

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT❖

VOL. VI.

MAY, 1887.

No. 9.

WHATEVER THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT may not have done, something certainly has been accomplished by it in *one* direction, viz., in emphasizing the importance of studying entire books of the Bible. The outline-studies of 1 and 2 Samuel, Isaiah XL.-LXVI., Genesis, Exodus and Hosea (in the present number) have been presented within a year; and the reception accorded them has been so favorable as to warrant the presentation, in the future, of similar studies of other books. The demand for these book-studies indicates most clearly a tendency to adopt more widely the historico-critical method of interpretation, for such work is of no value to those who adopt a mystical or allegorical method. The plan of the book-studies has been applied to the books of the New Testament by many of our readers. Let it also be applied to other Old Testament books. It should be borne in mind that such a study prepared by one's self will prove to be vastly more helpful than if prepared by another. Let every man make his own outlines, and let no minister, no interpreter of the Divine Word rest satisfied until every book of both Testaments has thus been treated.

THE interpretation given individual verses of the Bible, by intelligent ministers, is sometimes painful. One often thinks that the minister has neglected to note whether the verse under consideration belongs to the Old or to the New Testament. Too frequently he fails even to determine whether it was uttered by an inspired or an uninspired writer, it having been forgotten that inspired writers often give us the words of others without necessarily endorsing them. It is, of course, an every-day occurrence to assign to a verse a sense which it not only does not have, but which it could not receive by the most tortured exegesis. Why will men persist in this thing? In a recent

"Easter service" on the "Resurrection of Christ," out of twelve Old Testament passages cited as bearing on this subject, only *two* contain any reference to a resurrection, and but *one* of these to the resurrection of the Messiah. Yet verses from all parts of Scripture, which a close examination of the context would have shown to be entirely foreign to the subject, are brought together and interpreted as teaching this fact. Such work brings discredit upon the Bible and its doctrines. There is nothing more true than that the friends of the Bible have done it much more injury than its enemies have ever been able to accomplish.

THE prevalence of the "critical" ideas in their destructive form is, without doubt, greatly to be deplored. There are other tendencies of Bible-teaching to-day, which are equally injurious. Very few realize the strong grasp which the "mystical" tendency holds on the Bible-students of our day. Some openly confess it and pride themselves in it. Many are unconsciously under its sway. There are very few who are not more or less tainted with it. Is it then so great an evil? Undoubtedly. To this tendency may be traced, nearly, if not all, of the reproach which has been heaped upon the Sacred Word from the beginning of its existence. At its feet may be laid the responsibility for the low estimate at which the "world" regards the Bible. Let it once be understood that Sacred Writ has one meaning,—a meaning which can be ascertained by the application of the laws of language and the principles of common sense, and the ridicule of it which one meets in every class of society, the indifference to it which characterizes so large a portion of so-called believers, will cease. The darkness of the middle ages has passed. Let this instrument, prepared and guided by Satan himself, but wielded by the Bible's own friends, be broken in pieces, and rendered useless.

NO Bible-student, in these days, can be blind to the interest, so widely prevailing, in the work of exploration. If one will but sum up the wonderful discoveries that have been made within twenty years, or even within a decade, he will be surprised at the results. In Egypt, in Syria, in Babylonia, every month brings to us new developments. The work of exploration is largely due to the increased interest in Bible-study; but on the other hand, it contributes largely to this same end. Two difficulties, however, prevent our reaping the full results of the activity now being manifested in this direction:

(1) The slowness of Bible-students, in general, to take hold and make use of these results. The average student is indifferent to the whole subject and allows himself to remain in entire ignorance of the most important facts. He prefers the old-fashioned, mystical, hit-or-miss way of studying the Bible; that which requires study or investigation he leaves to others. "Scott" and "Henry" are all that he needs. Such a method scarcely does justice to that book which, of all books, should engross our attention.

(2) The lack of means to carry on the work as rapidly and as widely as it deserves. An investment of money which would be more profitable would be difficult to find. Do we desire evidence to substantiate the claims of the Bible? Such work will accomplish more in five years than theoretical argument will accomplish in a century. By a union of effort on the part of men of means and men able to carry on such explorations, the most valuable results could be obtained. Scholars stand ready to prosecute the work even at the risk of their lives. Are there not men who will furnish the necessary money?

THREE years ago the editor of *THE STUDENT* was sharply criticised and soundly berated for certain statements concerning the prevalence of the so-called critical views. The statements made at that time were strictly correct, though denied by many. In this, as in all other mooted questions, time points out the truth. In the last number, the statement of Dr. Samuel Ives Curtiss was quoted to the effect that but a *single* Old Testament professor in Germany still maintains the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The April *Presbyterian Review* contains the following statement by Dr. Charles A. Briggs:—

"There has been a steady advance until the present position of agreement has been reached in which Jew and Christian, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Rationalistic and Evangelical scholars, Reformed and Lutheran, Presbyterian and Episcopal, Unitarian, Methodist and Baptist all concur. The analysis of the Hexateuch into several distinct original documents is a purely literary question in which no article of faith is involved. Whoever in these times, in the discussion of the literary phenomena of the Hexateuch, appeals to the ignorance and prejudices of the multitude as if there were any peril to the faith in these processes of the Higher Criticism risks his reputation for scholarship by so doing. There are no Hebrew professors on the Continent of Europe, so far as I know, who would deny the literary analysis of the Hexateuch into the four great documents. The professors of Hebrew in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and tutors in a large number of theological colleges hold to the same opinion. A very considerable number of the Hebrew professors of America are in accord with them. There are, indeed, a few professional Hebrew scholars

who hold to the traditional opinion, but these are in a hopeless minority. I doubt whether there is any question of scholarship whatever in which there is greater agreement among scholars than in this question of the literary analysis of the Hexateuch."

Now, however true or false this critical position itself may be, its acceptance as a matter of fact is very general, and is rapidly becoming more general. It is not wise to shut our eyes to *facts*, however unpleasant they may be. Grant that the prevalence of these ideas is destructive to the interests of true Bible-work; the thing to be done, in this case, is to plan how their influence shall be counteracted, and not how those who are not in a position to ascertain the truth for themselves shall be convinced that they do not exist.

THE PERFECTION OF THE DECALOGUE.

By TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,

New York City.

We read in the nineteenth Psalm, "The law of Jehovah is perfect," and this is exactly and literally true. It is therefore an exception to what generally obtains in this world. All men acquiesce in the couplet of Pope,

"Whoever thinks a faultless piece to see,
Thinks what ne'er was, nor is, nor e'er shall be,"

which simply reiterates what was said two thousand years before in Holy Writ, "I have seen an end of all perfection." But as the same writer proceeds immediately to say, "Thy commandment is exceeding broad." Incompleteness belongs to all the works of man, but the work of God is like himself perfect, and that not in the sense conveyed in the well-known verse of the poet-laureate:

"Faultily faultless, jolly regular, splendidly null,"

but in the higher sense of being in substance, form, expression and tone, exactly adapted to its purpose. This has been denied, not only by avowed enemies of our holy religion, but even by some who minister acceptably at its altar. The subject, therefore, is worthy of consideration. The purpose of the ten commandments was to reveal a rule of duty for men, and this we insist was accomplished in a way that leaves nothing to desire. The truth may be shown,

I. By the *Nature of the Law itself.*

Its contents are just what they ought to be. They enjoin only what is right; they forbid only what is wrong. They err neither in excess nor in defect. No error or incongruity can be detected from beginning to end. The ground that is covered takes in all the relations and interests of man, the recognition, the worship, the reverence, and the proportion of time he owes to God, all relative duties arising from the family, the household and the state, the regard due to the life, the domestic circle, the property and the good name of one's neighbor; and then the whole winds up with a precept that shows that thought as well as speech and act is included in the obligation. No modern theory of practical ethics discloses any duty which is not contained in the Sinaitic summary. That summary is suited to all lands, all races, all times, all states of society. It contains nothing that is sectional, or national, or fortuitous, or temporary. The fifth commandment may seem an exception, because the promise attached to it mentions "the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," whence some have rashly inferred that the whole decalogue was simply a Jewish statute and destitute of universal significance and applicability. But the impropriety of this inference is shown by the language of the Apostle Paul in the opening of the sixth chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians. Writing to a Gentile church nearly all whose members were of heathen origin (cf. II. 11-13; IV. 17-19), he enforces the duty of children to their parents by citing this precept, altering the last clause so that it reads, "and thou mayest live long upon the earth," thus clearly teaching that the reference to the Holy Land in the original statute was a provisional feature which in no degree

limited or impaired the world-wide and perpetual scope of the obligation. It is clear, therefore, that the code is addressed to man as man every-where and always. It lays hold of Jew and Greek, Barbarian and Scythian, male and female, bond and free, high and low, all nations, all classes without exception; for whatever other differences obtain, all stand upon the same footing as rational, responsible beings, and alike need some authoritative directory of conduct.

But, while the code is thus comprehensive and far-reaching, it is also succinct and brief, as a manual always should be. It resolves human duty into its constituent elements, and then sums up these elements into a decade of precepts whose force is not to be mistaken. Obedience to parents, the very earliest of earthly obligations, stands for the whole series of relative duties. And rightly, for the good child will naturally be the good husband, and master, and citizen. Nor is it conceivable that one relation should be defined and cared for, while others, equally natural and permanent and general, should be neglected. In like manner when the code takes up the rights of man in society, the leading overt act of gross transgression is selected and specified, because the prohibition of it means the prohibition of all lesser forms of the same sin. And the last precept lays particular stress upon the heart, out of which are the issues of life. Thus there is provided a *vade mecum* of the most satisfactory kind. A little summary having no more parts than can be counted on the fingers of both hands contains the whole substance of the moral law. It realizes the proverbial saying, "The Iliad in a nutshell." A child can easily learn it by heart. A man can recall its precepts anywhere. It is a portable manual always available. As a summation of ethics it has never been surpassed save once, and then it was by its divine author—when our Lord, in answer to the question of a lawyer (Matt. xxii. 37-40), compressed the ten commandments into two. Apart from this most felicitous condensation, the decalogue remains the briefest, clearest and most complete statement of human duty the world has ever seen.

But the order in which its precepts are arranged is as remarkable as their nature. The two tables treat first of what belongs to God, then of what is due to man, with the clear implication not only that the former is superior to the latter, but also that it is the basis upon which it rests. Ethics, so far from being a substitute for religion, is its offspring and dependant. The first table begins with the ultimate fact of the divine existence, then prescribes the way in which God is to be worshiped, next the reverence with which every manifestation of his nature is to be regarded, after which comes the period of time to be consecrated to his service, and the duty which is due to those who are God's representatives on earth, whether parents or other superiors. The second table begins with life, because the dead have no more to do with earth, and then, after this most necessary provision, guards personal purity and the integrity of the domestic circle, after which comes the right of property, a right so nearly connected in all lands and ages with the preservation of social order. This is followed by a guaranty for the maintenance of truth and charity of speech, and the whole concludes with a precept that shows that in all cases it is not so much external obedience as the state of the heart that is required. Now this arrangement of the divine commands is the best conceivable. It could hardly be altered in the least without injury. It puts first what is first in reality. The claims of God transcend those of all his creatures, and attention to these is a condition precedent to the discharge of all other duties. If experience teaches anything, it is that a divine

sanction is indispensable to a proper and permanent restraint upon human conduct. To love God is the first and great commandment. In like manner the second table proceeds, taking up in turn the chief social obligations of mankind, and riveting them all by a final precept which lays its firm grasp upon the inner man of the heart.

Once more, the perfection of the decalogue may be argued from its manifest reasonableness. If there be no God, then religion does not exist, and it is folly to talk of sacred precepts; but if there be a God, the maker of heaven and earth, and sole ruler of the children of men, the one in whom we live and move and have our being, then the duties prescribed in the first table are due unto him. Nothing less can meet his exalted claims. Every feeling of propriety and gratitude summons us to render to him love, honor, reverence, worship and obedience. And so with the other part of the Ten Words. If men be a race, if they have sprung from a common ancestor, if they are of one blood, if they are linked together, not casually or temporarily, but by a bond of nature, then beyond question they owe to each other all that the second table enjoins. They are members one of another, and as such must be governed invariably by the law of love. There is nothing arbitrary or capricious in any precept. All spring from a common source, and are self-commended by their bearing upon human welfare. And as far as the decalogue is obeyed in its spirit, just so far is earth made to resemble heaven.

But the decalogue is no exception to the rule that in this world nothing human or divine escapes criticism, and accordingly fault has been found with it, and sometimes even by those who are within the Christian pale. People have tried to identify it with the moral character of the people to whom it was first given, just as if it were a natural development of the human faculties instead of being a descent from above just as really as the "great sheet let down from heaven by four corners," which Peter saw at Joppa. Its constant claim is that it came to man, not from him. It expresses, therefore, not the moral ideas which he has attained, but those which are held by his Maker and by him put into the form of a statute.

(1) Of the older class of objections the most common is that no provision has anywhere been made for friendship or the love of country. But the former is not properly a subject of legislation, nor could its terms or degrees be intelligently prescribed. In itself it is a felicity rather than a duty, and it is more properly to be placed among the rewards of moral excellence than among its obligations. Indeed, the moment it is made a duty, the fine aroma of the relation exhales, and its chief charm disappears. Its whole value lies in its spontaneous character. As for the duty of patriotism that may be safely left to the action of natural causes. Experience shows that the great danger here is, not that men will fail in love of their country, but that they will become so absorbed in it as to forget the rights of individuals and the immutable claims of humanity and justice. And when patriotism is pampered to excess it ceases to be a virtue, and is rather "the bond and cement of a guilty confederation." Nor if the relative duties (of rulers and ruled), fairly implied in the fifth commandment, are faithfully discharged by each party, is there any reason to fear that men will fall short of the attachment to their country which is universally recognized as appropriate and becoming. The law, therefore, without enjoining the duty, lays the basis for its rational and consistent exercise.

(2) The Rev. R. W. Dale, in his excellent little work on the Ten Commandments, says that they "were not intended to constitute a complete code of morals. There are many sins which they do not condemn, and there are many virtues which they do not enforce. The symmetrical completeness of human systems of ethics is not to be found either in the Old Testament or the New; and certainly we have no right to expect that these laws, given to a race which must have suffered the gravest moral injury from protracted slavery to a heathen nation, should cover the whole ground of moral duty." If this be so, it is very singular that, while almost everything else in Judaism has become obsolete, this code has kept, and still keeps, its place in the theology, the catechisms, and the ritual, of the Christian world. The whole church cannot have been mistaken for eighteen centuries. The omissions which some detect are seeming rather than real. It is true that the second table contains only a series of naked prohibitions, but the principle underlying these negations sweeps the whole field of human duty. The inward and spiritual character of the morality here enjoined is made abundantly plain by the closing precept, which casts its piercing light upon all that precedes. It does not annex any additional province of obligation, but affirms that the law covers every movement of the mind, as well as the actions of the body, and brings the whole man, inner and outer, under the sway of duty. It was this tenth commandment that wrought a spiritual revolution in the soul of the great apostle (Rom. vii. 7), and led him to the true experimental knowledge of his natural condition and character. Nor was this due to any strained application of the words, but rather to the strict and natural interpretation of their meaning. Moreover, when the rich young ruler came to our Lord with the weighty question, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" the plain categorical answer was, "If thou wouldest enter into life keep the commandments." Now it is impossible to explain or justify this answer save on the principle that the commandments comprehended all human duty. It is true that the subsequent words of the Saviour show that he intended to convince the amiable ruler of his self-ignorance, and bring him to a proper sense of sin; but this fact in no way lessens the intrinsic force of his declaration as to the weight and significance of the decalogue.

(3) The Rev. Dr. Dykes, in his "The Law of the Ten Words," speaks of this code as being of a "juvenile or primary character," and says that its "requirements are concrete, and expressed in a negative or prohibitory form," and insists upon the fact "that the sanction of the decalogue was fear," as if there could be a law without such a sanction. Yet he claims for it "an admirable breadth and massiveness," and says that "it succeeds in sweeping the whole field of duty," which is just what this paper insists upon. His book closes with a chapter upon the "uses and defects of the law," which is very unhappily named, for it is not shown that there are any defects in the law; nay, the exact contrary is stated, viz., that it is a pure transcript of the divine holiness. It did not restore spiritual life to fallen men, but the reason of this lay not in any shortcomings in the Ten Words, but in the hopelessly injured condition of man himself. It follows, then, that however inefficacious the law is as a means of saving men, it is absolutely without spot as a rule of duty. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, since it is simply an expression of the nature of God in the form of moral requirement, and a necessary expression of that nature in view of the existence of moral

beings? Law, according to Julius Müller, is simply rectitude embodied in the form of command.

(4) Again, it has sometimes been objected to the completeness of the decalogue that there are many things binding upon us which, without a further revelation of the will of God, we should never have known to be obligatory. The great duty of men under the Gospel is faith, as our Lord said, "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." And the whole Scripture is filled with exhortations of every kind to repent; yet there is not a word of this in the ten commandments. The answer is that no law makes provision for its own violation save in the way of penalty. When it declares clearly and sufficiently what is duty, and annexes an appropriate sanction, its function is ended. If a remedial system be introduced, that is an act of sovereignty which carries with it its own conditions, but in no respect interferes with or derogates from the original statute. The law which the sinner has broken holds its primeval character, and it is still true that perfect compliance with its enactments is perfect compliance with the will of God and needs no supplement of any kind or from any source.

(5) It has been said that while the Ten Words deal well and fully with our duty to our neighbor, they omit the consideration of our duty towards ourselves; and the Bishop of Carlisle, in a sermon before the university of Oxford, said that the criticism might be a true one. Is it so? Nay, on the contrary, is it not clear that men are so closely interlinked together in the whole circle of their relations and interests, that he who performs his duty to his Maker and to his fellows must needs perform whatever obligations he owes to himself? The latter may be comprehended in self-support, self-defense, self-control and self-culture. Yet every one of these, besides being involved in the nature of man as a moral and responsible being, is necessarily secured by the discharge of his duty as laid down in the decalogue. If he does not support himself, then he takes that support wrongfully from others? If he does not control himself, how can he avoid sin against others? If he does not train his own body, mind and heart, how can he perform properly his part in society? The objection is purely fanciful. Duties to one's self are most surely fulfilled when they are considered as parts of what a man owes to other beings, and there is no need of their being put in a distinct category.

II. By *Comparison with Ethnic Statutes.*

But excellent as the decalogue is in its own nature, our conceptions of its merits are greatly exalted by comparing it with the moral law of other religious systems. Nowhere is there to be found a compact, orderly and comprehensive statement of practical ethics such as is contained in the Ten Words. The most important relic of the literature of ancient Egypt is the Book of the Dead, which treats of the beatification of the departed, and represents it in the form of certain recitations made by the deceased person himself in the nether world. The 125th chapter of this book is said by LePage Renouf to be the oldest known code of private and public morality. In it the person who enters into the hall of the Two-fold Maät recites the sins of which he claims not to have been guilty. The list of these sins runs up to forty-two, and it includes crimes of theft, fraud, falsehood, oppression, violence, evil-speaking, and the like, so as in some measure to justify M. Lenormant in ascribing to the Egyptians "a refined morality." But these

sins are not catalogued according to any scientific arrangement. There is a great deal of repetition, and no classification. Sins of omission as well as of commission are mentioned, and those of the mind as well as those of the body; yet there is no discrimination of these from the violation of mere police regulations for public order. Similar statements are found in inscriptions upon the tombs so abundant in the Nile valley, and in various papyri which Ægyptologists have brought to light. But nowhere do we find a manual for popular use giving in condensed form the substance of religious and moral duties. Nothing in the shape of such a code has been discovered. The wisdom of the Egyptians was proverbial in Scripture (1 Kgs. iv. 30) and elsewhere, but it did not suffice to give them either a sensible mode of worship or a coherent and authoritative rule of daily life. No inscription and no papyrus has yet disclosed any parallel to the utterance from Sinai.

The same difficulty confronts us when we pass over to India, and consult the ancient records of Brahmanism. Here we have a renowned law-book, known as *The Institutes of Menu*. Its contents are very varied, extending from a system of cosmogony at the beginning, to the doctrine of transmigration of souls and final beatitude at the end. Several of its twelve books treat of duties, and one sets forth private morals. And scattered through the pages are found many admirable sentiments; but there are just as many, if not far more, of an opposite character. What, however, concerns us is that there is no comprehensive summary of faith and duty, nothing that formulates principles, or suggests a moral system. Physics, metaphysics, education, government, diet, caste, social life, asceticism, penance and abstinence, are all treated upon the same plane and as of equal importance. The killing of a cow is a sin to be atoned for by severe penances. He who strikes a Brahman must remain in hell a thousand years. Benevolent falsehood (e. g., to save an innocent man from a tyrant) is a venial sin. No religious rite is allowed to a woman apart from her husband. A thousand such statements as these occur in the book, nor is there any discrimination as to their relative dignity and usefulness. A cento of just and important rules might be collected from its pages, but they never were collected, nor were the Hindus ever favored with any brief compend which might be brought into comparison with the Ten Words of Moses.

Quite the contrary is the case with the other Indian religion or philosophy which for a time shared with Brahmanism the confidence of the people, Buddhism. There was a period when it was dominant in the peninsula, but in the seventh century it began to decline, and in the seventeenth it was extinct, although in the coterminous regions it still prevails and counts three or four hundred millions of adherents. As it is a religion without God, if the paradox be allowable, it lays great stress upon all kinds of moral duties. The great object of human desire and effort is Nirvana, the precise nature of which need not be discussed here. The theoretical way to Nirvana consists of eight steps, which I need not stay to particularize. The chief ethics of the system lies in certain commands or "precepts of aversion," which are exactly ten in number. Five of these are of universal obligation, and five apply only to the monks, i. e., the clergy of the system, for all its priests are monks, taking the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. What now are these precepts? First, do not kill; second, do not steal; third, do not commit adultery; fourth, do not lie; fifth, do not become intoxicated. The second pentad is, first, abstain from food out of season, i. e., after midday; second, abstain from dances, singing and theatrical representa-

tions; third, abstain from ornaments and perfumes; fourth, abstain from a lofty and luxurious couch; fifth, abstain from taking any gold or silver. Here, now, is fair room for comparison. Of the first pentad, four are rules which exactly answer to the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth commands of the decalogue, but the fifth prohibits simply one form of sensual indulgence, which, however gross and irrational and even bestial as it is, does not head any distinct category of morals, and is itself fairly included in the scope of the first precept which, forbidding the taking of life, forbids whatever carnal habits tend in that direction. But what shall be said of the second series, which concerns those who have embraced the religious life and laboriously seek the chief good? How puerile they are! How unspiritual and formal! Whatever claim may be made for a "comparatively pure and elevated morality" in the teachings of Buddha, it must be admitted that the ten precepts of aversion cut but a sorry figure beside the ten commandments of Scripture. The resemblance in four precepts only renders the difference in the other six the more striking. Buddhism has its good points, some of which are very admirable, but as a system it falls far short of truth and propriety. It furnishes no convenient manual which is suited to all places, all times and all classes, and which if obeyed from the heart leaves nothing to desire.

If we turn to ancient Greece, there is no name among lawgivers that stands so high as that of Solon. So confused and variant are the accounts that we have of him that it is hard to say how much is mythical and how much is historical; and modern writers have come to the conclusion that it was the habit of the Attic writers to attribute to him every piece of wise legislation the precise authorship of which they were unable to discover. But for our purpose the exact truth upon this point is of no moment. The Solonian legislation took in a wide range. It limited estates, classified citizens according to their income, encouraged agriculture, regulated marriage, provided for the transmission of property by will, put honor upon industry, checked luxury, forbade evil-speaking; indeed, extended to almost every subject of social importance. But we look in vain for any short, compendious summation of duty. Some remarkable utterances of his have come down the stream of tradition, but nothing that can be compared with the decalogue, or that can for a moment be considered as taking its place. The best wisdom of enlightened Greece in this respect fell far behind what had been received and adopted ages before in Judea.

The case is somewhat different when we pass to the literature of the other classic race, the Latins. Here we find in existence, at an early period (462 B. C.), a series of statutes engraved on bronze tablets, which were twelve in number, and hence gave name to the code as the Twelve Tables (*Lex Duodecim Tabularum*). These were praised by Livy as the fountain of public and private law, and Cicero (*de Orat.*, I., 44) pronounced them incredibly superior to the jurisprudence of any other people. They are no longer extant in their entirety, so that their contents as a whole and even their order and arrangement are unknown. Our knowledge is gained from those portions which were quoted by jurists and others. From these fragments it appears that the first three tables treated of judicial proceedings, the fourth of the paternal power, the fifth of wills and succession, the sixth of property and possession, the seventh of buildings and fields, the eighth of injuries to person or property, from which a right of compensation arose, the ninth of public and political law, the tenth of sacred rites and observances, while the eleventh and twelfth were supplementary to the others. This, it must be acknowl-

edged, was a code of extraordinary completeness and excellence, and it must have had vast influence in forming that peculiar character which enabled the Romans, after conquering the world by arms, every-where to organize it by law. Yet it was only civil and political. It regulated the outward and not the inward. It announced no principles, and rested upon no supernatural authority, but so far as appears, simply put into statute form what had been already the consuetudinary law of the Latin race.

It may then be fairly claimed that the decalogue stands alone in the literature of the world. Whether we go to the west or to the farthest east, nowhere is there found anything approaching it in correctness and completeness as a standard of human duty. All rivals fall short either in excess or in defect. They are vague, or inaccurate, or confused. They mingle the trivial with the important, or they confuse ethics with politics or economics. They overlook the state of the heart, and they omit to ground their precepts either in right reason or the will of the supreme lawgiver. In distinction from all these, the Ten Words stand out as a clean-cut manual, resolving all duty into its essential principles, stating these with the utmost precision and clearness, and basing them upon the nature and perfections of the ever-living God. As has well been said, "There is contained in this short summary the outline of all treatises on morality and all codes of justice. Not the least blemish of any vicious or barbarous legislation is mingled with it. The form is Hebrew, national; but the truth is as broad as human life, and fitted to the wants of the race. If we compare this code with the remains of other ancient peoples, with the code of Menu, the sacred books of China, the fragments of the Persian religion, there is nothing like it."

THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION,—RECENT PHASES.

BY PROF. HENRY P. SMITH, D. D.,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

While the school of Wellhausen in general seems determined to adhere to its theory of the late date (post-exilic) of the Priest Code, and consequently of the redaction of the Pentateuch, there are not wanting signs of a reaction.

The first of these is a notice by Baethgen of Finsler's attack on Wellhausen.¹ Although the reviewer finds that "the fortress cannot be carried without heavier artillery than is at Finsler's disposal," he yet pronounces the attack a severe one, and himself supports it by contributions of his own. He asserts, for example, that there are passages in the earlier literature (before the exile) which show acquaintance with A (the first Elohist). He believes, further, that the comparison of Israel with other nations does not show the order of development assumed by Wellhausen. "According to Wellhausen, the notion of sin and guilt was as good as absent from the earlier religion of Israel. . . . But in the Babylonian penitential psalms of the highest antiquity (which are not annihilated by the fact that sport is made of them) the consciousness of guilt is expressed in the most affecting manner, in part in forms which remind us of the biblical Psalms. The

¹ Finsler, *Darstellung und Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausen's von Geschichte und Religion des Alten Testaments* (Zürich, 1887). Notice by F. Baethgen in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, No. 4.

heathen have mourned over their sins; and it is extremely difficult to believe that this consciousness is something secondary to the Israelites, whose importance to the world consists so largely in their recognition of the nature of sin and the necessity of expiation."

Again; the idea of the covenant between God and his people can hardly be of late date. This idea is found in very ancient times among non-Israelites. "The Baal-Berith of the Shechemites is not the Baal who protects treaties, as so often ungrammatically explained, but the Baal with whom one has made a covenant."

Once more; according to Wellhausen the ritual regulations were codified only after the destruction of the temple, because there would have been no occasion earlier. But the lists of offerings of Marseilles and Carthage (which show some striking similarities to Leviticus) are examples in just the other direction. The fact that in Carthage, centuries before its fall, regulations concerning offerings—regulations scrupulous in detail and allied to the Hebrew—existed in *written form* seems a very important one.

One of the fathers of the Graf school was Vatke, "a prophet of the past," as Wellhausen himself calls him. Since Vatke's death his lectures on Old Testament Introduction¹ have been published by one of his pupils. Great must be the astonishment of his supposed followers to find that he has abandoned the ground they have reached. Vatke, at the latest stage of his investigations, believed that the Elohim document (A or Q, or first Elohist), instead of being post-exilic, is as early as the time of Hezekiah (say the end of the eighth century) and earlier than the others, except the so-called second Elohist, which preceded it by a few years. These two, with the Yahvist, were already combined into one book before Deuteronomy was written, and *this* composite book (not Deuteronomy) was the "Book of the Law" found in the time of Josiah. Deuteronomy was not written until just before the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. These results are reached after a minute examination of all the documents.

Even more importance will be attached to Dillmann's re-statement of his views at the end of his now completed commentary on the Hexateuch.² The author gives the arguments against the Mosaic authorship, and a sketch of the history of criticism. He then takes up each document, analyzes it, and attempts to fix its age, beginning with Deuteronomy. This book he supposes (with the majority of critics) to have been written not long before the time of Josiah. The second Elohist (B) he places in the first half of the ninth century. "That first in the eighth century it was discovered that the name Jahve was introduced by Moses, or that the worship of the Nehushtan was unlawful, or that child-sacrifice was not allowable, or that other gods must be put away in order to the service of Jahve, or that the prophet is a man who *must* proclaim the will of God—Kuenen will hardly be able to show." The author of B was a citizen of the Northern Kingdom. The Yahvist, on the other hand, belongs to the Kingdom of Judah. He can hardly have written earlier than the middle of the eighth century.

Coming now to A, it must first be noticed that it is itself a composite writing. This has indeed been acknowledged so far as to separate the "Holiness-laws."

¹ Wilhelm Vatke's *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Bonn, 1886.

² *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Dretzehnte Lieferung. Numert, Deuteronomium und Josua*, von Dr. August Dillmann. Leipzig, 1886. The essay on the "Composition of the Hexateuch" occupies pp. 592-690.

Dillmann prefers to carry the analysis further, and to group the sections under the two signs A and S. S (Sinai-laws) comprises, besides Lev. xvii.—xxvi. (Holiness-laws); Lev. v. 1-6, 21-24; parts of Lev. xi.; Exod. xxxi. 13 seq.; possibly Lev. xiii. seq.; Num. v. 11-13; xv. 18-21. Besides these, however, we find a number of legal pieces difficult to place. But many enactments contained in S are already acknowledged by the Deuteronomist as Mosaic. The variations between S and D do not argue for the priority of the latter, nor does their relation to Ezekiel. The form of some of the laws, however, points to the exile as the time in which they were written down, or at least recast.

For the main document (A) we cannot assign an earlier date than that of B, and the author seems to have known C also, or some similar compilation. On the other hand, we can hardly place it later than Deuteronomy. The most plausible date is not far from the year 800. A, B and C were combined early in the exile, and D was inserted not long after. If there was any later editorial work, it consisted in inserting a few scattered pieces—some parts of S perhaps.

That so eminently fair a critic as Dillmann, after carefully working through the whole Pentateuch in the light of the most recent discussion, should hold his ground so ably is a fact of the first importance.

A BOOK-STUDY: HOSEA.

BY PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO, M. A.

Bangor Theological Seminary.

I. LITERATURE.

Perhaps the most serviceable equipment one can have is Cheyne's *Hosea*, belonging to the Cambridge Bible Series for Schools, and Keil on the *Minor Prophets*. They are mutually corrective. Keil is of more value than Cheyne to the student who studies the Hebrew. He is not sufficiently quick to feel the life in the midst of which Hosea lived. On the other hand, Cheyne sometimes needlessly rejects the reading of the Hebrew text, and does not give contextual interpretation its true influence; for he is too apt to ignore the course of thought. When one guards himself against these defects, he will find his best help in Keil and Cheyne. Lange's and the Bible commentaries are useful. So also Ellicott's commentary for English readers. Pusey's is quite disappointing. It will be of use to read Prof. W. R. Smith's *Prophets of Israel*, Lecture IV.; Geikie's *Hours with the Bible*, vol. IV., pp. 176-270; Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, article "Hosea;" and the Old Testament Introductions, as Keil's, Bleek's, and Davidson's. It is not advisable to occupy the full range of the books mentioned. The Book of Hosea should be the object of study. Let it all be done in writing or memorizing.

II.

1. Master the contents of the book according to directions in previous book-studies, writing on separate slips of paper the topic or topics of each chapter, studying these topics until, without hesitation, the details of each can be recalled, learning so as to recall with the number of each chapter the topics and the contents of that chapter.

2. Index the contents of the book under the following heads:
 - (1) The immorality of the Northern Kingdom.
 - (2) Sinfulness of the idolatrous Yahweh-worship.
 - (3) Sinfulness of the foreign policy.
 - (4) Sinfulness of the separation of the kingdoms.
 - (5) The blessings which Yahweh had bestowed.
 - (6) The punishments which Yahweh must inflict.
 - (7) The reform of Israel and its future blessing.
3. Analyze the book:
 - (a) Into what two general divisions is it naturally divided?
 - (b) Take the first division, divide it into three subdivisions. Analyze these subdivisions into sections, where the thought requires it.
 - (c) Take the second division, divide it into subdivisions according to head (7) of the analysis. Divide these subdivisions into sections and sub-sections, according to the subject-matter. To illustrate in chapter first,
 - I.—1. Introduction.
 2. Marriage.
 3. Children, and symbolic meaning.
 10. Promise of blessing.

III. STUDY OF THE TEXT.

1. The first division.
 - (a) Is ch. III. a reiteration or continuation of chh. I., II.? i. e., does it repeat the lesson taught in the former chapters? or, does it give the sequel of them? Or, in other words, do chh. I. and III. have a common starting-point and goal? or, is ch. I. 9 the starting-point of ch. II.?
 - (b) Is the discourse of chh. I. and III. to be regarded as history, parable, or vision? What reasons are there for and against calling it history? At this point gather all the symbolic acts recorded in the Bible, and see what light they throw on the subject. What reasons are there for and against regarding it as a parable? Define the allegory, symbolic parable, and typical parable; and gather all instances of each in the Bible, and see what light they throw on the subject. What reasons are there for and against holding that these chapters give the contents of one or more experiences like that of Peter's in Acts x. 9, 16? Gather all instances in the Bible of the narratives of visions which are to the point, and see what evidence they afford. State briefly your conclusion and the grounds for it.
 - (c) What is the reason for the difference between Hos. i. 4 and 2 Kgs. x. 30? Hos. i. 11, what is meant by "the day of Jezreel"? III. 5, what is meant by "the latter days"? Study this phrase here and where else you find in the Old Testament "the last (or, latter) days." Cf. Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, article *אֵלוֹן*.
 - (d) Study the symbolic language all through the book. Gather the persons that are symbols, and explain them. Gather the things (e. g., the bow, i. 5), and explain them.
 - (e) Read through the second part, and note all the passages which are obscure, or excite wonder respecting their meaning. Then, taking them up one by one, gather all the available evidence respecting their meaning under the following heads:

- (1) the natural meaning of the words;
 - (2) the evidence which the context gives;
 - (3) the evidence given by the books as a whole;
 - (4) the evidence from the Bible in general;
 - (5) the evidence given by history, geography and any other branch of knowledge.
- (f) Revise the analysis of the book formed as above, i. 3, in accord with the results of this exegetical study, and commit it to memory.

IV. QUESTIONS OF INTRODUCTION.

1. Historical questions.
 - (a) When did Hosea prophesy?
 - (b) What was the internal condition of the Northern Kingdom in his time?
 - (c) Sketch the history of the Northern Kingdom until the time of Hosea.
 - (d) What were the relations between the Northern and Southern Kingdoms?
 - (e) What were the relations between the Northern Kingdom and Egypt, Syria, and Assyria, in the time of Hosea?
2. Who was Hosea? What can be learned as to his character? Of what kingdom was he a native? Gather the evidence on these subjects under two heads: the evidence in the book itself; the evidence from all other sources, including tradition.
3. What evidence does the book afford on the following subjects?—Who uttered the contents of the book? Who wrote it? What evidence may be gathered from other sources?
4. For whom was this book written? For whom uttered? Gather the evidence under the heads internal and external.
5. When was the book uttered? When written? Determine the relation to be found between the contents of the book and the times in which it was uttered.
6. Where was it uttered? Where written?
7. On account of what causes was it uttered? For what purpose was it uttered? For what purpose was it written?
8. What are the characteristics of the style?

V. QUESTIONS OF CRITICISM.

1. What is the position of Hosea as respects the Mosaic covenant, law and priesthood?
2. Is the book two units? This question will deal chiefly with the second division of the book. In dealing with the subject it will be well to consider it under the following heads: Is this second division a patchwork or compilation from various authors? Is it a single piece of composition, like a sermon, written and uttered on one occasion? Is it a unit as being designed and uttered from one mind? Is it a collection of utterances made on several different occasions? Is it a general resumé by one person of his general preaching through a series of years?
3. Is the influence of any other writers manifested in this book either by quotation or by the general trend of thought?
4. Does the book show traces of re-editing?

VI. OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

1. Gather and systematize the passages indicating Hosea's idea of God.
2. Also those passages which indicate the proper and the actual relations between God and man.
3. What ideal of the Kingdom of God is expressed? Positively, by describing what the kingdom ought to be; negatively, by describing the failure of the Northern Kingdom; prophetically, by describing what the Kingdom of God will be.
4. What is taught respecting the future of God's people? In the immediate future? In the remote future? Also, what is the relation between the immediate future and the remote future?
5. What is the relation of the contents of the book to (a) the development of the theocracy? (b) to the sacred canon?

 AMERICAN EXPLORERS IN BIBLE-LANDS.

BY PROF. E. C. MITCHELL, D. D.,

Cambridge, Mass.

These are inspiring days for the biblical interpreter. The science of New Testament criticism, at last placed upon a solid basis of accurate scholarship and illuminated by valuable manuscript discoveries; the principles of interpretation emancipated both from slavish literalism and dogmatic spiritualism, and clarified by common sense; the hitherto sealed book of the Holy Land, now opened and copied and photographed and brought to our doors; the "treasures in Egypt" now being brought forth from their "store-houses," and even the Pharaohs rising from their tombs to give us testimony; and, to crown all, the key placed in our hands for the decipherment of the secrets of antiquity, preserved for us on "tables of stone" in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia; these are the conditions under which the Christian scholar of to-day enters upon the study of the Bible. Surely we have reached the dawn of the golden age of divine revelation!

The outlook is so vast, the land yet to be possessed so rich and limitless, that there can be no room for jealousies, only for a friendly rivalry in doing the utmost to help each the other, of whatever name or nation, to secure the common treasure for the common brotherhood of scholars. It is not a question whether the deliver in this mine of sacred wealth is a German, a Frenchman, an Englishman or an American. The question is, What things, new and old, can he contribute to the common stock of biblical learning? For this reason, it would not have been my choice to have limited the present inquiry to such explorers in Bible-lands as happen to be Americans by birth or adoption. Having, however, had the topic assigned me in this shape, it may have a certain advantage in stimulating among us the ambition to do our whole duty in the great work of exploration.

Possibly there was wisdom and blessing in the providential hindrances which made separate exploration societies in America a failure. The world of Christian scholarship is substantially one. Its aim, its subjects of study, its sources of information, its fields of research are common property, to be used for a common end. To divide, is to weaken it. Hope and strength lie in concentration. Territorial lines are constantly fading and the world is growing smaller by

rapid intercourse. What better center for a great international Christian enterprise could there be than London? What better agencies than the "Palestine Exploration Fund" and the "Egypt Exploration Fund"? What better media for interchange of thought and diffusion of newly discovered information than their respective publications? For collection of money, division of labor is helpful, as the recent experience of the "Egyptian Fund" in this country has signally shown; but for all the other purposes of these organizations, there is a great advantage in the communion of kindred minds of all nations, and their co-operation through a common channel.

In attempting to complete our notices, begun in the March number of this magazine, of what Americans have done in the exploration of Bible-lands, we shall not include the work of our distinguished fellow citizens by adoption, Messrs. Schliemann, of Greece, and Cesnola, of Cyprus; because their fields, though properly among Bible-lands, have yielded fruit more properly classical and archæological than scriptural. We have no more than a very modest account to give of personal work by Americans in Egypt or Assyria. The most that we can say is that some Americans have done what they could to send material aid to those who are in the field, and that others by their scholarly investigations and critical studies have contributed to make effective the results of explorations.

One organized attempt has been made to enter the Babylonian field. In the summer of 1884, a small company of biblical scholars, members of the American Oriental Society, held a consultation together on the subject of an expedition to Babylonia, the result of which was an organized plan to send one as soon as means could be obtained. Not long after, a noble-hearted lady, Miss Catherine L. Wolfe, of New York,—the recent close of whose beneficent life has just been announced,—volunteered to defray the whole expense of the expedition. At the same time the services of the Rev. Wm. Hayes Ward, D. D., LL. D., of the *Independent*, were secured as a leader. Dr. Ward sailed for Europe September 6, 1884, and took the overland route to Constantinople, going thence by steamer to Mersin on the Cilician coast, and then by private conveyance to Aintab. His party for exploration consisted of Dr. J. R. S. Sterrett, of Athens, and Mr. J. H. Haynes, of Robert College, Constantinople, who acted as photographer and took charge of the caravan, with five Arab attendants.

The report of the expedition was published by Dr. Ward in the columns of the *Independent*, May 20, 1886, as well as in the "papers of the Archæological Institute of America," under whose auspices the work was finally conducted. The report is intensely interesting as a journal of personal adventures, and contains some matter of considerable value to science, though the brevity of his stay and the hurried nature of the trip rendered original discovery well nigh impossible. There is, however, one suggestion of his which may open the way for a discovery of great importance. This is no less than the possible site of the *Accad* of Gen. x. 10, one of the four oldest cities of Babylonia. This he identifies with a mound called *Anbar*, supposed to be the Anbar of Arabic historians, the *Persabora* of classical geographers, and the *Agade*, or *Sippara*, of Anunit.

At the time of its discovery, Dr. Ward and his party were on their homeward route. They had turned aside to examine the mound of *Sufeira*, which had formerly been supposed to be the site of *Sippara* of *Shamash* until this claim had been given up in favor of *Abu-Habba*. This proved to be an inconspicuous mound of no importance; but another mound was mentioned to them, much larger than

Sufeira, several miles off. To this Dr. Ward and his guide repaired, and he was surprised to find a very extensive and elevated mound not laid down on modern maps. It is called Anbar by the natives, and compares very well with the sites of the largest cities of Babylonia, Babylon itself excepted. It is divided in its center by a depression, which may represent an old canal, and which may have separated the old from the new city, and thus, Dr. Ward thinks, may have arisen the dual form of the name Sepharvaim. It stands upon the Euphrates, which agrees with inscriptions which call the Euphrates the river of Sippara.

If future excavations should prove this identification to be correctly made, the discovery will take rank among the most important, and will do great credit to the Wolfe expedition. The special object of Dr. Ward's journey was to open the way for further explorations in the future. It must be confessed that the immediate results in this direction were not abundant. That the field for work is yet very extensive, no one can doubt. Nor can the importance of the discoveries yet to be made be greatly overestimated. Undoubtedly a vast store-house of archaeological treasures lies buried in the mounds of Mesopotamia, and the unexplored regions of Babylonia are especially rich in objects of the greatest antiquity. Unfortunately, however, the difficulties in the way of thorough work in excavation seem to increase rather than diminish as their importance becomes known. The Turkish government, which holds the key to this treasure-house, is not only incapable, even if it were disposed, to do the work; but it is yearly growing more determined to prevent anyone else from doing it. Dr. Ward could get permission to enter the country only upon express condition that no excavations should be attempted. It is the present policy of Turkey to forbid absolutely all excavations of antiquities, whether by natives or foreigners.¹

In spite of the policy and the restrictions of the Turkish government, however, Dr. Ward succeeded in obtaining by purchase a large number of valuable objects embracing several complete barrel-cylinders, or parts of them, belonging to Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, and other kings, and perhaps a hundred complete "contract" and other tablets, a few of a period perhaps fifteen hundred years before Christ, but mostly of a period ranging from Nebuchadnezzar to Antiochus Epiphanes. The "contract tablets," so-called, which formed the larger part of the collection, are those to which we must look for the recovery of the private life of the people. Some of those which Dr. Ward has secured are among the most interesting yet discovered. They are now deposited in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York city. None of them have yet been published; but when they have been properly studied and brought out, it will be seen that, on this account if for no other reason, the Wolfe expedition has well earned the gratitude of biblical scholars. There were also many smaller finds of curious interest, such as small engraved and inscribed objects in gold, chalcedony, lapis-lazuli, and clay, burnt and unburnt. A very important service was also performed by the expedition in photographing the mounds, ruins, excavations, and other scenes which they visited, so that a more definite idea can be obtained of the work and the localities, and by it the facility of illustrating the subject is greatly increased.

Besides this organized effort, there had been performed,—as in the field of Palestine,—some good work in previous years by American missionaries. Dr.

¹ The three preceding paragraphs formed part of an editorial, by the writer of this article, in the *Journal of Education* for July 22, 1886.

Selah Merrill has given, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1875, an interesting account of relics from Assyria sent to this country by missionaries, among which are slabs enough to cover a wall 275 feet long and eight feet high, which are now deposited chiefly in the libraries of New England colleges. In the bibliographical list which follows¹ this paper will be found the names of several who have contributed to the literature of this subject through their own personal explorations.

But it is not to the explorer alone that we are indebted for the contributions to sacred learning which now come, in such rich profusion, from the fields of Babylonia and Assyria. Long before any light dawned upon us from those ancient sources, we were actually in possession of a large part of the material which now proves so luminous. Long before the jealous Turk suspected the value of his buried treasure, the intuitions of science had anticipated the present revelation, and transferred to Christian keeping the precious caskets in which it was concealed. Here, however, it waited for a Grotefend, a Rawlinson, and a Jules Oppert, to find and perfect the key to its decipherment, and now it is to the patient toil of linguistic scholarship more than to the original work of exploration that we owe our present advances in Assyriological science. In this department of the work American scholars are coming to occupy a very respectable position. Already courses of instruction, under competent teachers, have been established in Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins, and Madison Universities; in the Union, Newton, and Louisville, and other theological seminaries; as well as in the various summer schools of the American Institute of Hebrew. One American scholar, Prof. D. G. Lyon, of Harvard College, has published, at Leipzig, an edition of the cuneiform inscriptions of Sargon, King of Assyria, after the originals, with a transliteration, translation, glossary and explanations. It contains six inscriptions in autograph, one of which had not been published before, and all of which are improved in accuracy. Dr. Lyon has also published an Assyrian Manual for the use of beginners, which has already gone into use as the text-book in this department. There has also appeared at Leipsic, from the pen of a young American scholar, Mr. Samuel A. Smith, an edition of the Asurbanipal inscriptions, with a translation, commentary and complete glossary.

Egypt, as a field of biblical research, has been much longer before the Christian public than either Assyria or Babylonia, although the most important discoveries there have been comparatively recent. A fair proportion of American travelers have followed the steps of Edward Robinson in taking the pyramids and the desert on their way to Palestine; and some American scholars have kept up their studies of Egyptian archæology as a part of Old Testament interpretation. One honored name stands prominently forth in this connection. The lamented Dr. Joseph P. Thomson commenced, a quarter of a century ago, a series of notes in the pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* on "Egyptology, Oriental Archæology and Travel," and kept them up, with scarce any interruption, till the close of his life in 1879. They were and still continue to be of great interest and value as contributions to the literature of the subject. They have done much to stimulate American scholars to investigation in this department.

It would be impossible here even to allude to all which American travelers have published about Egypt. The bibliographical list, hereafter to be published, will furnish some glimpse of it. A few recent works, however, seem to require special mention. The Christian public is greatly indebted to the Rev. Dr. H. C.

¹ In the June number of THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT.

Trumbull, of the *Sunday School Times*, for an exceedingly thorough and exhaustive discussion of the true site of Kadesh Barnea, and incidentally of the route of the exodus, which was the fruit of a recent visit of his to Egypt and the desert. We also have, in Prof. H. S. Osborn's "Ancient Egypt in the light of Modern Discovery," a very useful and trustworthy compendium of recent facts in connection with Egyptian exploration.

By far the most important contributions of Americans, however, to the science of Egyptology, have been in the shape of material aid to the "Egypt Exploration Fund." An American clergyman, the Rev. Wm. C. Winslow, LL. D., of Boston, a Vice-President of that society, has done great service to his countrymen by his indefatigable and successful efforts to awaken interest in this important work. Through his correspondence and personal influence a very large number of eminent scholars and distinguished men have had their attention called to this society, and have enrolled their names as members. In this way, during the year 1886, a contribution to the amount of about \$4,000 was sent over to swell the fund and stimulate exploration. At a public meeting held in London last summer, Miss Amelia B. Edwards, the accomplished Secretary of the Fund, paid a very high encomium to Dr. Winslow, saying that, "with the one single exception of the late Sir Erasmus Wilson, Dr. Winslow had done more than anyone, not merely for the work of this society, but for the cause of biblical research and the spread of biblical knowledge, in connection with Egyptology, throughout the civilized world."

Why is not this method of co-operation as feasible, economical and effective, as any which could be adopted, not only for Egypt, but for Palestine and for all exploration in Bible-lands? And why may not the Christian laymen of America, whose intelligence and liberality in all good undertakings are unsurpassed anywhere in Christendom, be enabled so to appreciate the vital importance of this work as to place it on a substantial basis among the foremost of Christian enterprises?

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.

BY PROF. WILLIS J. BEECHER, D. D.,

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

MAY 15. THE CALL OF MOSES. Exod. III. 1-12.

This lesson is interesting as an instance of a theophanic "appearing" of Jehovah to a man. In verse 2, the person who appears is called "the angel of Jehovah;" he is said to be Jehovah, in verses 4, 7, etc., and is called "God," in verse 4, and "the God," in the close of verse 6. From the analogy of other instances of the same sort, I suppose that we are to understand the author of Exodus as affirming that Jehovah, in the person of "the angel," assumed a human character, for the purpose of making this revelation to Moses. This theophany is like that of Mount Sinai, and unlike most of those in which Abraham participated, in that it was accompanied by a visible miraculous symbol, the burning bush; perhaps it was also like the Sinaitic theophany in that the human character assumed by God consisted entirely in the audible words, without the presence of any visible human form.

From Exod. iv. 19, we may perhaps infer that the incident of the burning bush occurred before the death of Rameses II., the Pharaoh from whom Moses fled, and that, being prepared for his mission by this incident, he was started upon the mission itself by a fresh message from God that came to him in the land of Midian. If this be the case, the forty years of the exile of Moses from Egypt were the last forty years of Rameses; the great battles of the Hittite wars of Rameses had been fought before Moses left Egypt; after he left, occurred the marriage of Rameses with the Hittite princess, and also the wars he carried on to obtain captives to employ on his public works, as well as the construction of most of these works themselves.

In the matter of dates, however, and in the consecutive placing of events, Egyptology is a very puzzling and unsatisfactory branch of learning. Doubtless it will become less so in time. At present, it is most satisfactory when it deals with facts that are comparatively independent of chronological data. For example, we are informed, Acts vii. 22, that "Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." It is now known that the period of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, in Egypt, was rich in its production of literature. It was particularly so in the departments of heroic and religious poetry, ethics, and light literature. For example, much more than half the Egyptian literature published in the five volumes of the *Records of the Past* dates from the times of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, and before the death of Moses. A very large portion of these texts are texts that Moses may have read when they were first published, as new books. The two great literary men of the monuments, the poet PENTAUR and the novelist ENNA may have been schoolmates of Moses; they may have read together the older classics of Egypt.

MAY 22. THE PASSOVER. Exod. xii. 1-14.

The first twenty verses of this chapter, with verses 43-49, are the statement of a law, put into the form of a narrative. Verses 21-28 inform us that Moses, at the juncture of affairs then reached, gave directions to the elders of Israel, publicly assembled, for having the law carried out, and the passover lambs killed. This implies that the law itself had been given at an earlier stage of affairs. But the law, narrative though it is, is not introduced into the longer narrative as a circumstantial clause, by weak *Waw* followed by the subject (for instance, like the circumstance of the Israelites' obtaining contributions from Egypt, xii. 35, 36), but begins as an independent narrative, with *Waw* consecutive of the Imperfect. This and half a dozen similar facts in these chapters are pretty conclusive proof that the anti-traditional critics are correct in holding that this part of Exodus is composite—that it was composed, to some extent and in some way, out of previously existing pieces of writing. The evidence of this from the structure of the narrative is worth vastly more than the verbal trivialities commonly cited for proving the same thing.

On the other hand, however, this evidence from the general structure of the passages does not lend itself to the support of any of the current theories concerning the Priest-code; it does not indicate that this law can be recognized as a part of one of three continuous accounts that have been combined into the present account; on the contrary, it has the same sort of force to distinguish this law from the so-called sections of the Priest-code that precede and follow it, that it has to distinguish it from the other parts of the present narrative. It testifies

distinctly that the writer of Exodus (or some writer of Exodus, if there was more than one) when he reached this point, instead of explaining the situation by writing a new account of the passover feast, made his explanation by transcribing an account that either he or some one else had previously written; and here it ceases to testify. It follows that there is nothing in this part of the evidence to favor the idea of the late origin of any part of the account.

The author of Exodus certainly intended to convey the idea that the Israelites lived mainly in one tract of Egyptian territory—the land of Goshen, Exod. viii. 18 (22); ix. 26, etc. He did not intend to convey the idea that they were the exclusive inhabitants of that section. The houses of the Israelites were among the houses of the Egyptians, so that the destroyer would “skip” Israelite houses, in going from house to house among the Egyptians, xii. 13, 23, etc. If the Israelites had sacrificed in Egypt, they would have done so in the presence of Egyptian neighbors, who would have stoned them, viii. 22 (26). Very generally they had Egyptian neighbors, from whom they could “ask” contributions; not the men only, but the women had such neighbors; it was a case of Egyptian households and Israelite households very generally living in the same neighborhoods, iii. 21, 22; xi. 2, 3; xii. 35, 36. We shall presently find that this fact is significant, both in regard to the passover, and in regard to the facts narrated in our subsequent lessons.

Another statement of similar significance is that made concerning their numbers, Exod. xii. 37, 38. Translating this in the order of the Hebrew, we have:

“And started the sons of Israel from Raamses Succoth-ward, about 600,000 foot, the men, apart from offspring; a great mixed multitude also having gone up with them, and flock and herd, an exceeding great property.”

The numeral 600,000 is commonly interpreted by the account of the census taken a year later, as now found in Num. i., thus making it to be the number of the men over twenty years of age. As it was a census of people who were rapidly increasing, and therefore of people who had large families of children, this would indicate a population nearer three millions than two millions. It is not surprising that, to many, this number appears incredibly large. What is true in this case is true of a large proportion of the census numbers, and of the numbers for military armaments, as given in different parts of the Bible. As the biblical writers hold that, from the times of Moses, Israel was organized under “captains of thousands, captains of hundreds, captains of fifties, and captains of tens,” Exod. xviii. 25, it would be a fair question to ask, whether, in these large numerals, the “thousands” are not units of organization, rather than strict numbers, and whether there may not have been enough of the “thousands” only partly full, to amount to a material reduction in the total numbers given. But whether we accept views of this kind or not, the population that kept that first passover is certainly represented to have been more numerous than that of an average American state; if the numbers are to be taken strictly, it was as numerous as that of some of our largest states. Irrespective of all questions of Egyptian geography, the writer of Exodus, if he was writing history and writing it intelligently, intended us to understand that this population was scattered over a territory extensive enough so that they could get a living in it. It must have been some thousands of square miles in extent; for however compactly oriental populations may sometimes live, this was a population that was well provided for,

that was addicted to grazing industries, and that shared with other populations the districts where it dwelt.

Now if this account is historical, and if the state of things just mentioned actually existed, and if the account is to be understood without hypothesizing a million of miracles to explain facts otherwise incredible, several inferences follow from it. First, the writer expected his readers to be sufficiently intelligent to understand that the passover law was given early enough to afford time for its promulgation and acceptance over all this territory, among all these people. Again, he intended to convey the meaning either that the final orders concerning the passover, XII. 21, were given to the assembled elders early enough for transmission over all the territory where the people lived, or else that the orders had previously been transmitted in some other way. Again, he meant to be understood that Israel had now become a thoroughly organized body, for the purposes of the uprising, and looked forward to the passover feast as the time for a simultaneous movement.

The passover law that constitutes our lesson does not contradict the statement made in Exod. XII. 34, 39 :

“ And the people took up their dough that was not yet fermenting, their leavening pans bound up with their clothes upon their shoulder. . . . And they baked the dough which they brought out from Egypt, unleavened cakes ; for it had not fermented ; for they were expelled from Egypt, and were not able to linger ; and they had not made provision for themselves.”

It is not fair to interpret this to mean that every particular Israelite housewife in Egypt had that afternoon set bread, and that some member of every household started swinging a pan of unbaked dough on his shoulder. If it is a record of fact, it must be regarded, not as describing a universal practice, but an illustrative incident. If this author teaches that Israel generally had put away leaven, in obedience to the divine command, then, perhaps, he here teaches that some who had failed properly to obey the command, were afterward providentially compelled to obey it, and to obey it in a way which signally illustrated its meaning, rather than did credit to themselves. And at all events, whatever this passage means, it certainly is not a second account of the origin of the passover feast, contradicting that previously given.

In fine, there is nothing in any account of the passover contained in the Bible to prevent our regarding the law, as stated in the present lesson, as describing the actual origin of this festival. It is possible, indeed, to put the various accounts together in other ways, especially if one calls in the aid of an interpretation that puts contradictory meanings upon some of them ; but if we allow any weight to the historical statements of the Bible, we must always prefer that view which accepts the statement with which our lesson begins, that this particular law was given to Moses in Egypt, and therefore is the original law of the passover.

MAY 29. THE RED SEA. Exod. XIV. 19-31.

Here again we have an account of a form of theophany, in which the being who appears is called “ the angel of the God,” Exod. XIV. 19, and “ Jehovah ” in the other verses of the narrative, and in which the “ appearing ” is rather by the visible symbol of the pillar of cloud and fire, accompanied by personal divine acts and communications, than by any assumption of a human form.

The Massoretic division at XIII. 17 opens a distinctly fresh section in the literary form of the book. This account presupposes the previous parts of the history, but it starts with a fresh beginning, and from a point of view somewhat changed.

Points of especial interest in this lesson are those which pertain to the route of the exodus, the place and nature of the crossing, etc. But these are so certain to be fully treated by others, that I venture to pass them by.

The account in Exodus seems to be that the children of Israel were in their dwellings, all over the districts of Egypt which they inhabited, at midnight of the fourteenth of Nisan, with closed doors, the passover having been eaten that evening. The passover feast itself, with the death of the first-born of Egypt that followed it, is apparently represented to have been the signal of a movement that was made simultaneously throughout these regions. It is not intimated that any miracle was performed in transporting these multitudes of people, with their flocks and herds, from their homes, all over the thousands of square miles where they lived, to a place of rendezvous. The translations make the Bible to say that the whole 600,000, with the women and children, started together from Raamses; but the Hebrew does not necessarily mean that. Probably the common impression is that the Book of Exodus says that they were all massed together within a few hours, just as they might have been, if there had been only a few hundred of them, from a small tract of country. It is thus that too many of the traditional commentators fill out in their minds the picture outlined in the Scripture; and on this scale they sketch the whole affair till the sons of Israel are safe across the sea. They hold that there were two or three millions of people here, and then treat the account as if it were possible for the millions to move within the same limits of space and time which would limit the movements of thousands. If this filling out of the Bible account were correct, there would be no escape from the conclusions of the critics who say that we have here not a historical account of either natural events or miracles, but merely a grotesque, though perhaps instructive figment of the imagination.

But, if this narrative is history, then the proper filling out of the account is something very different from that just described. If this writer was writing history, then he had in his mind, and intended to convey to other minds, a just picture of the events described. If we supply details from our imaginations for the purpose of enabling us the better to understand the affair, we should supply them in accordance with known facts and possibilities. This author tells us that all Israel went out of Egypt, and apparently that they started from their homes the night after the passover; he does not tell us in how many different bodies they moved, besides the main body, nor on how many different routes, nor how much time elapsed before the last body had crossed the frontier. He gives us a somewhat detailed account of the movements of the main body, who accompanied Moses and the pillar of cloud and fire, and who were, representatively, Israel itself; but whether this main body was composed of nineteen-twentieths of the whole population, or one-twentieth, he does not inform us. As he does not intimate, however, that any portion of this body was transported to the starting-place by miracle, we must infer that it included no more Israelites than could be massed there by ordinary means, within the time available for that purpose. The overthrow at the Red Sea, by breaking the power of Pharaoh so thoroughly that he could no longer interpose obstacles, freed the Israelites who were then still in Egypt, as really as those who crossed the sea with Moses.

JUNE 5. THE MANNA. Exod. xvi. 4-12.

This article is in danger of exceeding its proper limit of length. On the present lesson, it must confine itself to a single point. What the Bible says concerning the manna is liable to similar abuses of interpretation with what it says concerning the overthrow at the Red Sea. Many comment on this subject as if, during the whole forty years in the wilderness, the Israelites subsisted entirely, or at least chiefly, on manna and quails miraculously given them from heaven,—as if, in this particular case, God undertook to train a race to habits of hardihood by relieving them of all necessity of doing anything to provide for their own needs. As in the case of the descent into Egypt, and the case of the passover and the exodus, we have here a traditional interpretation of the matter which affords a strong position for those who attack the traditional opinions concerning the Bible itself.

To understand what these writings really say in regard to the manna, one should read, not only the passages in which it is directly mentioned, but such as the following: Exod. x. 9; xii. 32; xvii. 3; Num. vii. throughout; Num. xi. 22, etc.; Deut. ii. 6, 28; Num. xx. 19; Lev. xvii. 13; xi. 21-22, 9-10, etc.; the sacrificial laws generally, Exod. xxii. 5, 6, etc.; Num. xiv. 33. He will there learn that Israel in the wilderness had flocks and herds, which were several times in danger of perishing for lack of water, and for which it was proposed to buy water, when they asked leave to pass through Edom; that they left Egypt with money and other commercial resources, and reached Palestine able to purchase such things as they needed; that they are assumed to have resources of hunting and fishing; that the ceremonial law throughout implies their possession, not only of animals for sacrifice, but of agricultural products; that the civil laws contemplate their being engaged in agriculture, as well as in the care of flocks; that what we are accustomed to designate their wandering in the wilderness is actually described as their being shepherds in the wilderness. In fine, these writings represent God's treatment of Israel in the wilderness to have been just what we should expect, in view of the principles on which he ordinarily deals with men. As a rule, he threw them upon their own resources, and thereby trained them; when exceptional needs arose, during the forty years, especially when the need arose from their obeying some especial command which diminished their ability to provide for themselves by ordinary means, then God cared for them by miracle.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

Columbia College is to have a chair of Hebrew (Rabbinic) literature. The sum of \$100,000, for this purpose, has been contributed by certain wealthy Jews of New York city.

Dr. Cheyne's new book, "Job and Solomon," noticed in the April *STUDENT*, is published in this country by Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York city. The price is \$2.25, not \$1.25, as announced.

The trustees of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, have voted to establish at once a professorship of oriental languages and literature. This chair will be distinct from that of Old Testament interpretation.

It is but justice to the managing editor of *Hebraica*, to say that the note of Henry S. Morais on Neubauer's "Etymologies" in April *Hebraica*, was inserted only at the earnest request of Mr. Morais, and upon his responsibility, after his assurance by the editor that Prof. Neubauer's "Etymologies" were intended as a joke.

If twenty additional subscribers can be obtained, a new edition of *Pithom*, by M. Edouard Naville, of which Prof. Gillett wrote so fully in the January *STUDENT*, will be published. Few works in the line of archæological research have been more interesting. There ought to be a demand for several editions. The matter is in the hands of Rev. Wm. C. Winslow, 429 Beacon street, Boston.

Professor John G. Lansing, New Brunswick, N. J., sails this week for Egypt. While absent, Prof. Lansing will collect material for a work in the line of Arabic literature. His Arabic Manual, recently published, has become the authority in Egypt for missionaries learning the language. Immediately upon his return from Egypt, he will publish an Arabic Chrestomathy and Summary of Syntax, which will serve as a companion-volume to the Arabic Manual.

Much interest, and not a few "warlike" editorials have been inspired by Capt. C. R. Conder's article, "The Old Testament; Ancient Monuments, and Modern Critics," in the March *Contemporary Review*. In the strongest possible manner the writer contrasts the results of monumental research and destructive

criticism, the former every-where substantiating, the latter endeavoring to destroy the credibility of the Bible. Captain Conder selects Wellhausen as the representative of modern critics, and aims to show (1) that Wellhausen himself is ignorant of monumental "facts;" (2) that his hypothesis is constructed without regard to these "facts," and (3) that, in short, these "facts" are in direct opposition to Wellhausen's hypothesis and all similar hypotheses.

This article, as well as the reply to it in the April number by Robertson Smith, is well worth reading. It most certainly contains material of which it will be difficult for the "destructive" critic to make satisfactory disposition. It is not to be forgotten, however, that the arguments are based almost entirely upon linguistic evidence, and that Captain Conder does not pretend to be a Semitic scholar. He uses material second-hand, and, we are sorry to say, does not always choose the best authority. His predilection for Lenormant is too decided. However this may be, it is clear from this discussion that *external* testimony, gathered from the monuments, will hereafter play a more important part in the critical discussion.

Prof. T. Witton Davies, of Haverford Baptist College, South Wales, proposes a Hebrew Institute for Great Britain. In the *Athenæum* of March 19th he reviews the work of the American Institute of Hebrew, and suggests that some such an organization is needed in England. "It could help in the publication of suitable grammars and lexicons; it could see to the issue of good periodicals, keeping students well up with the latest information; it could make it much more possible to produce polyglots, and other great works involving large outlays, too large for private enterprise to deal with, as the experience of some very strong and respectable firms has proved; it would awaken an *esprit de corps* that would itself be a gain to oriental learning." He suggests that perhaps this Institute would do well to assist in increasing the circulation, size and character of "the already excellent" *Hebraica*, rather than start a Hebrew or Semitic quarterly of its own. In the following number of the *Athenæum* (March 26) Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie makes a short reply which shows that his ideas upon the subject are somewhat vague. A later number contains other letters by Prof. Davies and Mr. Hyde Clark. Something will undoubtedly result from this discussion. It is not periodical and book publishing that our English friends so much need, as *teaching*. The professors in the English Universities have in many cases come to believe that all teaching is drudgery. It is even a great burden to lecture. If a movement could be inaugurated looking to the encouragement of *teaching* the Semitic languages, it would meet with a hearty response from hundreds of men who feel the need of such instruction.

The following "note" was received from Prof. H. P. Smith too late to be placed with his article in a former part of this number:—

"Since the above was sent to the editor I have noticed Cornill's contribution to the same subject in the prolegomena to his Ezekiel. I will quote what he says (pp. 174, 175).

"In chapters XL. to XLVIII. we find for the Hebrew *Adhonay Yahweh* not

Kurios Kurios, but regularly *Kurios ho Theos* 'Lord God.' No commentator has noticed this remarkable fact, or mentioned it; but it gives us an important hint for the comprehension of this section [of the book], and throws unexpected light on the burning problem of Pentateuch criticism. That the *Kurios ho Theos* was not simple guesswork, but the faithful reproduction of the Hebrew text before the LXX. translators, will be readily admitted by those who are well informed. It follows that, in the Alexandrine recension of Ezekiel, the divine name throughout these chapters was *Yahweh Elohim*. That the change is intentional cannot be doubted, and an explanation lies near at hand. In the earlier section of the book *Yahweh* is *Adhonay* 'the Lord;' his relation to Israel is essentially legal. In the last part, on the other hand, he is *Elohim* 'God;' and this relation is a relation of grace. In the time brought before us in chh. XL.-XLVIII. the promise is realized that *Yahweh* will become *Elohim* to them. But this explanation alone is not sufficient; the prophet's intention in this change of names is more significant still. In the present Old Testament there is only one passage in which we meet *Yahweh Elohim*, Gen. ii. and iii., the history of Paradise. *Evidently Ezekiel would make his vision of the New Jerusalem parallel to this narrative.* Humanity, having ended its cycle of sin and error, returns to its starting-point; the future salvation which follows chastisement is for Israel a new creation, a restoration of the original paradisaic condition, with peace between God and man,—so in substance, although of course in a different form. . . . It follows then, necessarily, that Ezekiel must have read the first chapters of his Pentateuch with the double divine name. Budde's recent assertion, that this must be traced to an inner-jahvistic process, receives this way an unexpected confirmation.'

"The question of an 'inner-jahvistic process' we need not enter upon. The indications that Ezekiel read the early chapters of the Pentateuch as we read them, are very welcome."

→BOOK NOTICES.←

SYRIAN STONE-LORE.*

The many discoveries made within the last quarter of a century, the results of archæological study during this period, as they stand related to the country of Syria, more especially Palestine, are presented in this book. It is written to answer the question, What is known about Syria outside of the Bible? The peculiar situation of Syria, so closely related to other nations,—Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Asia Minor, Phœnicia,—renders it possible to make use, directly or indirectly, of the large amount of material which has been collected during late years. There are taken up in order, the Canaanites, the Phœnicians, the Hebrews, Jews and Samaritans, the Greek age, the Herodian age, the Roman age, the Byzantine age, the Arab Conquest, the Crusaders. Three maps accompany the work, one of Syria, 1300 B. C., a second of Syria, 500 A. D., and the third of Syria, 1180 A. D. The writer acknowledges freely his indebtedness to other scholars. He seems, however, to lean too heavily on Lenormant, who, at best, and especially in minute matters, is scarcely trustworthy. Comparatively little aid has been drawn from German sources.

It is with "archæology and social conditions, with monuments and customs, rather than with annals and books" that the volume deals. The study of such a work must, of necessity, strengthen one's belief in the truth and integrity of our biblical literature. Questions, it is true, are sometimes raised which leave one in suspense; but, in general, the Bible is found to be vindicated, so far as it is possible for archæological criticism to corroborate. There is an apparent conflict going on between the external and internal evidence relating to the character of Old Testament history. Mr. Conder's work is of the external nature; the literary or higher criticism is of an internal nature. Will both come out at the same place? While Mr. Conder is thought by scholars to be sometimes too hasty in his conclusions, the present work contains little with which the general consensus of opinion would not agree. In his recent attack upon Wellhausen, in the *Contemporary Review*, and in his recent announcement that he has discovered the key to the Hittite inscriptions, Mr. Conder has placed himself in positions from which much will be expected. The desire of every biblical and oriental student should look towards the multiplication of such books as that now under consideration.

ABRAHAM, JOSEPH AND MOSES IN EGYPT.†

In this interesting volume the author aims to fix the position of Abraham, Joseph and Moses in Egypt's history. With what dynasty, with what Pharaoh did these patriarchs come into relation? The author has collected much valuable material. A fuller notice of the book will appear later. The plate (p. 287) of Thothes III., the probable Pharaoh in the time of Joseph, is taken from this book by the kindness of the publishers.

* SYRIAN STONE-LORE, or, The Monumental History of Palestine. By Claude Regnier Conder, R. E. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1887. 8vo, pp. 472.

† ABRAHAM, JOSEPH AND MOSES IN EGYPT. Being a course of lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., by Rev. Alfred H. Kellogg, D. D., of Philadelphia. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 8vo, pp. 160. Price, \$1.50.



FROM BRITISH MUSEUM.

THOTHMES III.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

- Die Armen-Verwaltung im alten Israel.* Vortrag, geh. im akademischen Verein für jüdische Geschichte und Litteratur in Berlin. Von D. Cassel. Berlin. 1887. 25 S., gr. 8.
- Commentar zum Buche Judith.* Von A. Schoiz. Würzburg: Woerl. 1887. xxii, 114 S., gr. 8
.....M.3.
- Zur Geschichte des Königs David von Israel.* Eine Studie über das Mittelstück des Samuelis-Buch [1 Sam. xvi.-2 Sam. viii.]. Von A. Gaupp. Progr. d. Königl. Gymn. Schw. Hall. 1886. 31 S., 4.
- Septuagintastudien: Zur Geschichte der Septuina.* Von E. Nestle. Progr. d. kgl. Gymn. Ufm. 19 S., 4.
- Deltzsch's Biblical Commentary on the Psalms.* From the latest edition specially revised by the author. Transl. by D. Eaton. 3 vols. Vol. I. London: Hodder. 1887. 8vo, pp. 520
.....7s. 6d.
- Misere du viel Testament.* Par le baron James de Rothschild. T. V. Paris: Fermin-Didot
..... 10fr.
- Das Buch der Richter und Ruth.* Wissenschaftlich bearb. mit theol.-homilet. Betrachtgn. Von P. Cassel. 2. Aufl. [Lange's Bibelwerk, A. T., 5. Th.]. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klafing. 1887. VIII. 314 S., gr. 8.
.....M.3.60
- Études historiques et exégétiques sur l'Ancien Testament.* Par E. Le Savoureaux. Avec une préface de M. I.-F. Astié. Paris: libr. Fischbacher. 1887. lxxi, 403 p., 8.
.....5fr.
- L'histoire religieuse d'Israel et la nouvelle exégèse rationaliste.* Par M. de Broglie. Paris: au bureau des annales de philosophie chrétienne. 1887. 30 p., 8. Extrait des annales de philosophie chrétienne.
- Une nouvelle hypothèse sur la composition et l'origine du Deutéronome, examen des vues de M. G. d'Eichthal.* Par M. Vernes. Paris: E. Leroux. 1887. 53 p., 8.
.....1fr.50
- Haifa: or, Life in Modern Palestine.* London: Blackwood. 1887. 8vo, pp. 376.
.....7s. 6d.
- The History of Tithes, from Abraham to Queen Victoria.* By H. W. Clark. London: Redway. 1887. 8vo, pp. 200.
.....5s.

ARTICLES.

- The Pharaohs of Egypt.* By G. J. Stevens in N. W. Christian Advocate, March 23, '87.
- The Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings.* By A. H. Kellogg in S. S. Times, April 2, '87.
- History of the Pentateuch Question.* By Prof. Ed. König, ib.

- Fresh Biblical Illustrations.* By Charles S. Robinson, D. D., ib., April 16, '87.
- The Anonymous Egyptian Princesses of the Bible.* By Amelia B. Edwards, Ph. D., ib., April 22, '87.
- Ethics of the Hebrew Scriptures.* By Dr. Andrew P. Peabody in Am. Hebrew, April 15, '87.
- The Karens of Burmah.* I. Their Jewish Traditions. Ib.
- Biblical Research.* Independent, March 31, '87.
- The "Barrier" of Chaluf.* By C. R. Gillett, ib., April 14, '87.
- A Destructive Criticism that destroys the Critic.* Christian at Work, April 14, '87.
- Art among the Ancient Hebrews.* By Dr. Chotzney in Am. Israelite, April 8, '87.
- The Biblical Account of the Creation.* By Rev. Robert Davey in English Pulpit, June, '88.
- The Old Testament: Ancient Monuments and Modern Critics.* By C. R. Conder in Contemporary Review, March, '87.
- Notes on Arabia Petraea and the country lying between Egypt and Palestine.* By Chas. Warren in Palestine Exploration Fund, Jan., '87.
- Recent Discoveries: Notes and News from the Liva of 'Acca.* By G. Schumacher, ib.
- Die Bedeutung der Priesterschaft fuer die Gesetzgebung waehrend der zweiten Tempelzerstoerung.* Von H. Graetz in Monatschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judenth., '87, 3.
- Ein neugefundenes Kanon-Verzeichniss.* Von J. Weiss in Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol., 30, 2, '87.
- A Hebrew Institute for Great Britain.* By Prof. T. Witton Davies in Athenaeum, March 19, '87.
- A Hebrew Institute.* By Terrien de Lacouperie, March 26, '87.
- The Hebrew (or Semitic) Institute.* By T. Witton Davies and Hyde Clark, ib., April 2, '87.
- Ueber die Schreibart und die Aussprache des goettlichen Eigennamens.* Von B. Hochstädter in Jüdisches Literaturblatt. XVI. No. 11.

REVIEWS.

- Der Autor des masoretischen Werkes Ochlal' Ochlal' (H. Graetz).* Von R. Gershom in Monatschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judenth., '87, 1.
- La Bible.* I. (E. Ledrain.) Von W. Nowack in Deutsche Literaturzeitung, April 2, '87.
- Die Buecher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua (August Dillmann).* By Wellhausen, ib., Apr. 2, '87.
- Das Jahrhundert nach dem babylonischen Exile* mit besond. Rücksicht auf die religiöse Entwicklung des Judenthums (Rosenzweig). In Lit. Centrblt., April 2, '87.
- Ethik in der Halacha (M. Bloch).* By H. Strack in Theol. Litblt., '86, 44; Lit. Ctrbit., '87, 7.