-Islamic history in Arabic, together with a translation and annotation in Latin, and four years later was called to the chair at Leipzig, which he held till his death. His most important work was the editing of Beidhawi's voluminous commentary to the Koran.

It is interesting to note the great success attending the delivery of Prof. D. G. Lyon's lectures on "Ancient Assyrian Life" in Lowell Institute Course, Boston. The subjects are as follows: Sources of Assyrian History; Epochs of Assyrian History; Social Organization; Arts and Sciences; Literature; Religion and Ethics.

In a note on "the Cosmogony of Genesis" (in reply to a criticism of Prof. Driver), Prof. James D. Dana, of Yale University, writes as follows:—

"Regarding the verbal discrepancies in the record not fatal imperfections, I still accept the document, whether it was communicated to Moses, or had been handed down from earlier times, as the grandest of all records, worthy of its place at the head of the history of revelation."

The philosophical thesis (Leipzig Inaugural dissertation) of Mr. Robert F. Harper has just appeared. Its subject is "Cylinder A of the Esarhaddon Inscriptions, transliterated and translated, with textual notes; together with the unpublished texts of Cylinder C and other fragments." The subject matter of the inscription is both interesting and important.

→BOOK NOTICES.←

SAYCE'S LECTURES ON THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT BABYLONIANS.*

No books are more welcome at this time to O. T. students than those discussing the religions of people akin to the Hebrews. Such is the one before us. It is the latest and the most exhaustive treatise in English of the Babylonian religion. Its author is numbered among the authorities on Assyriology, and while some may think his poetic fancy is at times too strong, no English scholar, certainly, stands higher in this department of learning. First, we have a good sketch of the immense difficulties attending the study of original Assyrian literature. He who succeeds here must be endowed with little less than genius in unraveling the mysteries of the past, and a spirit of heroism that shrinks from no painstaking task in gathering and deciphering bits of clay tablets, matching them together and seeing that not a single precious word is lost. In the results of this study here given, especially in the first lecture, we have a good insight into the views of Assyriologists upon Old Testament subjects. Some of the facts or theories presented will appear quite novel to the average Bible student. It is said, for example, that Sargon I., of Babylonia, reigned 3750 B. C., or 1400 years earlier than the date assigned to the flood in the margin of our English Bibles. The different lines of the proof of this fact are given; they will, however, scarcely satisfy all readers. Babylonian influence on Israel is shown to have been very great from the kinship between the people, and it is claimed that along the Euphrates rather than the Nile must be sought the religious antiquities of the Hebrew people. This, of course, thoroughly accords with incidental statements of Scripture. But few have thought of the ark and the table of shew bread and the lavers of the priests being of the temples of the old ancestral home. More striking, perhaps, is the derivation given to certain names. Moses is not of Egyptian origin from "mess" or "messu" son, as is quite popularly believed, but from the Assyrian "masu" hero. The name Joseph, also, probably was originally "asipu" the god of the oracle, and "long before the Israelitish house of Joseph took possession of Luz it had been the house of Joseph in another sense, and the sanctuary of a Canaanitish oracle." Likewise also to the Babylonian pantheon are we to look for the originals of the names of the three earliest kings of Israel, Saul, David, and Solomon. But not all of this volume is filled with such interesting references to the Old Testament, although many others are given. Its bulk is devoted to a description of the various deities of Babylonia and the explanation of their development and meaning. The lectures given to this will, perhaps, be found heavy and dull to those not especially interested in the science of religion. Yet they are replete with needed information, and are of great value in showing the wide gulf existing between the Semitic religion of the valley of the Euphrates and that of the Jordan. Without divine revelation such a difference could not have existed. Still, however, from the Assyrian Psalms we find that God's Spirit even there was working, and leading men, through penitence, into a higher and better spiritual life. These Psalms, together with hymns, litanies and magical texts, to the number of 100 pages, are given in the appendix,—a noteworthy collection, and increasing much the worth of this valuable volume.

* LECTURES ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT BABYLONIANS. By A. H. Sayce, Fellow and late Senior Tutor of Queen's College and Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford; Hon. LL. D., Dublin. The Hibbert Lectures, 1887. 8vo, 558 pp. London: Williams & Norgate.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Psalm LXVIII. Eene exegetisch-kritische Studie.*
By J. W. Pont. Leiden: Brill, 1887. 8vo, pp. 159.
- Luther's Urtheile ueber seine hebraeischen Kenntnisse.* By Frdr. Grundt. Leipzig, 1887. 4to, pp. 18.
- M. Gustave d'Eichtal et ses travaux sur l'Ancien Testament.* By M. Vernes. Paris: libr. Cerf et fils, 1887. 8vo, pp. 63.
- A Homiletical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.* Vol. 2. (Preachers' Homiletical Treasury.) By R. A. Bertram and A. Tucker. London: Dickinson, 1887. 8vo, pp. 686.9s.
- Il salmo CX des testo ebraico: studio esegetico.* By B. Ferrari. Venezia: tip. Patriarcale, 1887. 8vo, pp. 59.
- Palestine, Historical and Descriptive; or, the Home of God's People.* Fully illustrated with 150 engravings and maps. By W. L. Sage. London: Warno, 1887. 8vo, pp. 560.7s. 6d.
- La Bible. Traduction nouvelle d'après les textes hébreu et grec.* T. 3. L'Hexateuque. I. Genèse, Exode. Paris: libr. Lemerre, 1887. 8vo, pp. lxxviii, 317.7fr. 50c.
- Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung d. Buches Hosea.* Ein Beitrag zu den Septuagintastudien u. der Auslegung d. Propheten Hosea. 1 Hpt. Karlsruhe: Bielefeld.M. 1.
- Hosea and Joel.* (Pulpit commentary.) By W. J. Deane and J. J. Given. 8vo, 155.

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

- At the Sign of the Bible.* By W. G. Elmslie. Ibid.
- Recent Old Testament Studies in America.* By Samuel Ives Curtiss. Ibid.
- Harmuth's Chronologische Rhythmus des alten Testaments.* By H. Guthe in Theol. Litztg., Jan. 28, '88.
- Vit de geschiedenis van het ontstaan en de opteekening der Priesterlijke Thorah. II. Het werk van Moses. III. De opteekening der Priesterlijke Wetten.* By G. Wildeboer in Theol. Stud. d'En, 4 and 5, 1887.
- Nieuwe poging tot oplossing van het Joël-vraagstuk. I.* By J. Visser. Ibid.
- Die Immanuelweissagung [Jesaja 7 u. 8].* By Giesebrecht in Theol. Stud. u. Krit., '88, 2.
- Die epistolarischen apokryphen u. die apokryphischen Zusätze zum Buche Daniel.* By N. Brüll, in Jahrb. f. jüd. Gesch. u. Litt., '87, VIII.
- The Messianic Idea among the Early Babylonians and Assyrians.* By Theo. G. Pinches in Academy, Jan. 21, '88.
- The Hittite Empire.* By W. W. Moore in Presbyterian Quarterly, Jan., '88.
- Who was Melchizedek?* By Jos. H. Alexander. Ibid.
- Bible Study in College.* By J. B. Shearer. Ibid.
- Muhammedan Doctrine.* By George Washburn in Independent, Feb. 9, '88.
- The Authority of the Old Testament.* By Samuel T. Spear. Ibid, Feb. 16, '88.
- Our Religious Inheritance from Israel. I.* Andover Review, Feb., '88.
- On the Cosmogony of Genesis.* By James D. Dana. Ibid.
- The Citizen of Zion Described. Psalm. XV.* By John Brown in Evang. Repository, Feb., '88.

- Christ's Use of the Book of Proverbs.* By R. F. Horton in Expositor, Feb., '88.
- Franz Delitzsch and August Dillmann on the Pentateuch.* By Owen C. Whitehouse. Ibid.