

THE EMPHASIS IN THE REPORTED PREACHING OF PAUL,
by Rev. Samuel McLanahan.

A SCIENTIFIC HOMILY ON THE RESURRECTION,
by Prof. Geo. Macloskie, LL. D., D. Sc.

VOLUME VII. *New Series.*

APRIL, 1903.

NUMBER 4.

The Bible Student

220.05
B58
C45

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

Editors:

WILLIAM M. MCPHETERS, D. D.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D. D., LL. D.

SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.

JOHN D. DAVIS, PH. D., D. D.

Contents:

- I. EDITORIAL NOTES: Creed and Life. "The New Religious Experience." A New Note. Prayer. The Soul and God. No Authority Anywhere. "Less Celestial, More Earthly." The Result. (S. M. S.) ** Professor Friedrich Delitzsch. His Specialty. His General Contention Supported by the Bible. Concerning Monotheism. Concerning the Name Jehovah. His Bondage to His Theory. German Criticism of His Rationalism. His Lectures and the German Church. (J. D. D.) ** The Question of Miracles Again. Are Miracles Incapable of Proof? What is the Object of Testimony? Only One Kind of Occurrence. Theories versus Facts. Plasticity of Theories. Miracles a Matter of Evidence. (B. B. W.)..... 181
- II. THE SPEECHES OF PAUL IN THE ACTS. *J. Ritchie Smith*..... 198
- III. PAUL'S PRAYERS FOR THE EPHESIANS. *Samuel T. Lowrie*..... 204
- IV. THE EMPHASIS IN THE REPORTED PREACHING OF PAUL. *Samuel McLanahan*..... 210
- V. A SCIENTIFIC HOMILY ON THE RESURRECTION. *George Macloskie*..... 217
- VI. ALLEGED INACCURACIES IN ACTS. *J. W. Beardslee*..... 226
- VII. CURRENT BIBLICAL THOUGHT: A Critic's Criticism of Critics. The Elusive Argument From "Style." König's Verdict on Recent Metrical Theories. Pseudo-Scientific Generalizations. The Patriarchs Not Personifications of the Tribes. Saga versus History. (J. OSCAR BOYD.) Great Babylon, the Mother of Us All. Law Four Thousand Years Ago. Hammurabi the Lord of Righteousness. The Laws of Babylon and the Laws of Israel. (B. B. W.).. 235

The R. L. Bryan Company Press, Columbia, S. C.

ON SALE BY—JOHN WANAMAKER, New York and Philadelphia.
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, Philadelphia.
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION, 1601 Main St., Richmond, Va.

Address all communications to The Bible Student, 1426 Richland Street, Columbia, S. C.

The Bible Student.

CONTINUING

The Bible Student and Religious Outlook.

Vol. VII., New Series. APRIL, 1903.

Number 4.

Some writers are fond of emphasizing a difference between theology and religion, to the somewhat evident and decided discredit of the former. That there is a difference no discriminating mind will deny; but at the same time every thoughtful person will recognize between one's theology and his religion a constant and vital relation: a man's conception of religious truth will inevitably determine the character of that man's religious life. A disposition to minimize the importance of theological beliefs in favor of an emphasis upon the practical duties of religion betrays a lamentable ignorance of the necessary connection between the two, a connection analogous to that existing between the heart and the arteries. Any decided change in one's conception of religious truth will sooner or later infallibly register itself in a corresponding change in his religious life. This fact has been much obscured of late years. There has been a marked effort to divorce the two, to insinuate an independence between them, to ignore or at least depreciate the importance of doctrine, to institute and force a contrast between creed and life, to suggest mere theoretical abstraction in the former

and absorb attention in the latter as alone worth the serious thought of a practical age.

Cautious, conservative thinkers have long marked this tendency and have again and again deplored it, have repeatedly and insistently asserted the vital connection between the two and have plainly advertized what seemed to them an irreparable loss sure to follow a position so irrational. Their protests, however, have been either ignored or scorned and all danger scouted as mere imagination while the reading public was constantly and confidently assured that the modern tendency meant nothing but illumination and emancipation, only a larger liberty and a deepening spirituality, a baptism of fresh power that would be felt in every department of religious faith and religious feeling; that it promised gain and nothing but gain, no possible loss in any direction.

Any reader who has kept up with the discussion from the beginning must have noticed in the last few years a very gradual but a very marked disposition to abate these claims. A careful comparison between any article appearing within the last twelve months and one put forth ten or even five years ago will show this abatement most strikingly.

particular part of the Old Testament under consideration, as do not permit of explanation according to the rules he has previously laid down."

Saga versus History.

(9). The poetizing method. This manner of treating the Old Testament narratives is best illustrated by GUNDEL in his date commentary on Genesis. KÖNIG is at his best in this, the last section of his brochure, in which he aims his shafts at those who, with GUNDEL, would have us regard the whole narrative of the patriarchal period as saga, not history. "History," says GUNDEL, "deals with great public events; saga tells about the things in which the common people have an interest, the personal and private." Well does KÖNIG exclaim: "What an arbitrary declaration, that particular events happening to persons and families possess no importance! Does not the historian relate just such occurrences? Does GUNDEL reckon Tacitus, for example, among the historians? How much in him tells about individuals! How if a Rachel or a Leah were quite as important to the Israelite, as to the Roman a Plancina and an Agrippina?"

"But," writes GUNDEL again, "the principal thing is and remains the *poetical tone* of these stories," meaning the stories of Genesis. KÖNIG replies: "Childlike one may call them, naive or the like, but to make their chief characteristic their poetical tone, is, to speak mildly, an altogether subjective judgment. The poetry that could be taken up into the service of the Old Testament religion, was only the poetical reproduction of the religious history, or the poetical echo of the joy over this religious history and the poetical representation of the new inward life that was quickened by those historical experiences of Israel. Do you want to hear this poetical

echo of the Old Testament history of salvation? Harken then to the triumph-song of Israel just escaped by God's help from the house of bondage, Egypt (Ex. xv.), and to the other *really* poetical parts of the old Hebrew literature. The most prominent trait of the Old Testament religion lies in this, that it claims to rest on facts, on an objective basis. All imaginative, factitious, subjective elements it rejects. How then dare you assert that it has especially cherished the poetical, that is to say, the artificial, story? This latest principle of Old Testament criticism involves, therefore, a denial of objectivity as the fundamental characteristic of Israel's religious history."

Such words, coming from such a source, are timely and weighty. It would be well if they were translated and set before the eyes of every American critic of the Old Testament.

J. OSCAR BOYD.

Great Babylon, The Mother Of Us All. There has grown up in Germany in recent years a school of Orientalists of whom Drs. HUGO WINCKLER and FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH are perhaps the most widely known representatives. This school has apparently set itself to explain the whole history of culture, including the whole development of religion as seen in Judaism and Christianity, as mere natural modifications of the ancient conceptions of Babylon. In the first number of the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* for the literature of 1901 Dr. GEORGE BEER calls attention to this new outbreak of constructive imagination.

"Recent theories," he remarks, "along with their own fantasy have misled certain Assyriologists into the notion of a Babylonian world-conception based on mythology and astral religion which formed the foundation of the entire antique culture (including the Israelitish-Jewish). The

special task of ancient history, according to this view, is merely to trace the transformations undergone by the Babylonian conceptions, in the countries small and large into which they have been conveyed, including Greece and Rome."

The general public were made startlingly aware of the existence and mode of theorizing of this school, last year by the publication of Dr. DÄLITZSCH's lecture delivered before "His Majesty the German Emperor and King," called "Babel and Bible." In this lecture he endeavored to trace pretty nearly everything, not merely on earth but in heaven also, back to Babylon—this new mother of all human culture. "I have succeeded in showing," he complacently concludes, "that there is very much that is purely Babylonian that still, through the medium of the Bible, clings to our religious thought." The Sabbath, the flood, the creation, the fall, heaven, hell, the angels, demons, devils,—even God himself, his names, unity, character,—the Ten Commandments and the best of the ethics—of the Bible, are all, according to Dr. DÄLITZSCH merely developments of conceptions borrowed from Babylon. The stir aroused by this very stirring lecture is not yet passed away. A multitude of pamphlets, essays, lectures, have been published reviewing, defending, refuting it. The first number of the *Christliche Welt* for the year 1903, for example, contains a very pointed paper by JENSEN refuting Dr. DÄLITZSCH's assertion that the better spirits of early Babylonia were Monotheists and the forerunners and indeed originators of Israelitish belief in One God.

**Law Four
Thousand
Years Ago.**

same vigorous and industrious body of scholars—a gift of, we trust, better

omen. It is a thin pamphlet bearing the title, *Die Gesetze Hammurabis* and constituting the fourth part of the fourth volume of the series of papers published by the great Leipzig house of Hinrich for the *Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft* under the general title of *Der alte Orient*. It contains a code of laws published by Abraham's contemporary Hammurabi (Amraphel is the Biblical form of the name) some two thousand years or more before Christ, translated by Dr. WINCKLER, from a stone found at Susa in Persia by the French explorer M. DÈMORGAN. It is a remarkable code of laws in itself apart from the double additional interest it derives from its extreme antiquity and its relation to the Mosaic enactments. It may indeed be said that it yields in interest to scarcely any "find" hitherto brought from the far East. *The Independent* has printed an English translation of Dr. WINCKLER's German version (in the three numbers for January 8, 15 and 22, 1903,) and has devoted two informing editorial articles to it (Dec. 25, 1902, and January 22, 1903). Those who wish to know for themselves what these laws are like can consult them conveniently in its pages.

**Hammurabi
The Lord of
Righteousness.**

The first thing that strikes the reader, perhaps, is the seriousness with which Hammurabi takes his function as law-giver. It is as "king of righteousness" that he comes forward with his laws: and he declares that he publishes them "to bring about the rule of righteousness in the land, to destroy the wicked and evil-doers, so that the strong should not harm the weak,"—that security might be guaranteed to the people in their homes, and widows and orphans might be protected. The laws themselves reflect a peaceful,

agricultural and commercial society, settled by a great river's side and near enough to the wilderness to embrace under their jurisdiction flocks and herds liable to incursions of wild beasts. The chief disturbing element in the well ordered life of this community arises from frequent wars, carried on no doubt at a distance, by which they were not liable, therefore, to be themselves wasted, but on account of which their male population was apt to be withdrawn for long periods from home. The code opens with clauses designed to protect men from miscarriage of justice: frivolous accusation is punished and all carelessness on the part of the judge in dealing with cases most severely. Then comes a long series of laws concerned with property-rights: first those dealing with theft: then those dealing with the complications in property-rights growing out of absence on military service: then those dealing with land rentals and irrigation, and grazing-rights and long leases that pass into transferences. These agricultural laws are succeeded by a series regulating more specifically commercial relations,—banking, brokerage, taverns, deposits, and the like. Then follows a long series treating of marriage and the relations of the sexes, slander, betrothal, adultery, desertion, divorce, concubinage, incest, financial rights of wives and widows. These pass into the laws of inheritance in general, and these naturally into laws concerning adoption and that other form of adoption,—apprenticeship. The laws regulating crimes of violence against the person come next, based generally on the idea of retaliation and compensation, and these oddly enough pass into laws regulating the practice of surgery which seems to be treated almost as a form of violence. At all events, as the careless judge, so also the careless surgeon is made to suffer for his

carelessness: if he succeeds, well and good,—he shall be paid handsomely; but if he fails,—why, the hands that failed him in skill shall be cut off! This feature recurs through the whole code: the judge that failed to do justice, shall "pay twelve times the fine set by him in the case," and be forever disqualified for the office of judge; the surgeon that fails shall lose his unskilful hands, or if the operation be on a beast shall pay a fourth of the value of the animal; the careless builder shall pay for the evil wrought by the falling house; the careless ship-builder shall bear all the cost of repairs; and the like. From the surgeons the laws proceed to regulate other trades—those of house-building and ship-building, and sailors, and ploughmen, and field-laborers, and herdsmen, and slaves, and so come naturally to their end, with the lowest class in the community.

**The Laws of
Babylon and
The Laws of
Israel.**

As has already been said the code presents some curious parallels with the law system of Israel

—parallels largely growing out of similar social usages, perhaps common origins. They present also just as curious differences. One of the most striking of the parallels in social usage is brought to light by the laws regulating concubinage, given in the sections numbered 144-147: "If a man take a wife and this woman give her husband a maid-servant, and she bear him children, but this man wishes to take another wife, this shall not be permitted to him; he shall not take a second wife. If a man take a wife, and she bear him no children, and he intend to take another wife: if he take this second wife, and bring her into the house, this second wife shall not be on equality with his wife. If a man take a wife and she give this man a maid-servant as wife and she

bear him children and then this maid assume equality with the wife: because she hath borne him children, her master shall not sell her for money, but he may keep her as a slave, reckoning her among the maid servants. If she hath not borne him children, then her mistress may sell her for money." What a flood of light these enactments throw on the history of Hagar (Gen. xvi.). It is quite clear that the laws of Hammurabi regulate a social usage which the action of Abraham illustrates in its minutest details. Take again this passage in the laws of burglary,—which is very significant of the relations between the two sets of laws: "If any one break a hole into a house, he shall be put to death before that hole and be burned." Exodus xxii. 2-3 provides that if he be smitten in the act, it shall not be accounted murder; but that he shall not be put to death for his crime but shall be fined or, failing to pay the fine, shall be enslaved. A superior humanity animates the Hebrew code—a higher regard for human life and personal as distinguished from property concerns. *The Independent* draws especial attention to this; and illustrates it at some length; and it is deserving of the emphasis it gives it. But it must not be thought that Hammurabi's code is a harsh and heartless code. It is only in contrast with the supreme humanity of the Mosaic enactments that it can be called harsh. In itself it is a remarkably mild code and does not fail to provide, as the king in publishing it affirms, for the

protection of the weak and the succoring of the widows and orphans. Take this for instance: "If a man take a wife, and she be seized by disease, if he then desire to take a second wife he shall not put away his wife who has been attacked by disease, but he shall keep her in the house which he has built and support her so long as she lives." That just and even tender enactment is characteristic of this code. Its whole law of marriage is built up on an essential presupposition of monogamy and reflects the tender relations that grow up only in monogamous marriage. Everywhere the code protects the classes most liable to oppression. If there are some harsh penalties inflicted for what seem to us minor offences against property—yet everywhere these penalties are made to guard the widow and the orphan, the deserted and the friendless. We come to like Hammurabi immensely as we read his laws. When we think of Abraham bringing into Canaan with him a hereditary body of usages reflected in such laws as these, already codified and in widely extended authority in that Eastern land whence he came forth,—we wonder how it can be longer maintained that Moses, a thousand years afterwards, cannot possibly be supposed to have put forth a code like that recorded in the Pentateuch. Surely the laws there codified must have had a long history of usages to explain them: but why could it not have been a pre-Mosaic rather than a post-Mosaic history?

B. B. W.