

and is it merely a translation of *choli* to speak of *cholera morbus*?—Etymology.

THE etymologies of the three words, 'mistletoe,' 'hogmanay,' 'cholera,' given in the dictionaries of Skeat, the *Century*, and Murray respectively, are, I understand, quite scientific, and they exclude the Hebrew etymologies suggested. 'Mistletoe' is from the Anglo-Saxon *mistel-tan*, in which *tan* means 'twig,' and *mistel* is the diminutive of *mist* (dung); 'hogmanay' may be traced through Norman-French to the old French form *aguilanneuf* or *auguilanneuf*, meaning, 'to the mistletoe! the New Year!' *au gui l'an neuf*); and 'cholera' is the Greek *χολέρα* used by the Greek physicians. The employment of the affix *morbus* (see Murray, *s.v.*) comes from the use of the word 'cholera' in English to signify 'bile.'

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

Why did the New Testament Revisers render 'a living and true God' in 1 Thess. i. 9 contrary to their

usual practice, which they followed even in the similar passage, Acts xiv. 15? In the Old Testament the phrase 'living God' is without the art. (Dan. vi. 26 is Aramaic), and so also in the New Testament, except the two passages in Matthew (xvi. 16, xxvi. 63). The words 'and to wait for his Son' which follow would have been more natural after 'the living and true God.'—O. T.

I HAVE nothing to add to what I said on this point in the *Expositor*, April 1887, p. 254, note:—

'In some cases the power of association was too strong to allow the disturbance of a familiar phrase. Every reader will feel, upon reflection, the difference between 'a living God' and 'the living God,' between the conceptions of the One Sovereign Father, regarded in His character and regarded in His personality. But the definite form remains in Heb. iii. 12, ix. 14, x. 31, xii. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 10; Acts xiv. 15, though in every case the argument gains by the strict rendering (1 Thess. i. 9). Here and there, however, the Revisers ventured to use a new form; e.g. Rom. i. 17, iii. 21, *a righteousness*.'

B. F. DUNELM.

Is the Old Testament Authentic?

BY THE REV. J. ELDER CUMMING, D.D., GLASGOW.

IV.

WE begin then to get some clear notion of what is intended by these critics, when they maintain so vehemently that they have left untouched the inspiration of the Old Testament. What inspiration? The reply of Canon Cheyne, at least, is *the same sort as the present-day preacher has*,—the same sort as the Canon has himself. And Chronicles (and we presume the Hagiographa generally) is 'no better than its neighbours' in respect either of accuracy of statement, or of the spiritual teaching of the facts which it records!

Yes, for we cannot draw a distinction between the books and their contents, and say that the one is full of mistakes, or bias, or 'coloring,' and yet the other is the very truth of God. It is the substance of the books that is at stake. Here is the statement of the case by one of the leaders of British thought on the whole subject: 'Up to the time of the literary prophets, the *religion of Israel was a mere nature-religion, like that of their neighbours*; it was the Prophets who created the idea of

ethical monotheism.' It must be added that the above statement is given as that of the school represented by 'Kuenen, Stade, and Wellhausen'; but, on the one hand, it is no means clear which of their followers in this country openly protests against such extreme views; and, on the other, we see what the views of the school lead to.

It is no more a question of documents; it is a question of *substance*. And it is not the substance of the history alone which is in question, but the substance of the spiritual teaching is also at stake, even as to such matters as the unity and the holiness of God. Nothing less than this is the problem which is presented to us by the New Criticism, as to the religion of Israel of old; and the books of the Old Testament, while professing to give a more favourable view of this, which their authors know to be a false one, are yet so constructed as to reveal the real state of affairs to those who carefully study them.

We take in detail one or two tests of the theory

of the critics and of its bearing on the substance of the record, as well as its form. In 2 Sam. xxii., a sacred song is inserted with the historical statement that 'David spoke this song, in the day that the Lord had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies and out of the hand of Saul.' The authorship of the song is therefore stated, and the occasion on which it was composed. It is, with slight differences, the 18th Psalm of our collection, the prefatory note being used as the title of the Psalm. Dr. Cheyne says the song is *not* by David, but is as late as the Exile, or later. In doing so, does he not offer a direct contradiction to the substance of the record?

In 1 Chron. xvi. 7-36, we have another sacred song, introduced by the words, 'On that day did David first ordain to give thanks unto the Lord, by the hand of Asaph and his brethren.' The song that follows is the 105th Psalm, followed by the 96th Psalm. The 'day' spoken of is that on which the ark was brought up by David to Zion. Now, when the critics maintain that these are late psalms, written hundreds of years after David's death, it is no mere question of chronology and literature; it is a question of the veracity, or at least of the accuracy of the sacred historian, who tells us that they came from the pen of David, and fix the date at which they did so. It is possible, no doubt, that certain additions to David's psalm may have crept in during subsequent generations; but the preservation of *the substance* of the whole is necessary to the truth of the record.

Take another instance. In Isaiah xxiii. we have described what is called 'The burden of Tyre,' and at ver. 17 it is said: 'And it shall come to pass after the end of seventy years, that the Lord will visit Tyre, and she will return to her hire, and shall play the harlot with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth.' Into many questions suggested by the passage we do not enter; but it is evident that the whole credit of the record depends on this having been issued before the event described. If it be not prophecy but history, the record of a fact long past, and only recorded after the event, then the writer is offering us a pretended prophecy which never was uttered. This is no longer a question either of the authorship or date of a document, but of the honesty, truth, and sincerity of the author.

Take, again, a specimen or two of the difficulties

which these critics declare to be insuperable, and take them from that book as to which they are all at one in declaring it a late and untrustworthy composition—the book of the Prophet Daniel. Why is it, they ask, not included in the Prophets; why degraded (as they imply) to the list of the Hagiographa by the ancient Jews? The inference suggested is met by Professor Ryle's admission—it was part of the sacred volume which passed entire into the hands of Jesus Christ. But why was this book so classed? Surely, I reply, a difference is discernible between it and the Prophets. Their books contain history, sometimes largely; but it is history which is told indirectly in the course of the prophecies recorded, and to illustrate these. In the Book of Daniel it is different. The prophecies are there set in the history, not the history in the prophecies. The book is a story of the Exile; and its prophetic parts are given us as recorded then. Had the arranging of the Old Testament books been left to us we should probably, with our present light as to the immense importance of the Danielic prophecy, still unfulfilled, have had some difficulty where to place it. Possibly we should have placed it between the Prophets and the Hagiographa, as a connecting link. But had we been where the ancient Jews were, with their light only, we should probably have placed it where they have done.

The critics have stumbled at the use of the phrase 'Chaldeans' in this book; and, as one of them has put it, they say it is as if in England at the present day some one should speak of a sect, or portion of the people, as *The English*. But the Book of Daniel uses the phrase 'Chaldeans' in a twofold sense. In one place, at least, it is used for the whole country—'King over the realm of the Chaldeans'; yet a frequent use of the name is clearly to distinguish an old and small division of the priesthood, tracing its descent from a period when Chaldea had a separate existence. The common name for the people at large was the 'People of Babylon,' and 'the King of Babylon' was the common title of the monarch; but meantime we have the position of the 'Chaldeans' carefully defined—'Magicians, Enchanters, Chaldeans, and Sorcerers'—'the Enchanters, the Chaldeans, the Soothsayers.' Have we nothing like this among ourselves? Do we never talk of 'the *Anglican* rite,' to distinguish something in one of our many English churches, even if we do not

press the further distinction between *British* and *English* institutions? ¹

Again we have much made of two Greek words which are said to have found a place in the Book of Daniel, and which determine its date as post-Exilic. They are *both* (and it makes much difference) the names of instruments of music—the one is ‘Psaltery,’ and the other ‘Symphony’—given in ch. iii. in the list of six instruments used in the worship of the image of gold. We do not rest much on the fact that in the one case ‘psaltery,’ the word is changed from ‘psanterin,’ a change as likely to have been made by the Greeks from the Eastern tongue, or *vice versa*; for confessedly that would not cover the case of ‘symphony.’ But what are the facts? The Book of Daniel is one which professes to have been written at the close of the Captivity, shortly after the expiry of the seventy years of Jeremiah’s prophecy, and must have been put into shape about the date of the Return. And there is abundant evidence that in the reign of Cyrus the communication between the Greeks and the Babylonians and Persians, was so general, that, in the matter of music, names of instruments and songs might well be interchanged.² The two

¹ I observe a singular instance of want of care in Professor Sayce’s last book—*Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*. ‘Cyrus (he says), hitherto supposed to be a Persian, appears as an Elamite’ (p. 135). And in the preface (p. 5), ‘Cyrus, we now know, upon his own authority, was King of Elam, *not of Persia*. It was Elam, *and not Persia*, as Isaiah’s prophecies declared, which invaded Babylon.’ But at p. 136 in the *Annalistic Tablet*, referring to the ‘sixth year’ of Nabonidus, after Cyrus has been called King of Media in the beginning of the Tablet, we *also* read: ‘In the month of Nisan, Cyrus, *King of Persia*!’ This was in B.C. 550, or 549, eleven or ten years before Cyrus occupied Babylon. May I be allowed to call attention to the fact that Gobryas, ‘the Governor of Gutium,’ was appointed governor of Babylon when taken by Cyrus, on 11th Marchesvan, a ‘Median’; and query whether he is not ‘Darius the Mede,’ who ‘received the kingdom’ (R.V. Dan. v. 31). He seems to have been a man of some age; and this circumstance also agrees. Practically this seems to be settled by a Tablet of the seventeenth year of Nabonidus, which tells us that when Cyrus entered Babylon, he appointed Gobryas to be governor. The only question remaining is whether he took, and why, the name of Darius.

² The Tel Amarna Tablets speak of a Greek ambassador to Tyre at a very early period (? 1500 B.C.). The Terpander harp of seven strings appears on Assyrian monuments from the age of Assurbanipal (668–625), though only invented about B.C. 650.

Greek words might well be known in Babylon and in Jerusalem before the Book of Daniel was written.

Take one more instance from the same book. Chap. xi. contains admittedly, by both parties, a statement concerning the King Antiochus Epiphanes. According to the orthodox view, it is a prediction of his reign, in the first place, and of future events, in a wider and deeper sense. According to the new critics, it is no prophecy at all, but a history of that reign, written very shortly after the events described. But it is agreed, or admitted, by all, that it professes to be a prophecy, as much so as chap. ii. or as chap. vii., and that there is no possibility of so dealing with its language as to show that it claims to be only a history of the past. Well, is this a question of form, or of substance? What object, what motive, could the writer have had in putting his story of Antiochus into the form of a prophecy—except one? And if the writer of the book meant in this way to deceive, what simpletons were his readers! In the generation immediately after his own, there were hundreds of Rabbis whose fathers had told them of the sacred books which God had given; of the care with which they had been preserved; and of the gulf of separation between them and all other books. In this generation, which shrink from the thought of reckoning the History of the Maccabees, and the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Prayer of Esdras, as books of Scripture, we are asked to believe that the Book of Daniel was received, not as a new book but as one known to the fathers, and equally sacred with Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes! The credulity imputed to that generation is only to be equalled by that shown by the critics, and expected from us! One sometimes wonders whether the curse of Elymas has not fallen upon them, and whether they are not groping now for the door which in former days they knew so well.

Suppose we take a case from our own literary history, to show us what we are expected to believe and accept. Many years ago there was published a volume professing to be *The Poems and Songs of Ossian*, which had been translated from documents of ancient date, written in the Gaelic tongue. It was a modern Iliad of the Scoto-Celtic race, and contained several lengthy and elaborate poems, true children of the mist. The book was published under the editorship of a Mr. M’Pherson. It claimed to deal with the history of the Highlands in a poetic but veracious fashion.

It is true that the histories recounted in it were not generally known to the reading public, but it was asserted that the substance of the poems had long been recited in the cabins of the Highlanders through winter evenings. The critics of the day demanded evidence that the writings were genuine, and asked where were the originals which had been translated by Mr. M'Pherson, with more or less success. These were never produced. Practically it was admitted that there were none. But the contention was that the substance of these historic

songs had been sung and known and recited for generations. It is hardly needful to say that the verdict of to-day is that the history of the Ossianic songs is fabulous, and that it would be lunacy to quote them as an authority for it. Is this not a real parallel to what the Old Testament has become, if Kuenen, Wellhausen, and their English disciples are to be believed? Something that is characteristic of Jewish feeling and tradition lingers in the pages; but Moses, Abraham, Joshua, David, are as shadowy and unreal as Fingal, Oscar, and Cormac.

Contributions and Comments.

The Resurrection of the Body.

YOUR interesting notes on this subject in the May number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES suggest the inquiry, What is St. Paul's doctrine on this subject? Does he really mean to teach that the identical body rises again? It seems to me that he teaches almost the exact contrary. The 'someone' who puts the question, 'How are the dead raised? and with what manner of body do they come?' evidently had 'this identic body' in his mind. For which thought St. Paul calls him 'foolish,' and proceeds to answer: 'That which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind; but God giveth it a body even as it pleased Him, and to each seed a body of its own.' Very distinctly he intimates that the body laid in the earth is 'not that body that shall be,' *i.e.* the raised body is *not* the identical body buried. The body raised bears to the body buried a relation analogous to that which the subsequent plant bears to the grain sown. The two cannot by any stretch of words be called identical; but there is an intimate and most real, though inexplicable, relation between them. The one is a development of the other. Mark the stress the apostle lays upon the analogy, how he uses it in his most impassioned utterances, how he repeats it: 'Sown in corruption,' 'sown in dishonour,' etc. His sharp distinction between 'celestial bodies' and 'bodies terrestrial,' and their respective glories, points in the same direction. As does also the argument of ver. 39: God has various sorts of bodies at His

command, all bodies, but different from each other nevertheless. And He has absolute power over all kinds of material. This wealth of illustration, this display of differences, this insistence upon God's control of every kind of created material, and His ability to produce other kinds, if need be, seem to indicate clearly that the phrase 'this identic body' is too definite, too strong, and therefore misleading, especially as it is employed in popular *parlance*.

Two things, then, are evident. The body raised is so far connected with—or identical with, if you insist upon the term—the body buried that the pronoun *it* may be used of both, '*it* is sown,' '*it* is raised,' and that the process referred to is not a new creation, but a resurrection. On the other hand, the body raised is so different and distinct from the body buried that its analogue is the green blade or the full corn in the ear. We must be careful not to carry the analogy too far; but we must be at least equally careful not to ignore it.

As to 'the serious difficulty of finding any other [than the identical body] theory to fit the facts,' I venture to suggest that this is the very thing that St. Paul himself declines to do, and discourages us from doing. 'God giveth it a body even as it pleased Him, and to each seed a body of its own.' Who could imagine, if he did not know, had not *seen*, the actual facts, that the bare grain cast into the earth would grow up a green blade or a yellow and bearded ear? Or who could imagine that two seeds, scarcely distinguishable from each other, would produce such unlike flowers? The difference—far beyond all antecedent human thought—is in God's gift and God's pleasure. He will do