

Princeton University Library



32101 063584666

5001
183
v.1

Library of



Princeton University.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

CONDUCTED BY
EDWARD ROBINSON
Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

VOLUME FIRST.

Nos. I—IV.

ANDOVER :
FLAGG & GOULD, PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS.

Codman Press.
1831.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

NO. I.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY. —By the Editor		TATION, AND SOME TOPICS CONNECTED WITH IT. —By Prof. Stuart	139
Introduction	1		
Part I. German Universities	7	ART. V. GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY OF THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. —By Prof. Tittmann of Leipsic. Translated by the Editor	160
ART. II. INTERPRETATION OF PSALM XVI. —By Prof. Stuart.			
Introductory Observations	51	ART. VI. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE AND EDUCATION IN ITALY. By Prof. Tholuck, of Halle. Transl. by the Editor	177
Translation	75		
Commentary	76	ART. VII. LITERARY NOTICES. —By the Editor.	
ART. III. GRAMMATICO-HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. —By Prof. Hahn, of Leipsic. Translated by the Editor		I. Literature of the Old Testament	186
Introductory Notices	111	II. Literature of the N. Testament	190
Hahn on Interpretation	117	III. Systematic Theology	193
ART. IV. REMARKS ON HAHN'S DEFINITION OF INTERPRE-		IV. Oriental Literature	194

NO. II.

ART. I. THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY. —By the Editor.		ART. IV. PREVALENCE OF THE ARAMAEAN LANGUAGE IN PALESTINE IN THE AGE OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES. —By Prof. Pfannkuche of Giessen. Translated by the Editor	317
Part II. Course of Study at the Universities	201		
ART. II. CREED OF ARMINIUS, WITH A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE AND TIMES. —By Prof. Stuart.		ART. V. INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS VIII. 18—25. —By Prof. Stuart	363
Introductory Observations	226		
Sketch of Arminius and his Times	229	ART. VI. LITERARY NOTICES. —By the Editor.	
Creed of Arminius	263	Zend-Avesta	407
ART. III. LANGUAGE OF PALESTINE IN THE AGE OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES. An Introductory Article.—By the Editor	309	Extract of a letter from Professor Hahn	408

5001 (RECAP)
183

V. I, No. 1-4

58978

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

NO. III.

<p>ART. I. THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.—By the Editor. Part III. Examinations, Ministerial Standing, etc. 409</p> <p>ART. II. SIMPLICITY OF INTERPRETATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.—By Prof. Tittmann, of Leipsic. Translated by the Editor 452</p> <p>ART. III. CAUSES OF FORCED INTERPRETATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.—By Prof. Tittmann, of Leipsic. Translated by the Editor 464</p> <p>ART. IV. CLAIMS OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.—By Prof. Turner, of New York. Lecture I. 491 " II. 593 " III. 516</p>	<p>ART. V. PREVALENCE OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE IN PALESTINE IN THE AGE OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES.—From Hug's 'Einleitung ins Neue Testament.' 530</p> <p>ART. VI. LEXICOGRAPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, IN A CRITIQUE ON THE LEXICONS OF WAHL AND BRETSCHNEIDER.—By Prof. Tholuck, of Halle. Translated by the Editor. Preliminary Remarks 552 Review 554</p> <p>ART. VII. INTERPRETATION OF JUDGES, CHAP. V. THE SONG OF DEBORAH AND BARAK.—By the Editor. Introduction 568 Translation 572 Notes 579</p> <p>LITERARY NOTICES 619</p>
--	---

NO. IV.

<p>ART. I. THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY 613 Part IV. Directions for theological students entering the university of Halle. Published by the theological faculty. Translated by the Editor. Preliminary Remarks 613 General View of Theological Study 615 Appendix 636</p> <p>ART. II. NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE GREEK STYLE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.—By Prof. H. Planck, of Gottingen. Translated by the Editor 638 Preliminary Notice 638 Introduction 640 Part I. Origin and Progress of the later Greek language 650 Part. II. Characteristics of the later Greek in the New Testament 658</p> <p>ART. III. GENERAL VIEW OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND</p>	<p>ITS DIALECTS. From Buttmann's Greek Grammar. Translated by the Editor 692</p> <p>ART. IV. GENUINENESS OF ISAAH, CHAP. XL.—LXVI. From Hengstenberg's 'Christologie.'—Translated by the Editor 700 Introductory Remarks 700 Objections considered 705 Positive Grounds 723</p> <p>ART. V. MEANING OF <i>KYPHOS</i> IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, PARTICULARLY AS EMPLOYED BY PAUL.—By Prof. Stuart 733</p> <p>ART. VI. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE 776 From Dr Henderson to Prof. Stuart 776 " Dr Smith to Prof. Stuart 778 " Dr Smith to the Editor 779 " Prof. Lee to the Editor 780 Letter from Mr Lee to J. Scott, Esq. 782</p> <p>INDEXES TO VOL. I. 787</p>
---	--

CORRIGENDA IN NO. I.

Page 60, l. 13 fr. bot. read *sixth* instead of *ninth*.
Page 198 at the close.—Lator information enables us to state, that Freytag's Arabic Lexicon is to be completed in *three* parts or volumes, and that the retail price of the *whole* work in Germany is 20 six dollars, or between \$14 and \$15, payable on the delivery of Part I.
NOTE.—The mark (°) was prefixed to the titles of several works in No. I. to denote that they are in the Library of the Theol. Seminary, Andover. This plan was afterwards abandoned.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. I.

JANUARY, 1831.

ART. I.—THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

INTRODUCTION.

IN commencing a work like the present, designed to promote a spirit of ardent and judicious inquiry in the wide field of Biblical literature, the Editor supposes he cannot render a more acceptable service to the great body of his readers, than to lay before them some information on the subject of theological education and the general character of the clergy in Germany. The history of that country for several centuries is an object of intense interest to the theologian, as well as to the politician. That assemblage of nations comprised under the general name of Germany, has long been, what it still is, a people of comparatively little practical energy, but of vast intellectual exertion. Broken up into a multitude of larger or of petty states, without a capital to serve as a centre of laws or of religious effort, and living under governments essentially despotic, their moral and mental energies have had no outlet in the ordinary channels of civil life and practical utility, which exist under free governments; and have therefore been able to display themselves only in the walks of literature and theoretical science. But in all that regards intellectual labour and intellectual excitement, and in all that serves as sustenance to these, the Germans fall at least behind no other people; in many things they have been far in advance of all other nations. The art of printing, with all its mighty results, owes its birth to Germany. Here too was engendered that spark, which kindled and spread with the rapidity

of lightning over northern Europe, and produced at length the clear and steady light of the Reformation.

It is singular to remark, however, that in all the fierce discussions of the time relative to religious liberty, which formed the very basis of the Reformation, and in the violent rejection of the papal authority in matters of faith and religious practice, there was no direct or at least no efficient application of the same principles to civil rights. The governments continued as despotic as before ; and the question of any possible political reform does not seem to have been seriously agitated. But in England, the more practical tendency of the people produced, in time, the natural results of a struggle for liberty of any kind. The same principles and reasonings that led men to burst the shackles which ecclesiastical tyranny had imposed on them for ages, led them also to call in question the validity of that civil tyranny, by which they were deprived of their natural rights. It is thus that the Reformation in Germany, operating also upon England, and there extended to the kindred question of political liberty, may be regarded as the great ultimate cause, which led to the settlement of this western world. It is the great principle of liberty of thought, suggested to the mind of the Monk of Wittemberg, and by him spread out before the world,—and in England coupled with the great kindred principle of liberty of action,—that has lain at the foundation of all the mighty movements of succeeding centuries. If it were right to refer to a single individual that which was but the expression of the spirit of an age, we might thus ascribe to Luther not only the Reformation in Germany and England, but also regard his exertions as the germ, from which have sprung all the great political events that have since astonished and convulsed the world ; the revolutions of England and of France ; and with happier results, the foundation of a new empire in a new hemisphere ; with the revolution by which this last threw off the pressure of a foreign yoke, and founded, on a basis unknown in history, institutions of freedom which will bear the test of experience, so long as virtue and intelligence shall be the characteristics of the people ; but which, it requires not the power of prophetic vision to foresee, will be surely swept away, whenever ignorance and irreligion shall become predominant in the land.

The light of the Reformation has not yet departed from Germany ; although its glory has been obscured in these latter days, by urging to an extreme the fundamental principles on which it

proceeded. The Reformers, with all their zeal for liberty of thinking and freedom of investigation, never had a thought of subjecting the form and matter of revelation to the decisions of human reason. With them the Bible was **THE ONLY AND SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.** Their reason acknowledged its authority as paramount to all other, and yielded with reverent submission to the guidance of its holy precepts. In modern times, men whose hearts have been opposed to the truths of revelation, have carried their freedom of investigation to the extreme of calling in question and denying, not only the fact of an actual revelation, but also the possibility of one at any time and in any circumstances. The reason of man has been proclaimed the source and the interpreter of all religion; the Scriptures declared to be the production of merely human wisdom; and all systems of faith and practice deduced from their pages, denounced as the imposition of a crafty priesthood upon the ignorant and credulous. All this however is nothing more than had already taken place, and with still greater virulence, in other nations; especially in England and France. The difference is, that in the latter countries these enemies of revelation were not enrolled under the banners of the church; they attacked her as open adversaries; while in Germany the poison has spread through the body of the church itself; and those who have solemnly bound themselves to make the Bible their only rule of faith and practice, have been among the first to discard its authority and contest its doctrines. The rationalism of Germany is the deism of England. The latter was professed by a few; the former has spread among the many; and its advocates, by pressing their consistency to its ultimate results, have already produced a reaction, which promises, by the blessing of God, in time to bring back the German churches to the faith and practice of the Gospel, as exhibited in the principles of the Reformation.

To an American who goes to reside for a time in Germany, the object of the greatest interest is not to study human nature in a different hemisphere, for that is every where much the same. It is not to observe manners and customs unlike those of his own land, for the novelty of these soon wears away, and they cease to make an impression on his mind. But it is rather to trace the developments of national character and feeling, as acting upon, or as affected by, their forms of religious faith and practice; it is especially the fact, that he is treading on histori-

cal ground. We as a nation have no antiquity, and no history, except of recent date; and our very spirit of change and improvement prevents us from preserving that which is old, merely for the sake of its antiquity. But in Germany all is different. There a love of antiquity predominates in external things, although discarded in regard to intellectual matters; and centuries seem there to be less remote from one another, than we have here been accustomed to conceive them. The period of the Reformation seems hardly separated from the present time. The names of Luther and Melancthon are as familiar in the mouths of the people, as with us those of Washington and Franklin; and the great Reformer is regarded with the same sort of filial veneration, as is our great champion of civil liberty. You pass through the small city of Eisleben, and visit his father's house. An inscription above the door announces that this was the birth place of Luther. A school for poor children is now kept in the house, the master of which shews you around, and explains to you the relics they have collected in the room where the Reformer was born. At Wittemberg you visit his cell in the old convent, now the location of a theological seminary; you see there the table, the huge stove, the seat in the window, just as when occupied by Luther in the beginning of his career; and it requires no great stretch of imagination to behold him and Melancthon, engaged in discussions which they little expected were to agitate the world. You enter the ancient church by the door on which Luther posted up his celebrated theses; within, the two friends lie entombed over against each other in front of the pulpit, and their portraits hang upon the walls. You go to the spot where Luther publicly burned the pope's bull, and thus cut off all hope of reconciliation; you walk the streets of the city; and all now remains as it was then. The persons and the generation are gone; but their place, and their houses, and their streets, and all the objects by which they were surrounded, are still before you, and are now presented to your eyes, just as once they met their view. In such circumstances it is almost with a painful feeling, that you wake as it were from a dream, and call to mind, that all this refers back to a hundred years before the earliest settlement of your native land. The ruined castles and massy churches which one every where sees, are monuments of still earlier ages; and are associated with the history and the legends of a thousand years. The past and the present here take hold of each other; and the ages that lie between them seem annihilat-

ed. This feeling, it is true, is carried to a still higher degree of solemnity and sublimity at Rome; where the monuments of ancient grandeur seem like the relics of another world.

The Germans, in their love of antiquity, are also eminently lovers of history. They require for every opinion and every doctrine, not only the proofs of reason and Scripture, but also the historical proof. They thus make history what it really is, the record of the experience of past ages; and they are slow to give credit to that which has not been tested by this experience. In this way the history of the Church has become to them one of the prime elements of the study of theology; and without this, one would no more be accounted an accomplished theologian, than he would be without a knowledge of the original languages of the Bible. One part of this history, viz. *Dogmengeschichte*, the history of doctrinal theology, or of the rise and development of the doctrines which are and have been current within the pale of the church, is almost peculiar to Germany. It cannot be denied that this is a department of very great importance; or that a doctrine or system of doctrines will ordinarily be better understood, if we know the occasion of their rise, the circumstances and character of those by whom they were first advanced, the discussions and contests they have undergone, the various modifications they may have received,—in short, all the historical facts and events connected with them, through the influence of which they have assumed the shape in which they are now presented to us. This subject has usually been treated of in Germany as a branch of ecclesiastical history in general; though several works of merit have appeared, devoted to the separate and more detailed consideration of it.*

As a suitable transition to the more immediate object of the present article, it may be observed, that the universities of Germany are also intimately connected with the history and antiquities of the country. Of those which still exist, the following were founded before the Reformation, viz. Prague in 1348, Vienna 1365, Heidelberg 1386, Leipsic 1409, Rostock 1419,

* The best history of doctrinal theology is found in NEANDER, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christl. Religion u. Kirche*, Hamb. 1826 ff.—The best separate works are, MÜNSCHER, *Handbuch der christl. Dogmengeschichte*, 4 vols. 8vo. Marburg 1804—18. A short outline of this work for the use of lectures (Marb. 1812), has been translated by Dr Murdock, New Haven, 1830.—AUGUSTI, *Lehrbuch der christl. Dogmengesch.* Leipz. 1820. 3d. ed.—BERTHOLDT, *Handbuch der Dogmengesch.* 2 vols. Erlangen, 1822.

Griefswalde 1456, Freiburg 1457, Tübingen 1447, Wittemberg 1502. This last, which in the first twenty years of its existence became to its immortal honour the cradle of the Reformation, was in 1815 transferred to Halle and united with the younger university of that place. This was done by the Prussian government on very sufficient grounds, after the union of that part of Saxony with Prussia; but it was done greatly against the wishes and the will of the people at large, to whom that spot had become consecrated in history. To quiet the people of Wittemberg, a theological seminary was established there in place of the university, in which young men who have finished their university course, may still pursue their studies. There is here free provision for twenty-two pupils; and the number of those who support themselves is not limited. Two of the old Professors of the university, Schleusner and Nitzsch, were left here to sleep out the remainder of their lives; while the general superintendence and instruction is entrusted to Heubner, a learned and pious man. The seminary however is little frequented.—In all the universities above-mentioned, the rights and privileges, the organization, the modes of teaching, indeed the whole external character of the institutions, have come down from a period anterior to the Reformation, except so far as they were necessarily modified by the changes which then took place. Throughout protestant Germany, the system of university education is in its leading features one and the same. It is the result of the experience of several centuries, and is now so interwoven with the character and principles, with the affections and prejudices of the people, that a change would be in a measure impossible.

In preparing an article on the state of theological education in Germany, it was the first intention of the writer to incorporate in it a cursory notice of the universities of that country, so far only as they have a direct influence on this branch of education. As however these institutions constitute in themselves a subject of great importance, and also of great interest to the literary men and students of our own country, and have moreover so much connexion with and bearing upon theological learning and literature; it has been thought best to treat of them under a distinct head; and thus divide the article into two parts, one of which may serve as a species of introduction to the other. Our attention will be chiefly confined to the universities of protestant Germany.

PART I. GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

It is natural and it has been customary for us, to compare the universities of foreign countries with the seminaries which bear that name and with the colleges of our own land ; and to derive our notions of the former in a great measure from our acquaintance with the latter. In regard to the universities of Germany, however, such a course must lead to false conclusions ; since there is scarcely a point of resemblance between those institutions and the universities or colleges of the United States. A German university is essentially a *professional* school, or rather an assemblage of such schools, comprising the four faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy ; the latter of which corresponds to what is elsewhere called the faculty of letters and science, and embraces every thing not strictly comprehended in some one of the other three. Those students who attend lectures in the first three faculties, do it merely as a course of professional study, and with direct reference to the professional occupations of their future lives. Those who attend in the philosophical faculty, are mostly such as are preparing themselves to become professors in the universities, or teachers in the classical or other schools ; or they are qualifying themselves for the general pursuits of literature and science ; or they are such as are chiefly attending to professional studies in one of the first three faculties, but wish at the same time to make themselves acquainted with other branches of learning. Hence the different faculties correspond precisely to our professional seminaries and schools ; so that could we consent to bring together into one place one of our theological seminaries, a law school, and a medical school ; unite the libraries and the advantages of all ; and add a faculty of letters and science ; the result would be a university entirely on the German plan. Whether such a course would be advisable or practicable in the present state of our country, is a question often asked in this time of excitement on the subject of education ; but to answer it properly is a matter of no little difficulty. In the course of these remarks, we hope to lay before the reader some facts and suggestions which may enable him, in some degree, to form his own judgment on this question. At present, the only advances towards such a plan in our country are exhibited at Cambridge and New Haven ; where however not more than two of the faculties, in the proper sense of that word, have gone into complete operation.

The universities of Germany were all founded by the governments of the countries in which they are respectively situated; but up to the time of the Reformation all such foundations, with their rights and privileges, had to receive the confirmation of the popes. That of Wittemberg in 1502 was the first that was confirmed by the emperor of Germany, and not by the pope; although the assent of the latter was afterwards applied for. That of Marburg in 1525 was at first confirmed by neither pope nor emperor; but received afterwards the sanction of the latter. After the Reformation, all new universities were confirmed by the emperors in the rights and privileges granted to them by their own sovereigns. The last which received this sanction, was that of Göttingen in 1734. Erlangen, founded in 1743, appears not to have received it. From that time till the dissolution of the German empire in 1806, no new university was established. Those which have been since founded, as Berlin, Bonn, and Munich, exist of course only by the will of their own sovereigns; than which there is at present no higher authority.

At the present day, all the universities are immediately and entirely dependent on the respective governments within whose bounds they fall. All the professors and instructors of every kind are appointed, and generally speaking their salaries paid, directly by the government; which supports also or directs the whole expense of the university, of the erection and repair of buildings,* of the increase of the library and scientific collections, etc. The writer has not sufficient information to enable him to state with precision, what sums are annually appropriated to the support of the several universities, nor even of the larger ones. He only knows that the Prussian government pays annually, on account of each of the universities of Halle and Bonn, the sum of 80,000 rix dollars, which is equal to about \$56,000. The government of Würtemberg appropriates annually to the university of Tübingen the sum of 80,000 florins, or about \$33,600. This is exclusive of the expense of a particular institution in the university (to be described hereafter), for the support of protestant and

* It has been often said that German universities have no buildings. This is true in one sense, and not in another. All have a building for a library and for scientific collections; some have one with lecture rooms; others have hospitals; and all have a riding school. But it is universally true that there are no buildings for the accommodation of students, who everywhere live in hired rooms, and mostly in private houses.

catholic theological students; the annual cost of which is from 90,000 to 100,000 florins, or from \$37,600 to \$42,000.—The universities do not exist as independent associations under charters granted by the governments; but stand immediately under their control; are regulated by them; and may at any moment be abolished by a decree of the same power, which called them into existence.

The professors are of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary. They are all appointed alike, but differ in rank. The ordinary professors, strictly speaking, constitute the faculty; they are members of the academical senate, and thus have a voice in the government of the university; they have a dean of the faculty, who is always chosen by and from themselves. When appointed, the ordinary professors may enter immediately on their duties without inauguration; but in order to enjoy all the rights and immunities of their office, and especially to be eligible as dean of the faculty, they must first hold a public disputation in Latin *pro loco obtinendo*. The professors extraordinary are simply teachers, and have no further duties nor privileges. Besides these there is another class of private instructors, *privatim docentes*, composed of young men who have taken the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (equivalent to our Master of Arts,) and have then permission to read lectures and give private instruction in the universities.—The regular salaries of the ordinary professors vary according to circumstances from 500 to 2000 rix dollars (\$350 to \$1400), and rarely exceed the latter sum. The professors extraordinary seldom receive more than 500 rix dollars; often not more than 100; and the instances are not rare, where a man is at first glad to receive merely the title, without any salary whatever. The private teachers also have no salary. All the professors and instructors receive fees from the students for their private courses of lectures; which however, except in extraordinary cases, do not amount to any considerable sum.

This class of private teachers is the nursery in which all future professors are trained; where they are seen just budding into life; and whence, if they flourish with a vigorous and healthy growth, they are soon transplanted to a maturer soil. If a young man distinguishes himself in this situation, he is very soon promoted to be a professor extraordinary. The governments have here an opportunity to judge of the qualifications of candidates for literary stations; and of selecting and secur-

ing the services of the best men; and to a young man of real promise, they are usually not slow in holding out a reward. A young man of talent and promise came to Halle in 1827 as a private instructor in the department of history; in 1828 he was made professor extraordinary; and in 1829 advanced to the rank of ordinary professor; and such instances are not uncommon. The extraordinary professorship again is regarded as a stepping stone to the ordinary one. It gives a young man a certain rank and standing in the university; he no longer reads lectures merely on sufferance; he has at least a permanent place; has enjoyed the notice of government; and is sure, if he continues to distinguish himself, of being further promoted. This however does not always take place of course. It is not unfrequent that a young man starts well in the beginning, who afterwards sits down satisfied with his present attainments, and makes no further progress. In such a case, his promotion is at an end, so far as the merits of the individual are concerned; for here, as elsewhere, importunity and favouritism often produce results, at which the public, who judge the question on its merits, are astonished. At Halle were two extraordinary professors of theology of about seventy years of age, who had held that station during the greater part of their lives; in 1829 one of them was made *ordinarius*; while the other remains as before. Private teachers are also sometimes found of the age of forty or fifty years; but they are usually such as have not had interest enough with the government to rise in spite of mediocrity.—In some instances literary men, with the permission of the government, give courses of lectures at the universities, and receive fees, without being attached to the institution in any other way, than as *privatim docentes*. Thus the historian Niebuhr, in his character of member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, reads lectures at Bonn; and at Halle a former major general was lecturing on military history and tactics.

From this arrangement of the instructors into different classes, and the practice of admitting young men of the requisite qualifications to teach at pleasure in the universities, arise two important benefits, which are as yet unknown in the institutions of our own country. The first is, that a number of persons are thus always in training, either as private teachers or as professors extraordinary, in the different departments of literature and science, out of whom the higher professorships, when they become vacant, may be at once supplied. When therefore an ordinary

professor dies, or removes to another sphere, the question is not, as with us, where a successor may be found ; but the difficulty lies in selecting the best out of the many candidates, who are already well qualified for the office. In this country we are compelled to choose, not the man who is already qualified, but him who, under all the circumstances, will probably be best able to qualify himself for the office, after he shall have been appointed. The consequence is, that a man of eminence in some public calling is for that reason often chosen to a professorship, with the duties of which he is wholly unacquainted. He must therefore first spend some years in obtaining himself that knowledge, which as a professor he is required to teach to others. In this respect the evil is entirely remedied in Germany ; but neither there nor any where is it possible to supply at once, and in all respects, the places of the more distinguished teachers. Many a man in the course of a long and active life acquires a stock of information and of influence, the loss of which can never be supplied. A younger man may indeed have all the learning and talent that is requisite to render him as good a lecturer and instructor ; but he cannot as yet have the experience nor the reputation of his predecessor ; and very probably may never be able to reach an equal standing. None of the successors of Newton have ever enjoyed the same reputation ; although, as teachers, they may perhaps have been superior to him. As a Hebrew scholar the place of Gesenius could not well be supplied ; while as instructors, there are many whose teaching might be equally valuable.

The other benefit of this arrangement is, that it holds out the strongest incitements to diligence on the part of the instructors. To a young man just entering upon his career, it is obviously important to bring his whole strength to the work, in order to acquire a reputation which may authorize the expectation of promotion. He has the direct motive of profit, and the not much less direct one of hope, to stimulate his exertions. He knows besides that there are others before him in the race, actuated by the same motives, and also by the fear of being outstripped. The extraordinary professor stands in a similar predicament ; he has the same motives to exertion ; the same goal before him ; and has moreover ardent competitors behind him. The ordinary professor has indeed reached the summit of his ambition ; but he knows that if he relaxes his efforts, the fruits of all his labour will be carried off by others, and he thus lose in a measure his influence and emoluments. This system has now been long

in operation; and the general effect of it has been highly beneficial. It is not to be denied, however, that the spirit of rivalry which in this way is so liable to be awakened, has often led to deplorable results in respect to the harmony and mutual good feeling among the instructors of a university; and that the desire of distinction, which the system doubtless tends to foster, has sometimes taken a wrong direction, and sought its object in novelty and strangeness, rather than in the power of tracing and developing the character and relations of truths already known, and thus extending the boundaries of science in a sure and legitimate method. But these are the incidental results of the system, and not the system itself, nor its proposed consequences. They are the friction of the machine, and if you please inevitable to it; they tend to weaken its power, but do not destroy its value. In the most powerful of all machines, the steam engine, there is a constant tendency to occasion the most disastrous results; and such accidents are in our day by no means uncommon; yet no one ever had a thought of abandoning, on this account, the use of this important invention. It is even so in regard to moral power. It is impossible to adopt any system, which shall operate upon the minds of men and urge them on to persevering effort, in which there will not be room and opportunity, and even inducement, for the passions and prejudices of worldly men to display themselves.—In passing it may be remarked, that in the various theological faculties with which the writer has been acquainted, there has been no interruption of harmony and friendly intercourse, in consequence of any thing arising out of the system of things above referred to. On the contrary, it is not at all unfrequent in this and in the other faculties, for the elder professors to patronize younger men in the same department, and even to exert their own influence with the government, in order to bring about their more speedy promotion.

The lectures delivered by the instructors are of three kinds, and are given *publice, privatim, et privatissime*. The first or public lectures are given only by professors; and constitute nominally that course of instruction, for which they receive salaries from government. Originally this was actually the case, and all regular instruction at the universities was free; as it still is in the *College de France* and other public schools of Paris. In process of time, however, it was found more profitable to give private courses, for which a small fee was charged; and it has now come to the point, that no professor reads more than one public

course, and that usually consisting of only one lecture in each week. The object is, to give as little free instruction as will comport with the tenor of their appointments. The second class, or private lectures, are those which have thus been introduced. They are precisely similar in their nature to the public ones, and delivered in the same place, and often to the same hearers. The only difference is, that for these each student pays a small fee; and the professor consequently endeavours to make these courses more interesting and instructive. The courses continue nominally six months; the year being divided into two terms or semesters, with a vacation of five or six weeks in the spring and autumn. Most of the professors give two courses of private lectures in each term, and sometimes three. In some of the courses lectures are delivered six times a week; in others four; and sometimes, though rarely, only twice. The fees paid by the students are small; for a course of theological lectures never more than one *Frederic d'or*, or about four dollars. In some instances a professor of law receives double fees; and even much more than this is paid for some courses of medical lectures. In the larger universities, as Berlin and Göttingen, where things are done more genteelly, these payments must always be made in gold. In Halle they may be made in any species of money; and the price of a course is graduated according to the number of lectures in a week. The private teachers receive the same fees as the professors; and for the sake of popularity usually give also a course of public lectures, although this is not a necessary part of their duties.—The instruction which is given *privatissime*, consists simply in private lessons.

The number of hearers whom a lecturer can draw together, depends upon the nature of his subject and his reputation. It depends also upon the general number of the students who frequent that particular university; although this again is in some degree dependent upon the celebrity of the professor, or rather the professors. If these have a high reputation, the university will generally not want for students. Sometimes also an individual professor makes an important improvement in some branch of science or literature, and creates a new era in regard to it. In such cases a new impulse is given to that particular study; students are attracted to his university; and his lecture room is crowded. Gesenius may be quoted as an instance of this in respect to Hebrew literature. In the winter of 1829–30 the writer attended his course on Genesis, which he reads every

two years. At the opening of the course he took occasion to remark, that he was then about to read it for the tenth time ; and adverted to the very great progress made in this branch of study, and the very great interest taken in it now, compared with twenty years ago. At that time he commenced the same course with fourteen hearers ; he was now addressing five hundred. He added, that he had then felt quite satisfied even with that comparatively small number ; inasmuch as a previous course on the same book, by Professor Vater, had been attended by only three. The great influx of theological students to Halle had thus been occasioned by the influence of his name. In like manner the reputation of a particular faculty often draws to a university a larger number of students in that department. Thus the faculty of law at Göttingen has enjoyed a high reputation, and has attracted young men from every part of Germany. At present all the faculties in the university of Berlin are filled with some of the most distinguished men of Germany ; and the consequence is a larger concourse of students, than has ever been known at any other protestant institution.—The lecture room of Gesenius is probably better filled than any other in Germany. Neander in Berlin had usually from three to four hundred in his exegetical course on the New Testament ; in his other courses fewer. The younger Eichhorn, the jurist, in Göttingen, had about three hundred ; and was considered the most popular lecturer on law in the country. He has since retired. His father, the orientalist, had ordinarily from ninety to a hundred hearers. Wegscheider and Thilo of Halle have each about three hundred. These are some of the more popular lecturers ; with others the number varies according to circumstances, and is not unfrequently less than ten.*

As a general fact, the professors deliver their lectures at their own houses. The recent universities of Berlin and Bonn occupy former palaces, and have ample room for all necessary lecture rooms, as well as for the public collections. In Halle also the university has one large lecture room, which is occupied by the theological professors in succession. But in Göttingen and at most of the other universities, each professor has to provide his own *auditorium*, and the accommodations for sitting and writing are commonly of the rudest kind. It is not unusu-

* In the *College de France* and the *Ecole des langues orientales* at Paris, De Sacy and the other professors of languages rarely, if ever, have more than from ten to fifteen pupils.

al for the students to have to hurry from one lecture to another, at the distance perhaps of half a mile. To accommodate them in this respect, the professor does not commence until five or ten minutes, as the case may be, after the hour has struck. In Berlin, although this reason does not exist, the lectures uniformly do not commence until a quarter after the hour, and are broken off punctually at the striking of the clock. They thus actually occupy only three quarters of an hour; although a full hour is the legitimate and usual time.

The students, before entering the university, are required to have passed through a regular course of preparatory study at the *gymnasias* or public classical schools. At these schools, boys are taken at the age of from eight to twelve; and are trained in a thorough course of classical study. They are taught, not only to read the Greek and Latin with fluency, but also to write them. They are moreover accustomed to speak the latter language with ease, and in the latter part of their course to hold all their exercises in it. This is one of the great secrets of the advantage of classical study as the foundation of a liberal education; and this circumstance goes far to account for the fact, why the early study of these languages is so much more highly prized in Europe, than with us. Here they are but partially studied; they are learned solely by the eye, and not by the ear. The American student is taught merely to connect the *idea* with the word which he sees before him, and not to connect the *word* with the idea. For example, if a boy be asked what is the Greek word for *water*, it is at least an even chance that he will not be able to answer the question; but if at another time you place before his eyes the word *ὕδωρ*, he immediately recalls the idea of *water*, because this idea has been already associated in his mind with this word. He could not answer in the first case, because the word was not in the same manner associated with the idea. Now this double power is necessary, in order to the thorough or even tolerable acquisition of any language. The one part of it we learn from reading; the other part alone enables us to write and speak another tongue with fluency and ease. It is obvious that in regard to the discipline of the youthful mind, the latter part of the process is far more important than the former. But in our own country, this part is comparatively speaking, entirely neglected; and the student is taught only to recal the meaning of words as he sees them on paper. In the public schools of the old world, both parts of the process are carried on

together, and in the most thorough manner ; and the result is a deep and solid foundation, on which to raise the future superstructure of education.

The consequence of all this is, that the German students on leaving the gymnasia for the universities are, as to philology and classical literature, far in advance of American students at the end of their college course. But in acquaintance with mathematics, the belleslettres, and in general practical information, the former are inferior to the latter. But they have acquired a method and habit of study, and a discipline of the mind, which enable them to enter upon the university course with well directed ardour and a sure prospect of success. Here they can spread out their inquiries to any extent ; and besides their regular professional studies, may and often do attend courses of lectures on classical or modern literature, history, the natural sciences, etc. As a general fact, however, both with regard to students and literary men, there is a much greater division of labour among them than with us. Every one endeavours to make himself master of his own particular department ; but has in other departments and on other subjects less general knowledge than is common with us. One grand result of the whole process of education is, that what they learn, they learn thoroughly, and have always at command. In matters of learning they are *ready* men, as well as profound scholars.

The students on entering the university from the gymnasia, pass from a state of discipline and close supervision to a state of entire freedom. Having once chosen their profession, they may attend what lectures they please, and as few as they please ; they may live where they please, and do what they please. The university exercises no authority over them whatever, so long as they are not guilty of open misconduct. These are circumstances which may serve to account for that wild spirit of insubordination and visionary liberty, which has been represented as so prevalent among the students of Germany. Prevalent it undoubtedly has been and is still ; but probably in a much less degree than has generally been supposed. The riots, and duels, and *renowning*, all the noise and folly and crime, are confined to a few in comparison with the great body of the students, who are engaged in a course of silent, persevering study. The noise and bustle of these few have struck foreigners as a peculiar feature of the German students, and have therefore been fully and frequently described ; while the more noiseless

course of the many has escaped their observation. The circumstances above mentioned have operated more conspicuously in the smaller university cities, such as Jena, Göttingen, etc. where the students, feeling their importance in respect to the inhabitants, have assumed a greater license, and have been at the same time unrestrained by the force of public opinion. The modern plan of locating universities in large cities, has been eminently successful in abolishing this spirit. The students in Berlin, for instance, are lost in the crowd of population; and could not as a body indulge in any of the freaks which are common at other universities, without being borne down by the ridicule of the surrounding multitudes.

The students, as has been already said, attend what courses of lectures they please. There are however certain professional courses which they must have attended, in order to be afterwards admitted to an examination. In theology for instance a man must have heard lectures in all the four departments of exegesis, *Dogmatik* or doctrinal theology, ecclesiastical history, and *Homiletik* or practical theology. These are significantly called *Brodcollegia*; because a man's future bread depends on his having heard them. In Berlin there is also a regulation, that the students in theology shall attend the courses in a certain order; inasmuch as it was found, that they often attended the practical lectures, before they were acquainted with either exegetical or systematic theology. Very often too the students in general attend the lectures of a particular professor from fashion, rather than from any choice. Not unfrequently there are lecturers in the philosophical department, who draw crowded audiences out of all the other faculties. This is the case with Ritter of Berlin, the celebrated geographer, a man of piety and genuine simplicity of character, as well as of profound learning in his department. The lectures of Böckh on Greek antiquities are also attended by all classes of hearers. In like manner it is fashionable to attend the courses of Blumenbach at Göttingen. The fashion however often varies from year to year, and in regard to the different courses of the same professors.

As a general rule, all the students not only take notes of the lectures, but mostly write them out in full. The professor often spends a part of the time in regular dictation, which is written down by all; while between the paragraphs he gives extempore illustrations, which are also seized and written down by many. It is exceedingly rare to see a student in the lecture room with-

out his writing materials in busy use. These are very simple ; consisting of a small portfolio or *Mappe* in which he carries his pens and paper, and a small turned inkstand of horn, with a cover that screws on, and a small sharp spike on the bottom by which it is stuck fast upon the bench or writing table before him. They are exceedingly punctual ; and the few minutes previous to the entrance of the professor, are usually devoted to mending their pens and putting their papers in order. This is accompanied by a general whistling and buz of conversation. The moment the professor enters all is hushed ; he begins immediately to read, and they to write ; sometimes without interruption till the striking of the clock. In this way they hurry from one lecture to another, and it is not uncommon for them to attend five or six every day. There are not wanting instances where a student has in this manner been present at *ten* different courses ; but this is quite rare. They very generally review at home the lectures thus written down ; and read or consult the books referred to by the professor. This is sometimes done in companies of five or six, who by their mutual remarks serve to imprint the subjects more deeply on the minds of each other. They thus obtain, generally speaking, a clear view and receive a deep impression of so much information, as the professor has chosen to give them. There are others, although their number is comparatively small, who merely make the lectures what they are in fact, a clue for the guidance of their studies, and go into extensive and profound investigation for themselves. These are the men who love knowledge for its own sake, as well as because it is power ; and while the multitude are ready to take up with the reports of others, they wish to trace for themselves the stream of knowledge to its source, and drink of its pure waters at the crystal fountain.

It is a question often agitated in Germany itself, whether this habit of writing in the lecture-room is on the whole beneficial ; and whether it would not be better, if the attention of the pupil were left free and undivided to follow the train of the professor's thoughts. Undoubtedly in this latter way the pupil would be better able to seize and trace the relations of the thoughts thrown out by the lecturer, to analyze and compare them ; and would thus be more immediately led to independent habits of thinking. On the other hand it is urged, that it is absolutely necessary to collect and treasure up for the whole life much of the knowledge imparted by the instructor ; that the process of writing leads to

a closer and more accurate attention, and to greater interest in the lectures themselves ; and that if the notes be properly reviewed, a far deeper and more precise impression is received. It is however recommended in all systems of *methodology*, that the instructor should enable the pupils to combine the advantages of both these methods, by devoting a part of each lecture to regular dictation, in which he may lay down his propositions and give the general illustration of them ; while the remaining part should be composed of free and often extemporaneous discussion and illustration. This is in fact the plan followed by the most distinguished and popular lecturers ; and their hearers make a point of writing all that is dictated, and listen to the rest ; though some, by means of a species of stenography, are able to seize the whole. So far as this, if the writer may judge by his own experience, the system of writing down after the professor is eminently beneficial.

The regular time necessary to be spent at the German universities in professional studies, is for medical students four years ; for all others three years. As a general rule young men are required to be principally educated at the universities of their own state ; but are allowed to spend one year of their course at any foreign university. Thus natives of Prussia who study theology, must remain at least two years at some Prussian university ; in the other year they may go wherever they please. Those states which have no university of their own, usually adopt a neighbouring one. Thus Göttingen, which belongs to Hanover, is at the same time adopted by Brunswick and Nassau as their university ; and the young theologians of these states are obliged to spend at least two years on the classic, though somewhat naked banks of the Leine.

After these remarks on the general character of the German universities, it may not be uninteresting to the reader to give an alphabetical list of them, accompanied by notices of their general history ; of the more distinguished professors, especially in the theological faculties ; of the number and general division of the students, so far as known ; of their libraries, etc.

I. BERLIN. This university, although it went into operation only in 1810, has already taken the first rank among the literary institutions of Germany. Situated in the midst of a large and splendid capital, amid a population of 220,000 souls, and supported by the whole influence of a powerful court and government, it has of course had comparatively few obstacles to strug-

gle with. It is located in an immense building, formerly the palace of Prince Henry, the brother of the great Frederic, in the midst of the most fashionable and splendid part of the city. The building is sufficiently large to accommodate the collections in anatomy, natural history, etc. besides furnishing lecture rooms for the use of all the professors in their turn. This edifice gives a strong impression of convenience and utility; and it was a thought of thrilling interest, when sitting among three or four hundred pupils, who were drinking in the instructions and the pure spirit of the gospel from the lips of Neander, to compare its present destination with its former character, when the voice of mirth and revelry resounded through its halls, "and the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe, and wine were in their feasts; but they regarded not the work of the Lord."

It has ever been a favourite endeavour of the King of Prussia, to collect in his university at Berlin the ablest men of the whole country. In this he has not been unsuccessful. The faculties of law and of medicine at present decidedly take rank of all others in Germany; while the philosophical one is in no degree inferior to any other. The theological faculty is abler and more fully attended than any other, except at Halle. This arises in general not from the greater ability of the professors at Halle; except so far as Hebrew literature is concerned, where Gesenius incontrovertibly takes the first rank; but from two other causes, viz. first, that a very great proportion of the theological students are poor, and Halle is in itself a cheaper place than Berlin, besides having a multitude of stipends and free tables; and secondly, that Halle is the favourite resort of almost all the followers of rationalism, who at the present day constitute a very large class among the theological students. Berlin, both as a city and a university, has a decided preponderance to evangelical religion, and may be regarded as one of the strong holds of faith and true piety in Germany.

The theological department contains the names of Strauss, the most popular and eloquent of the court preachers, who lectures on *Homiletik* or practical theology; Marheinecke, who teaches *Dogmatik* or systematic theology, and who is a disciple of Hegel and verges towards pantheism; Schleiermacher, a man of great simplicity of manners and one of the deepest thinkers of the day, who wanders at will over the whole field of theology. He has a system of his own, and has many followers. He seems to stand between the rationalists and the evangelical

party, being however more distant from the former than from the latter. It was related to the writer by Harms of Kiel, that he himself and several of his acquaintances, had been brought off from rationalism by the logic of Schleiermacher ; but not being able to rest in the position which he had taken, they had gone forward to embrace the evangelical doctrines. Neander is the first ecclesiastical historian of the age, and one of the best, if not quite the best, exegetical lecturer on the New Testament in Germany. His great work on the history of the church is advancing, but with slow progress. Hengstenberg is still quite a young man, and early distinguished himself as an Arabic scholar at Bonn, where he was the editor of the *Moallakat* of Amrulkais. At present he is engaged in a work entitled "Christology of the Old Testament," which treats of the predictions respecting the Messiah under the ancient dispensation. The first volume was published in 1829. He is also the editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, a work which has done good, although it is generally regarded as too intolerant in its spirit. De Wette was formerly a member of this faculty, but was cut off in 1819 by the king, on the ground of his having written a letter of condolence to the mother of Sands, the murderer of Kotzebue. The general opinion however is, that this only served as a pretext for his dismissal ; and so little weight did there seem to be in the charge, under the existing circumstances, that the whole university as a body petitioned, but in vain, for a recal of the decree.—As a jurist, the name of von Savigny stands preeminent in Germany ; in the medical faculty are the names of von Graefe, Hufeland, Busch, and others. In the various departments of the philosophical faculty are Hegel, the present prince of metaphysical philosophers in the north of Germany ; Encke the astronomer, who reads lectures as a member of the Academy of Sciences ; von Raumer, the historian ; Charles Ritter, the celebrated geographer, a pious and most amiable man ; Bekker, the indefatigable editor of Greek and Roman classics ; Böckh, the Greek philologist and editor of Pindar ; Zumpt, the Latin grammarian ; Bopp, the Sanscrit scholar ; and a host of others. The whole number of the instructors is usually more than a hundred.

The number of students at Berlin in the winter of 1829—30 was somewhat over 1800. In the winter of 1826—27 the number was 1732 ; in the summer following it was 1594. These last were divided as follows ; in theology 479 ; in law 577 ; in

medicine 333 ; and in the philosophical faculty 206. The relative numbers at present probably do not vary much from the same proportion. The cost to a student of living here may be estimated at 300 rix dollars (\$210) a year ; varying of course according to the habits of economy or expense of each individual. The students of Berlin, as has been above remarked, do not form a distinct and separate body as in the smaller cities, but are lost in the crowd ; and the consequence is, that there is about them little or nothing of that peculiar character, which German students are usually represented as possessing. Generally speaking too, they may be regarded as a higher class of young men, than those who frequent most of the other universities, with the exception of Göttingen. Their dress and appearance is certainly more respectable.

The university, as such, has no separate library ; but has the full use of the royal library, which occupies a splendid building of its own across the street from the university. It contains 180,000 volumes, and 7,000 manuscripts, and ranks in Germany next after the libraries of Munich, Göttingen, Vienna, and Dresden. It is open for consultation every week day, two hours in winter, and three hours in summer. Books may be taken out twice a week. All the students have the privilege of taking out books under the *cavet* of a professor.—There is also an extensive botanical garden, formerly under the care of the celebrated Willdenow.

In all the six universities of Prussia, viz. Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswalde, Halle, and Königsberg, the government have established what are called a *theological* and a *philological seminary*, or societies among the students, under the guidance of a professor, for the more extensive study of these branches. There are usually from ten to fifteen ordinary members, who are admitted on examination, after having been a year at the university, and are bound to attend the meetings and take part in the exercises ; these enjoy some slight privileges and stipends, and are in the way of favourable notice from the government. In Berlin, during the last winter, there were exercises of this kind in the exegesis of the Old Testament under Hengstenberg, and in the history of the church and of doctrines under Neander and Marheinecke. The philological seminary is under the care of Böckh. Similar institutions exist also in most of the universities of other states.*

* The story related in Russell's *Tour in Germany*, (Chap. X.) about

II. BONN. The university at this place, though founded only in 1818, is fast rising to a high rank among its elder sisters. It is called the Rhine university, and is located in the midst of the most delightful scenery, just where the splendid banks of the Rhine change their character of precipitous crags and vine-clad hills, and sink down into a rich and cultivated plain. The rugged cliff of Drachensfels with its ruined castle, so celebrated by Byron, is in full view, and nearer at hand the still more picturesque ruin of Godesberg. This university is also established in a palace, viz. that of the former electors of Cologne, who resided in Bonn. In extent and convenience, it is not inferior to that of the Berlin university.

In the Rhine provinces of Prussia, a considerable proportion of the population is catholic; and on this account the university of Bonn (as also of Breslau) has both a protestant and catholic faculty of theology. In the protestant part, the most important names are Augusti, the author of numerous works; Nitzsch; Sack; Gieseler, a spirited investigator in ecclesiastical history, and the author of the best manual on this subject; Bleek, formerly at Berlin, a learned and candid man, author of an introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews, and the reviewer of Professor Stuart's commentary on that book in the *Literatur-Zeitung* of Halle, for Jan. 1830. A part at least, if not the greater part of this faculty, are decidedly evangelical; and in this region of country, particularly at Elberfeld and Barmen, there is a very general prevalence of pure religious faith and practice. In the catholic faculty are Gratz, formerly at Tübingen, a prolific writer, and Scholz, the editor of a new recension of the Greek Testament, for which object he has travelled over Europe, Western Asia, and Egypt. In the philosophical faculty, we find the well known names of A. W. von Schlegel, Niebuhr, Welcker, and Freytag the orientalist, now engaged in the publication of an Arabic lexicon. This is not a second edition of Golius, as was at first intended, but a new and much fuller work.

The number of students in 1822 was 571; in the winter of 1829—30 it was over 1000; having thus nearly doubled in seven years. The proportion in which these are at present di-

the agency and influence of Wolf in the foundation of the Berlin university, is generally pronounced in Germany to be false. It was told by Wolf to Russell, either for the purpose of imposing on his credulity, or, more probably, in the dreams of his own extravagant vanity.

vided among the several faculties, is not now known to the writer; but in 1826 about one third were theological students, of whom the catholics were the most numerous; one third law students; and the remainder about equally divided between the medical and philosophical faculties.

The library contains already 66,000 volumes and 200 valuable manuscripts. There is a fine botanical garden, and also good collections in all the departments.—The theological and philological seminaries also flourish.

III. **BRESLAU.** This university, located in the capital of Prussian Silesia, was originally founded by the Jesuits in 1702, for the education of catholic theologians. In 1810, the university of Frankfort on the Oder was transferred to Breslau, and incorporated with the former one. Since that time it has greatly flourished. There is both a catholic and protestant theological faculty; in the latter of which are von Cölln; David Schulz, the new editor of Griesbach, and a commentator on the epistle to the Hebrews; Bernstein the orientalist; and Middeldorpf. In the philosophical faculty are Wachler, the historian; Passow, the Greek lexicographer; and Habicht, the editor of the ‘Thousand and one Nights’ in Arabic.

The number of students has been for several years on the increase. In 1826 it was less than 900; in 1829 it was over 1200. The most of these are in the faculties of theology and law. The seminaries of theology and philology are flourishing, under the guidance of Schulz, von Cölln, Middeldorpf, and Passow. The library is an important one; but the number of volumes is not specified.

IV. **ERLANGEN** is the protestant university of Bavaria. It was founded in 1743, by the Margrave of Baireuth, to whom Erlangen then belonged; and passed with his dominions under the sceptre of Prussia, and then under that of Bavaria. In 1807 the university of Altdorf was broken up, and incorporated with Erlangen. The university has a fine building, erected within a few years out of its own funds, which amount to more than 60,000 rix dollars (or \$42,000) a year, administered under the direction of the government. It stands on the site of a palace of the former Margraves, which had been assigned to the university, but was wholly burnt down in 1814.

The principal members of the theological faculty are Vogel, Kaiser, Winer the author of the New Testament grammar, Engelhardt, and the younger Ammon. In the philosophical is

Rückert, a fine oriental scholar and poet. The number of students is rather on the decline ; in 1825 the whole number was 500 ; in 1828–9 it was only 431 ; of whom 272 were theologians, 64 students of law, 41 of medicine, and 54 in other studies. The library contains 100,000 volumes ; and the other collections are very respectable.

V. **FREIBURG** in the *Breisgau*, as it is called, is the catholic university of Baden. The city contains about 10,000 inhabitants, and is beautifully situated on the east side of the great valley or plain of the Rhine, at the foot of the hills of the Black Forest, where the valley of the Treisam issues from their dark precincts. The university was founded in 1457 ; and has a large and important library, rich especially in old books collected from the many disbanded monasteries. The only professor of general celebrity is Hug, the author of the Introduction to the New Testament. It has been said that he is engaged on a similar work on the Old Testament ; he reads at least a course of lectures on that subject. The number of students in 1825–6 was 600.

VI. **GIESSEN** is the university of Hesse Darmstadt, and is situated on the great road from Frankfort on the Maine to Cassel. It was founded in 1607 ; and has a yearly income of 60,000 florins, or \$25,200, principally from funds of its own and those of the former university of Mayence. The professors of theology most known are Kuinoel, the author of the Commentary on the Gospels ; Schmidt, author of an esteemed ecclesiastical history ; and Pfannkuche. The number of students at present is not specified ; but it has not usually exceeded 500. The library contains nearly 30,000 volumes.

VII. **GÖTTINGEN** was founded by George II. of England in 1734 ; and is indebted for the liberal plan on which it was established, and for the extraordinary aid which it received from the government, to the celebrated minister von Münchhausen. The services of the ablest men were secured ; and the names of the illustrious Haller, Mosheim, J. D. Michaelis, and their coadjutors and successors, Heyne, Blumenbach, and Eichhorn, are some of the brightest in the annals of German literature and science. Thousands of young men from all parts of Germany and of the world, have here received their education. Indeed Göttingen has heretofore been better adapted to attract students from foreign countries, than most of the other German universities, not only through the celebrity of its professors and its libra-

ry, but also through the free and liberal spirit which pervaded the lectures, exhibiting less of a local and exclusively national character, than was common in other places. The extensive cultivation of classical literature, and also of politics and history, which are subjects of universal interest, have been the chief characteristics of Göttingen. The gentlemanly tone which prevailed among the professors and in society, has operated also on the students, who are generally speaking of a higher class than are to be found at most of the other universities, with the exception of Berlin.

At present, the general characteristics of the society at Göttingen are etiquette and formality. The university is also regarded as reposing upon its laurels,—as sustaining itself upon its former stock of reputation, rather than as making new accessions. The giants of former days in all the faculties are gone, and their mantles have descended on comparatively few of their successors. They have passed away, and are well nigh forgotten in the place of their fame. Few, if any, can tell where Michaelis is entombed. Heyne lies buried in the corner of a churchyard just out of the city, where his grave is marked by a solitary tree; but neither of the lives, nor of the graves, of most of the celebrated men who have lived and died here, are there now any memorials. This however is not peculiar to Göttingen, but is a national feature.

The names now most prominent in the theological faculty are the two Plancks, father and son; of whom the elder has sustained a high rank as a historian of the church; while the younger, after a youth of the highest promise in the department of New Testament philology, is now entirely broken down and lost to science through the effects of epilepsy; Pott; Lücke, the commentator on the writings of John; Reiche, a young man of promise. The faculty of law lost its chief ornament in the retirement of the younger Eichhorn. The medical faculty is celebrated. In that of philosophy the venerable Blumenbach still lives, the ornament of science and the patron of Americans; Heeren the political historian, the son-in-law and biographer of Heyne, is there; as also Dissen; Mitscherlich the editor of Horace, who sleeps on his former name; Benecke; Gauss, 'le plus grand des mathématiciens;' Otto Müller, a young man, and a first rate investigator of classical antiquities; Ewald, a still younger man, the author of a Hebrew Grammar and various other works on oriental and biblical literature; a man of extra-

ordinary attainments for his years, but hasty and not always solid in his judgments. The university has recently made a great acquisition in obtaining Jacob Grimm, formerly at Cassel, the author of the German Grammar, as professor and librarian.

Göttingen is rather on the decline as to the number of students. The improvements in the Prussian universities, and the foundation particularly of those of Berlin and Bonn, draw away many who would otherwise have come to Georgia Augusta. In the summer of 1825 there were 1545 students; in that of 1826 there were 1452; of whom there were pursuing theology 309, law 700, medicine 258, philology and other branches 185. In the winter of 1829–30 there were less than 1300. The average expense is usually estimated at 300 rix dollars.

The library of Göttingen is one of the largest, and for practical uses the best, on the continent. It is indebted for its present arrangement and high value principally to Heyne, who went upon the principle of purchasing useful books, rather than splendid ones; so that with any given sum of money, he very probably purchased twice as many books as an Englishman would have done, and those of equal value in themselves to the student. The number of books is often said to be near 300,000; but from minutes made on the spot in 1826, it appears to be 230,000. The arrangement of the manuscript alphabetical catalogue is such, that it occupies 150 folio volumes. For the increase of the library the government appropriates 3000 rix dollars (\$2100) annually; though in particular cases they are permitted to exceed that sum. The library is open every day for reading and consultation; and the students are allowed to take out books on the usual terms. The interior of the library in Göttingen, particularly the hall of history, is one of the most interesting spots for a scholar, that the old world presents. Other libraries have a more splendid location; but there is here so much neatness and simplicity, such perfect order and utility of arrangement, such an adaptation of the means of learning to facilitate the acquisition of it, that the mind of the beholder receives a deep impression, and loves to recur in idea to these ancient and venerable halls, long after the traces left by literary pomp or princely grandeur have faded from the memory.

The religious character and influence of the university of Göttingen, may be summed up in a few words. Orthodoxy is acknowledged here, but not evangelical piety, with a very few exceptions. In 1827, one of the *privatim docentes* who had

been in England, attempted to institute private religious meetings or conferences, but was put down by the university, backed by the government. He was obliged to abandon his place, and is now a missionary in the Ionian islands. It is not, however, to be denied, that he proceeded incautiously, and thereby awakened an opposition, which, perhaps, would otherwise have slumbered. Still, the practical influence of the university is against evangelical piety, and goes thus far directly to favour the spread of rationalism.

VIII. **GRIEFSWALDE** is the smallest of the Prussian universities, situated near the shore of the Baltic, in a region where there is little to attract students from other quarters. It was founded in 1456, and is the only one in Prussia, which is in some small degree independent of the government in its administration. There is a very fine building for the library, collections, and lecture rooms. The library contains about 50,000 volumes. The most known professors of theology are Kosegarten, a pupil of De Sacy and one of the first, if not the first, of the oriental scholars of Germany; Pelt formerly of Berlin; and Böhmer, author of an "Isagoge in Ep. ad Coloss." These are all young men. The number of students in 1827 was 160.

IX. **HALLE** has claims of peculiar interest in the history of theology, from the circumstance that it was founded in part, at least, through the influence of the pious Spener in 1694. The first occasion of its foundation was the secession of the jurist Thomasius from Leipsic, with a great number of his pupils, to whom he continued to deliver lectures at Halle. Spener's influence occasioned the appointment of Breithaupt, Anton, and that man of God, Francke, as the first theological professors. Halle therefore became the seat of all Francke's exertions, and of that school of piety and deep religious feeling, which forms an era in the history of the German churches. Nor was there any want of learning, strictly so called. Francke, with all his active duties, was a distinguished biblical scholar for his day; while the name of Thomasius ranks high in the history of German jurisprudence; and the two brothers I. H. and C. B. Michaelis, as also Cellarius, were certainly not inferior men. The tone of piety, however, began to give way with Baumgarten; and at length the foundations of faith in a divine revelation were undermined by Semler. Nösselt and some others still regarded themselves as orthodox; and within these few years (1825) their contemporary, the venerable Knapp, has closed a long life

of unobtrusive, but consistent piety. He stood however alone; while rationalism, through the exertions of Wegscheider, the countenance of Gesenius, and the indifference of Niemyer, had obtained firm footing, and seduced the understandings of the great body of the students.

The translation of Professor Tholuck from Berlin to Halle, as the successor of Knapp, gave the first occasion for open hostilities. The theological faculty, or at least, the principal members of it, protested against his coming, as being notoriously of different views and feelings from themselves, and as having already pronounced sentence against them before a public assembly in London. He came nevertheless; and the amiableness of his manners, combined with his uncommon and unquestioned talents and learning, served in no long time to wear away the violent prejudices which had existed against him. The year from the spring of 1828 to that of 1829, he spent in Rome; and then returned to his duties with increased vigour and influence. The difficulties which occurred in Halle the last winter, although neither occasioned nor promoted by himself, turned again for a time the popular current against him; but the excitement has, probably, ere this time subsided, and we may securely trust that God will here, as every where, overrule all apparent evil for good. In person, Professor Tholuck is slender and feeble; his conversation is uncommonly engaging and full of thought; and although not yet 32 years old, he possesses a greater personal influence and reputation than any other theologian of Germany. To an American Christian, who travels on this part of the continent, Tholuck is undoubtedly the most interesting person whose acquaintance he will make.

Gesenius is already so well known in this country, that a short notice of him may suffice here. He is also an instance of great precocity of learning; the first edition of his Hebrew Lexicon having been published before the age of twenty-four, his larger Hebrew Grammar at twenty-seven, and his Commentary on Isaiah, which placed him in the first rank of biblical critics, before thirty-two. His manners have more of the gentleman and man of the world, than is usual with German professors; and a stranger who should meet him in society, would never suspect that he was a laborious and eminently distinguished philologist; much less the first Hebrew scholar of the age. He has now been several years employed upon his *Thesaurus* of the Hebrew language, and has in the meantime published

three editions of his *Manual Hebrew Lexicon*, the first of which was translated several years since by Mr Gibbs. He is now occupied with an edition of the manual lexicon in Latin, which is to be completed in the coming spring; and is at the same time making preparations for the more rapid completion of the *Thesaurus*, the first part of which is already published. Thilo the son in law of Knapp, is highly esteemed as a lecturer on ecclesiastical history and exegesis of the New Testament. Wegscheider is sufficiently known, as the standard bearer of rationalism in its lowest forms. Ullmann, formerly at Heidelberg, has a good reputation in ecclesiastical history, and is one of the editors of the "*Theologische Studien*." Rödiger, a private teacher, is a fine oriental scholar, and superintends the publication of Freytag's Arabic lexicon. He has also recently published an edition of Lockman's fables with a corrected Arabic text and glossary, for the use of beginners in that difficult language.

In the faculty of law, the names of Mühlenbruch and Blume are advantageously known; and as a comparative anatomist, Meckel takes rank of all others in Germany. His collection, founded by his father and augmented by himself, is the best private collection in that country, if not in the world. In the philosophical faculty the aged Schütz, Gruber, Leo, Bernhardt, and others, have a high reputation.

The number of students has been increasing for several years. In 1829, there were 1330; among whom were 944 students of theology, 239 of law, 58 of medicine, and 89 in the philosophical faculty. The average cost of residence here is from 200 to 250 rix dollars per annum. The library contains over 40,000 volumes, and occupies a building by itself. The king has also granted 40,000 rix dollars (\$28,000) for the erection of an edifice for the university; but the foundations of it are not yet laid.

The theological seminary in this university has five classes, viz. in the Old Testament with Gesenius; in the New with Wegscheider; in systematic theology with Tholuck or Weber; in ecclesiastical history with Thilo; and in *Homiletik* with Marks. The philological seminary, formerly under Reisig, is now directed by Schütz and Meier.*

* Halle is also the seat of Francke's celebrated orphan house. This stands in no connexion whatever with the university; except

X. HEIDELBERG is the protestant university of Baden (comp. Freiburg), and is the oldest university of protestant Germany,

that the directors of the former are, and always have been, professors in the latter. Francke commenced his exertions in behalf of orphans in 1694 with two children, to whom a third was added, before he had a thought of any larger establishment. From this small beginning it grew up in a few years to an immense institution, or cluster of institutions, not only for orphans, but for the education of all classes of children and youth. The establishment now consists of the following schools. 1. The orphanhouse, in which nearly 5000 children of both sexes have been educated. Boys of bright parts are prepared for the university; the others mostly learn trades. The number formerly admitted at once was 200; but the diminished revenues do not suffice at present to maintain more than 100. 2. The royal *paedagogium*, in which boys of the middle and higher classes are received as in a family, and regularly educated. 3. The Latin school, intended by Francke as a classical school for the children of the poor. It receives boarders, and also city scholars. In 1809 the two city gymnasia were united with it; so that at present the schools of the orphanhouse are the only classical schools in Halle. 4. The German school, originally established for the children of the poor; but now consisting of four divisions, two of which are for boys and girls who pay for their tuition; while the other two are free schools for the poorest class.—All these schools serve also as a sort of seminary for teachers; indeed, the greater part of the instructors are students of the university, who spend an hour or two every day in giving lessons at the orphanhouse.—As an appendage to the orphanhouse may also be regarded the Canstein Bible Institute, founded in 1712 by the Baron von Canstein, an intimate friend of Francke's. The object of it was and is, by means of standing types, to furnish Bibles in different forms at the very lowest rates. More than two millions of Bibles, and one million of Testaments, have thus been put in circulation.

The revenues of the orphanhouse establishment come from the following sources. 1. Various large farms and other real estate, 2. Several secret medicines, bequeathed by the inventor, which had formerly an immense sale of more than \$20,000 annually; but are now unimportant. 3. An extensive apothecary's shop. 4. The book and printing establishment, commenced by a young man who printed a sermon of Francke's, and afterwards sustained and advanced by the sagacity of the latter, until it has become one of the most important in Germany. 5. The money paid for tuition and board. 6. The royal bounty. The present king of Prussia

having been founded in 1386. The city is small and inelegant; but most charmingly situated at the point where the Neckar is-

was the first to aid the diminished funds of the establishment by an annual appropriation. 7. Charitable contributions. These were formerly very great; indeed the whole establishment sprung from charity; but of late years, they have almost entirely ceased.

There is one principal building of very large dimensions, fronting on a large square or *place*; from each end of this, other buildings extend back, forming a court 800 feet long, which is closed at the other end by the buildings of the *paedagogium*. These were all erected in the life time of Francke, and through his agency; and the holy faith and energy of this remarkable man were in nothing more fully displayed, than in the manner of their erection. They were built literally *in faith*; having been undertaken by him without resources, except in his dependence, under God, on charitable contributions; and these not only not yet realized, but not yet even promised. Not unfrequently was it the case, in moments of despondency, when not a *groschen* more remained to pay the workmen, and the good man had poured out his soul in prayer to God for help, that he received, often by the post, from persons known and unknown, sums sufficient not only to pay off the debts already incurred, but to carry on the work for a time without further difficulty or risk.

On the rising ground at the east end of the long court above mentioned, there was erected last winter a bronze statue by Rauch, representing Francke supported by two orphans. This monument is in the first style of art; but one beholds it with less pleasure, because it is so much at variance with the whole character of the man, whom it was intended to honour. The buildings which surround the court, and the thousands of pupils who have gone out from them upon the theatre of life, are the strongest evidence of Francke's pious charities and unwearied energies, and constitute his best and most enduring monument. These institutions were all founded in prayer, and for a long time nurtured in piety and a pure and living faith; but in proportion as the spirit of Francke has disappeared in the German churches, so also it has ceased to direct even the work of his own hands; and that "Holiness to the Lord" which was once inscribed on all these walls, exists no more except in name. Indeed the state of all the orphanhouse schools was generally supposed to be such as to require a thorough examination and many reforms. Commissioners for this purpose were appointed by the government in April last; one of whom, on the religious state of the establishment, was Heubner of Wittemberg; but no intelligence has yet been received of the results of their inquiries.

sues from its mountain gorge upon the great plain of the Rhine. It would be difficult to select a spot of more loveliness, crowned as it is by the majestic ruins of the ancient castle, the finest and most picturesque object of the kind to be found out of Italy. The university suffered much at the plundering of the city by Tilly in 1620, when its celebrated library was carried off and transferred to the Vatican; whence nearly a thousand manuscripts relating to German history were recovered, at the general settling off of national accounts in 1814. Since the place came under the dominion of Baden in 1802, the university has been flourishing.

Among its theological professors are the venerable Schwarz, the author of a valuable work on education; Paulus, a man of taste and genius, but one of the leading rationalists of the day; who, at the age of threescore years and ten, seems daily more zealous to destroy the faith of Christian believers; Umbreit, the author of commentaries on Job and the Proverbs, and joint editor with Ullmann at Halle of the 'Theologische Studien.' Daub as a philosopher, Creuzer as a classical antiquarian, and Schlosser as a historian, are distinguished; the latter in particular deservedly enjoys a high reputation.

The number of students in the summer of 1829, was 602; of whom 55 were pursuing theology; 290 law; 168 medicine; and 89 other studies. The library contains about 45,000 volumes.

XI. JENA is a small city of 5000 inhabitants, situated in the deep valley of the Saale, in one of the pleasantest parts of Thuringia, about nine miles east of Weimar. The university was founded in 1558. Its reputation has suffered much in recent times, from the spirit of insubordination and licentiousness prevalent among the students; who, aware of their importance to the inhabitants, and unrestrained in this little city by any voice of public censure, readily gave into all the extravagance of imaginations heated by the excitement of the day, and neither under the regulation of sound judgment, nor controlled by the advice of wise and prudent instructors. It was also unfavourable for Jena, that Sands the insane murderer of Kotzebue was one of her students; as this action, which was no doubt the effect of a disordered intellect, was held to be an index of the views and feelings, supposed to prevail among the students in general. At present, however, these prejudices have, in a great

measure died away ; and the students of Jena are not regarded as greater demagogues, than many of their brethren.

The theological faculty has had a succession of eminent men ; the Walchs, Griesbach, and others spent their lives here, and Eichhorn and Paulus commenced here their careers. It now possesses Baumgarten-Crusius, H. Schott, and Hoffmann, the author of the Syriac Grammar. Luden, the successor of Schiller in the chair of history, is one of the brightest names among the many historians of the country. The number of students of late years has been from 500 to 600. Of the size of the library there is no recent specification.

XII. KIEL is mentioned here, because it is strictly a German university, belonging properly to the province of Holstein, the possession of which now gives to the king of Denmark a seat and voice in the Germanic confederation. The university was founded in 1665, and has a library of 100,000 volumes. In the summer of 1828 there were 380 students ; in the winter following 333 ; of whom 152 were in theology, 105 in law, 57 in medicine, and 19 in other studies. The only professors generally known, are the theologian Twesten, and J. Olshausen, who is now engaged in publishing the original of the Zendavesta.

XIII. KOENIGSBERG lies on the Baltic, in the remote north-eastern part of the Prussian territories ; and its university, founded in 1544, is therefore at present frequented only by students from the vicinity. The whole number in the autumn of 1829 was 441, viz. 221 theologians, 134 jurists, 23 students of medicine, and 63 in other branches. The library contains 60,000 volumes. The university is not wanting in able professors ; as is proved by the names of Olshausen, von Bohlen, Gebser, Dinter the rationalist, in the theological faculty ; and in the philosophical, those of Lobeck, Graff, Herbart, and others. The latter now occupies the former chair of the philosopher Kant.

XIV. LEIPSIK was founded in 1409, by an emigration of teachers and scholars out of Prague, and has always taken rank among the most distinguished of the schools of Germany. Its annals are graced by the names of Gellert, Ernesti, Platner, Morus, Dathe, Keil, Tzschirner, and many others of like distinction. Among its present professors are, in theology, J. A. H. Tittmann, the editor of the Greek Testament, and author of various works on exegesis and systematic divinity ; Goldhorn, Winzer, and Hahn, of whom some account is given in a subsequent article of this work. In the philosophical department are

Beck and Schaefer, the editors of various classical authors; Hermann, the coryphaeus of Greek philologists; Lindner, and the younger Rosenmüller, so prolific in commentary, but whose works advance so slowly as to exhaust the patience of those who wait for them. The medical faculty possesses Heinroth, distinguished as a medical and philosophical writer, and known for his skilful treatment of the insane.

The number of students in the summer of 1829 was nearly 1400, of whom those pursuing theology were by far the smallest class. In the other three faculties the numbers were nearly equal. There are here two philological seminaries, under the direction of Beck and Hermann. The library contains 60,000 volumes and 1600 manuscripts.

XV. **MARBURG** is the oldest protestant university, having been founded in 1527, soon after the light of the Reformation had begun to dawn. Its yearly income from funds under its own management is about 20,000 rix dollars, to which a like sum is added by the government of Hesse Cassel, to which Marburg belongs; making, in all, an annual income of \$28,000. The library has rising of 100,000 volumes. The number of students in the summer of 1829 was 351. The most known of the theological professors are Justi, the author of several works on the poetical writings of the Hebrews, and Hupfeld, a young and promising oriental scholar.

XVI. **MUNICH.** The university at this place was first founded in 1826, or rather was then established by the removal thither of the former university at Landshut. The project was a favourite one with the present king of Bavaria, who was himself educated at Göttingen (where also his eldest son is at present residing), and wished to establish in the south of Germany a university which might vie with those of the north. The institution seems already to be very flourishing; the number of students has been stated at 1600. The writer has no accounts, from which he can ascertain the numbers in the different faculties; nor does he know any distinguished names among the professors, except Schelling the philosopher, Oken the natural historian, and Mannert the geographer. The theological faculty is of course catholic. It has indeed been rumoured, that a protestant faculty was to be established; but this has not yet been done. The royal library at Munich is the largest in Germany or on the continent, except those of Paris and Copenhagen. It contains 400,000 volumes, and 8,500 manuscripts, many of which are very valuable.

XVII. **ROSTOCK** is the university of Mecklenburg. It was founded in 1419, was transferred from 1437 to 1443 to Greifswalde, and again from 1760 to 1789 to Bützow. It has a library of 80,000 volumes, including the very rare collection of oriental books and manuscripts made by the late O. G. Tychsel, its most distinguished professor. Among the present professors are Hartmann, the author of the *Linguistische Einleitung ins A. T.* and other works on biblical literature; and Fritzsche, the commentator on the Gospels. This is the smallest of the German universities, having only about 150 students, of whom nearly the half are usually theologians.

XVIII. **TÜBINGEN**. This university has the reputation of being the only one, which has not departed from the principles and doctrines of the Reformation; while the names of Storr, the Flatts, Süskind, and Bengel, have given it a peculiar lustre and influence among the friends of religion. It was founded in 1477, and early took a high rank among the literary institutions of the country. At present, the only names of note are Steudel in theology, Bohnenberger in physics, and Uhland the poet. There is also a catholic faculty of theology. The number of students in the summer of 1829 was 876, divided as follows; in theology, 226 protestants and 182 catholics; in law, 97; in medicine, 148; other studies, 229. The library contains over 130,000 volumes. In this university there is a peculiar institute or seminary for the education of theological students, to which we shall again advert in the second part of this article.

XIX. **WÜRZBURG** was founded in 1403, and after various vicissitudes has fallen at length under the dominion of Bavaria. It is a catholic university, and is most known abroad as a school of medicine; but it numbers among its professors no names which are celebrated in the north of Germany. It has a library of 100,000 volumes; and had in 1827 not less than 676 students, of whom 144 were theologians, 243 jurists, 158 students of medicine, and 131 in other studies.

Such is the list of the universities at present existing in Germany, exclusive of the Austrian states. In these there are four universities, catholic of course, viz. Vienna, Prague, Pesth, and Innsbruck in the Tyrol. The following notice, written immediately after a visit to Vienna in 1827, describes the character of the Austrian institutions. "The university of VIENNA, (founded in 1365,) like all those of the Austrian dominions, differs essential-

ly from those of the other German states. It is merely a continuation or an extension of the gymnasium. Instead of a freedom of choice among the courses of lectures and professors, the youth must pursue a prescribed course and hear certain professors. On first entering the university, they must pursue a specified course in the philosophical department for two years; this all must hear. Afterwards they divide off into professions; the theologian pursues a specified course of four years; the jurist, one of four years; and the student of medicine, one of five years. All these courses are accompanied by strict examinations; and no one can hope to obtain a place in any shape dependent on the government, (and all places are so,) without a certificate of good behaviour and diligent study. There is no ostensible prohibition (since 1825) against studying at a foreign university; but one who does it, cannot hope afterwards to earn his bread at home; for every place, civil, judicial, medical, every place as an instructor of youth, and all the catholic ecclesiastical situations, are in the hands of the government, and are never bestowed without this testimony from a domestic university. The study of all history, except that of Austria, has recently been excluded from the course; and the young men are kept so busy as to allow them no time to pursue it in private. All this I heard in Vienna; and had previously been told the same in Prague, in relation to the university there." At that time there were in the theological faculty at Vienna 35 students; in the law faculty 172; in the medical 283; and in the philosophical 25; in all 515. The medical school of Vienna has been and is still highly celebrated. Among the theological professors are Ackermann, who has given new editions of Jahn's *Archaeology* and his smaller *Introduction to the Bible*; and Oberleitner, the pupil and successor of Jahn, and the author of several works on oriental literature. He is a monk of the Benedictine order, and lives in a convent of the Scottish Benedictines. The library of the university contains 80,000 volumes. Besides this there is also the royal library, containing near 300,000 volumes, and a collection of manuscripts. It is arranged in an immense and splendid room, which however is too small for the number of books. The manuscripts and incunabula, in which the library is rich, are kept in separate apartments.

The university of PRAGUE is the oldest in Germany, having been founded in 1348 on the model of that of Paris. It flourished so much, that in 1409 it numbered 20,000 students. At

that time discontents arose, and secessions took place, both of teachers and pupils, which gave occasion for founding the universities of Leipsic, Rostock, Ingoldstadt, and Cracow. Of the particulars of its present state, the writer has no information, except that it possesses a library of 100,000 volumes. The same is the case in regard to the university at INNSBRUCK, which was founded in 1672, disbanded in 1810, and again reorganized in 1814. That of PESTH was first established as a university at Buda in 1780, and in 1784 transferred to its present site. In 1829 there were no less than 1710 students, viz. 1243 Catholics, 142 Greeks, 172 Protestants, and 153 Jews. Among these 73 were pursuing theology, 381 law, 401 medicine, and 609 the studies of the philosophical department. It may be here remarked, that the Hungarians are active and eager in the pursuit of knowledge; and many protestant students of theology visit especially the universities of Leipsic and Halle. In this latter, there are many stipends appropriated exclusively to students of this character.

Besides the nineteen universities of protestant Germany proper, above specified, there have formerly existed many others, which have been broken up in the vicissitudes and violence to which that country has been exposed. The following list contains their names, the date of their foundation, and the year of their dissolution so far as known: *Cologne*, founded 1388, now a gymnasium; *Erfurt* 1392, suppressed 1816; *Trèves* 1472; its library of 70,000 volumes still remains attached to the gymnasium; *Ingoldstadt* 1472, removed in 1802 to *Lands-hut*, and in 1826 to Munich; *Mayence* 1477, suppressed in 1798; its revenues now belong to Giessen; *Wittemberg* 1502, broken up during the wars, and afterwards united with Halle in 1815; *Frankfort* on the Oder 1506, united with Breslau in 1810; *Dillingen* 1549, now a gymnasium; *Helmstadt* 1576, suppressed in 1809 under the Westphalian government, and some of its professors transferred to Halle; *Aldorf* 1578, incorporated with Erlangen in 1807; *Rinteln* 1621, suppressed like Helmstädt in 1809, and Wegscheider transferred to Halle; *Salzburg* 1623, suppressed in 1810; *Bamberg* 1648, suppressed in 1804.

After this notice of the German universities, it may not be uninteresting to the reader, to know the present state of four other universities, which are either in themselves essentially German, or on the German plan; and from their position may

also be properly included in an article on the institutions of that country. They are the universities of Bâle, Strasburg, Dorpat, and Copenhagen.

BÂLE was founded in 1459, and has the names of Erasmus and the three Buxtorfs to boast of among its professors. In 1826, a Buxtorf, a descendant of the former family, still held the chair of Hebrew literature,—an old man who had reached the years, but not the fame of his fathers. At present, De Wette and Hagenbach are the only theological professors. The former is living here in a sort of exile; but attracts more students than all the other professors together. The whole number, however, is less than 100, exclusive of the students of the Missionary Seminary under Mr Blumhardt, who are all enrolled as members of the university, in order to enter the ministry by the regular door. Their number is usually from 40 to 50. The library has about 36,000 volumes, and contains some valuable manuscripts, autograph letters of the reformers, etc.

The university of STRASBURG was founded in 1621. Having been broken up during the French revolution, it was reinstated in 1803, by connecting faculties of law and philosophy with a protestant faculty of theology. The study of medicine is pursued in a separate *Ecole de médecine*. Among the theological professors are Dahler and Matter; and to the philosophical faculty belonged the two Schweighäusers, of whom the elder, the celebrated classical editor, is recently deceased. The number of students is unknown.

The city of DORPAT lies on the great road between St. Petersburg and Germany, and although in the Russian territory, is yet mostly inhabited by Germans, and its university is in all respects on the German plan, is furnished with German professors, and was founded for the German students of the country. It has of late years been distinguished for its activity in natural science, and several of its professors have made extensive scientific journeys in the interior of the Russian empire, as well as to its south-eastern borders. The names of Ebers and the Parrots are distinguished. It has ordinarily about 400 students; and has a library of 40,000 volumes. Its observatory is celebrated.

The university of COPENHAGEN was founded in 1475; and has now about forty instructors, of whom sixteen are ordinary professors, and from 600 to 700 students. The general plan is the same as that of the German universities, but the usual courses are longer, and the whole system more rigorous. Stu-

dents are admitted only after an *examen artium*; the first year is spent by all in the study of a prescribed course of philosophy, mathematics, physics, and astronomy; and it is only in the second year that the regular *Brodstudium* or professional study is commenced, which usually continues three or four years. Before leaving the university they are subjected to a severe examination of several days, and reported as *laudabiles, haud illaudabiles, et non contemnendi*. This university examination is unknown in Germany, except in the case of conferring degrees. Copenhagen and the literary world have lately sustained a great loss in the death of Bishop Münter. Among the present professors of theology are Möller, Müller, and Hohlenberg, the latter a former pupil of Gesenius. In the philosophical faculty, the ornament of the university and of Denmark is the indefatigable Professor Rask, who though still a young man has resided several years in Iceland, and penetrated by land to India, for the purpose of tracing out the affinities of the languages of Western Europe and Eastern Asia. The library of the university contains 80,000 volumes, and a collection of Icelandic manuscripts brought home by Rask, which the writer had the pleasure of seeing under the guidance of the professor himself. The royal library is one of the finest in Europe; the number of volumes is sometimes specified at 130,000; but in the writer's notes, made on the spot in 1827, and on the authority of the librarian, the number is stated at 400,000, and it certainly cannot be less than four or five times as large as the university library. It is the only library on the continent or perhaps in the world, of which there exists a complete scientific catalogue, comprised in 132 folio volumes in manuscript. Here are deposited the oriental manuscripts collected by Niebuhr.

From the preceding statements it appears, that in the nineteen universities of Germany proper, there are on an average constantly more than 15,000 students, in a population of about thirty millions. These are taught by more than 1000 professors and instructors. On the other hand, in a portion of the Austrian dominions containing a population of eighteen millions, there are four universities, in which we cannot estimate the number of students at more than 3600. If now we inquire into the causes of this success in the German protestant universities,—for only three out of the nineteen, Freiburg, Munich, and Würzburg, are catholic, and these are now conformed to the protestant model,—we

shall probably be able to find them without difficulty, and be led at the same time to other interesting results.

The first reason, and a very obvious one, is the small number of universities in comparison with the whole population ; there being only nineteen for thirty millions. Prussia with a population of thirteen millions has six universities with nearly 6000 students ; the United States with about the same population have more than forty colleges. This, however, is no fair comparison, since it should lie rather with our professional schools. Even then it would not hold good, unless the numbers engaged in professional study here, were as great as there, which is by no means the case. Assuming that the average course in the universities continues three years, there are then 5000 annually, who complete their professional studies ; and the like number who enter upon them. Of course, the fewer universities, the greater the concourse at each of them. If the same proportion between the population and the students were found in Austria as in protestant Germany, her universities ought to contain no less than 9000 students ; or rather, taking into account that the usual course in Austria is four years, instead of three, there ought to be 12000 students at her universities, instead of 3600. This fact serves to show the different spirit of these different portions of the great German family.

A second reason is the circumstance to which allusion has already been made, that in Germany the intellectual energies have no outlet in the ordinary channels of an active, practical, business life. Since therefore the means of acquiring external influence are in a great measure cut off ; men of aspiring minds are driven to the cultivation of literature and science, as the only remaining means of acquiring fame and influence and profit. Indeed, for such as wish to obtain posts of trust and emolument, the regulation is compulsory, as we shall see more fully below. But in regard to all those who are not aiming at offices under government, if any such there be, the same necessity is laid upon them. In the whole of Germany there exists, for instance, no opportunity whatever of addressing a public assembly, except from the pulpit. The proceedings of all the courts of justice are private, and are mostly conducted in writing. Deliberative assemblies exist only in the few states which have the semblance of a constitution, and their sittings are never public. Popular eloquence, the eloquence of the bar, the eloquence of the senate, these mighty engines in kindling the spirit and arous-

ing the energies of a nation, are to a German inaccessible and unknown. He has no opportunity of thus acting upon others, nor of being himself thus acted upon. He can come before the public only through the medium of the press; and hence it probably in a great measure arises, that the German press is so prolific; inasmuch as the ten thousand visionary schemes and projects, which in this country are thrown out in the ardour of public speaking or in the ephemeral columns of a newspaper, must there assume the more permanent form of magazines and books.

A third and more efficient reason than all others for the course of students at the universities of Germany, arises from the nature of the governments, and the relation which the universities sustain to them. It has been already remarked, that the various governments of Germany are in all their essential features despotic. They are, indeed, for the most part, mild and parental; but this must be attributed to the personal character of the rulers, whose actions are amenable at the tribunal of public opinion, and who yield to its decisions. This parental character certainly does not belong to the system; and it needs only a sovereign so lost to integrity and regardless of public sentiment, as to set at nought the bounds which custom has prescribed, to shew that there exists no higher power than his own will despotically exercised, and no legal or constitutional restraint whatever upon that will. The recent examples of Brunswick and of Hesse Cassel are in point; and it is only the revolutionary spirit of the moment, which has operated as a check upon the exercise of the fullest despotism. The sovereigns of Germany universally hold the whole power in their hands; and there is not a place of honour or profit, from the minister of state down to the petty schoolmaster of a village, which is not directly or indirectly dependent on the government. Every lawyer is one, only so far as he is connected with the courts of justice, as an officer of lower or higher rank and name; every physician is one, only so far as he has the license and the sanction of the proper department; the church itself is but the slave of the civil power, and must do all its bidding. No man can devote himself to the service of his divine Master, and proclaim salvation to the perishing souls of his fellow men, but in the way which the government directs. Were he to attempt it, without having yielded obedience to all the prescribed formalities, there is not a spot in Germany where imprisonment or banishment would not be his lot. The government

mixes itself in every thing, prescribes every thing, will know every thing, and prohibits every thing, which does not strictly coincide with its own interests and will.

In this system of things, the universities act a conspicuous and necessary part. They have been established, and are supported by the governments, as seminaries to train up and qualify young men for the offices of church and state,—those offices which the governments alone can give, and which, as a universal rule, they give only to such as have received a university education. No one is permitted even to ask for an office in the state, or a station in the church, or for employment in the courts, or for practice as a physician, unless he has been at a university. This is a *sine qua non*, a previous question, which, if answered in the negative, precludes all other questions. The only exceptions are in the case of village schoolmasters and the department of mines; for both of which, there are special seminaries, which take the place of a university course. The universities then are interwoven with the very system of government; they form an essential feature in its policy; and from the very nature of their relation to it, they must forever remain under its immediate control. They are not independent literary institutions, at which only those who please may drink of the waters of knowledge at the fountain; but they are the creatures of the government, to which all those who will get their bread in a professional calling must resort.

It is easy to see, however, that this state of things must have a prodigious influence on the character of society; that while the governments thus act directly in augmenting the number of those who frequent the universities, they afford in this way an opportunity for the universities to react upon the governments and upon the people, by exerting and cherishing a love of literature and science, and a spirit of liberal inquiry and deep investigation, in those who are to be the future servants of the church and nation,—who are to be the guardians of the health, the protectors and interpreters of the rights, and the shepherds and bishops of the souls, of millions of their fellow men. Such was once Wittemberg; and it produced the Reformation. Impressed with the magnitude of these considerations, how should Christians be constrained to pray without ceasing, that these fountains may again be cleansed; that pure and undefiled religion and morality may again prevail and abound there; and thus these institutions become once more, what they once have been, a rich blessing to the church and to the world.

In this connexion, we may also discover the ground of another feature in the German universities, which has often struck the literary men of other countries with surprise, and for which no satisfactory reason has usually been assigned. This is, the general character for diligence and unremitting study, which belongs to the students of Germany as a body. In all the universities, it is true, there are those who seem to regard it as the chief object of a residence there, to set at defiance all authority and all law, to escape as much as possible from the thralldom of all discipline, and to make it the great end of all their exertions to counteract, so far as they may be able, the purpose for which they were sent thither by their friends, and lay a broad foundation, not of future usefulness, but of future depravity. Such characters however are not confined to the universities of Germany; nor do they even there, as has been already remarked, constitute the greatest, nor even a great proportion of the whole number of students. To the great body must certainly be assigned the praise of diligent and patient study. Many of these, no doubt, are actuated by the love of study in itself; their thirst for knowledge spurs them on, and they make acquisitions, which render them objects of admiration to their companions, and to the learned world. But men like these are comparatively few; and they are chiefly those who afterwards devote their lives to the pursuits of literature and science, as professors in the universities or in other similar stations. And even among these, among the thousand teachers of Germany, how few, comparatively, can be regarded as eminently distinguished. In proportion to the number of students, it may be safely averred, that fewer rise to distinguished eminence in Germany than in our own country. But on the other hand, the great body of students are there carried forward far beyond our ordinary standard, and study with a perseverance that is with us rare.

What then is the cause of all this diligence? is a question often asked. Is it because the German youth have more solidity, more seriousness of character, than our own? This assuredly is not the case; for Americans, and the American youth, possess a character of serious earnest, which is unknown in Europe. Is it then the effect of example, a sort of hereditary or traditional diligence, which has been handed down for ages, and become so habitual at the universities that none can escape its influence? Something of this, indeed, there may be; but its effects are comparatively small; for the annals of former days tell of scenes

of idleness and dissipation, which would not be tolerated at the present time. But the chief secret lies here, as before, in the direct power of the governments over all places of honour and profit; in the general requisition of a university education as a *sine qua non* preparation for every public station; and lastly and principally in the fact, that no one is even then admitted into any profession, nor to hold any office whatever, without being first subjected to two, and sometimes three, severe examinations. Here is the strong hold of the governments upon the students, and the main secret of the good behaviour and diligence of the latter.

Of all who enter the universities, there are probably not so many as one in ten, who are not looking forward to an employment under government; that is to say, there are not so many who are expecting to subsist merely upon their own resources. They all know moreover full well, that the government not only keeps a watchful eye over their conduct while they are students, but that when they have passed through the regular time, they must undergo examinations, not in name alone, but in rigorous earnest, and before men of tried ability. If they fail here, they are indeed permitted to make one more trial; but if they fail again, the fruits of their years of toil, and their hopes of future subsistence, are gone forever. They can never again be admitted to an examination, either under their own government, nor under any other in Germany. It is here that the governments press with their whole weight upon the students, and compel a diligence which can know neither remission nor rest, until its great object be accomplished.*—It is in these circumstances

* The number of hours which German students spend each day in study, is of course different in different individuals. Generally speaking, their literary men do not push their studies far into the night, but pass their evenings with their families or in society. The same is also the case with the learned men of Paris; they do little or nothing after 5 or 6 o'clock, the usual dinner hour. When we hear of a professor's studying 16 or 17 hours a day, we may usually set it down as an exaggeration. The most that can be made of the assertion is, that his whole day is taken up with literary pursuits, without any intervals devoted to exercise or society. But this time is not spent in laborious *study*, properly so called; unless lecturing, the reading of newspapers and journals, the writing of letters, and any conversation which passes at his room, comes under that denomination. A general feature of

too, that a check is found upon that entire liberty of study, which is represented as the characteristic of the German sys-

the German scholars is, that they live a very sedentary, and in some respects secluded life; and this serves perhaps to account for the fact, that their literature has more learning, but less of elasticity and nerve, than that of English scholars. The modern fine writers of Germany, on the other hand, who have established and cultivated a national literature, have mostly been men of social habits, and have mingled much with the world.

Connected with this subject is that of the *health* of the continental students. It is often asked, how they are able to pass long lives in a regular course of hard study; while American literary men so often break down with dyspeptic and other complaints. The former do not escape the 'ills that flesh is heir to;' but it is true, that the fashionable disease of the day with us, is unknown, or at least is not fashionable, on the continent. This however cannot be set down to the score of diet; for the continental scholars eat and drink and sleep like other men. They love their glass of wine too; and German scholars moreover love a warm supper before going to bed. They also drink coffee twice a day, in the morning and after dinner; and take comparatively little exercise. Yet with all this, they generally enjoy good health; or at least suffer only from those complaints, which arise out of a sedentary habit. The cause of this difference in the two hemispheres, it is not the province of the writer to inquire into, nor is this the place for such an investigation. Suffice it to say, that *there* scholars are trained to study from childhood; and do not, as is often the case *here*, after a youth of labour and habits of great activity, change at once and adopt a sedentary life.

In respect to the article of food, there are three things which strike an American, and may probably have some influence in regard to complaints of the stomach, viz. that the inhabitants of the continent eat, as a general rule, less meat than we do; that in both the German and French style of cookery, the food of all kinds is much more thoroughly done than with us; and that the continental custom of serving the dishes in succession at meals, instead of placing all on the table at once, obliges them to eat much more slowly than we are accustomed to do. A dinner or supper table is there a place of animated conversation; which of course occasions many interruptions, and affords opportunity for the appetite to become satisfied, before the stomach is overloaded.

There is also a moral cause, which seems to have no little influence on the general health and spirits of their scholars; and

tem. A student who has made choice of his profession, is indeed left to select his instructors and arrange the course of his studies at will ; he may also hear as many lectures in other departments as he pleases ; but still the certainty of future examinations does not permit him to neglect the studies of his proper course ; he must first and at all events make himself acquainted with those branches, on which he is to be examined.* Nor can he do this by mere memory, or by studying the answers to a set of questions. The day has gone by, when a young man could be *ground* into a state of preparation for an examination made under the authority of government ; whatever may still be the case at some of the universities, in regard to an examination merely for a degree.

If we look now for a moment at the actual state and character of the German universities, we shall find, along with all their vast and acknowledged advantages, several great and prominent evils, some of which have crept in gradually in practice and are susceptible of correction ; while others are inherent in the system itself. Of the former kind, is the want of personal intercourse between the professors and students. As a general fact, most of the professors have no intercourse whatever with their pu-

this is, that in their hours of relaxation they unbend the mind much more than is usual here. While they are in their studies and lecture rooms, their minds work with intense effort ; but when they come out, and especially in society, they are like children let loose from school ; their labours and studies are for the time forgotten, and they meet each other not as professors or learned men, but as familiar friends and every day acquaintances. This is connected, no doubt, with the great feature of European character, which at once strikes Americans, that all ranks and classes there have a far greater *enjoyment of the present*, than ourselves. Our national character, so far as we have one, consists in a spirit of enterprise, excited by the desire of improving our condition. It may be shortly styled a *love of gain*,—gain not only of wealth, but also of reputation, of comfort, of happiness,—gain of all that we suppose to be desirable. *Our* enjoyment consists more in the striving after this gain,—in anticipation, and in the very act of acquiring ; *theirs*, in possession and quiet fruition.

* It is not uncommon for a student to spend the first year of his course in idleness, and afterwards give up all amusement and devote himself to severe study. In this case he is said, in their peculiar jargon, to *ochsen*, i. e. work like an ox.

pils except in the lecture rooms. They take no interest in them any further than to induce them, if possible, to attend their own lectures, and thus obtain the fee ; but do not take the trouble to inquire whether a young man properly improves his time, nor whether he has chosen the best course of study, or the best means to help him forward in his progress. Any parental interest in a young man, or watch over his moral development, is a thing, generally speaking, entirely unknown. Individual professors do indeed occasionally invite a few of their own particular pupils to their houses, but rather as a matter of ceremony, than out of any regard to their moral or intellectual culture. This evil has doubtless arisen, partly in consequence of the laborious and secluded lives of the professors, and partly from the great number of the students, which renders it impossible to be upon an intimate footing with all. Still the evil might easily be corrected, could the professors become imbued with the proper spirit. A few, like Strauss and Neander at Berlin, and especially Tholuck at Halle, have begun a different course ; and in the latter instance, particularly, the results have been highly beneficial.

Another evil of the same class, is undoubtedly the present character and conduct of a portion of the students. Left to themselves, without any direct moral or civil restraints, and without inspection on the part of their instructors, it is no wonder that young men should choose an errant course ; but it must be borne in mind, that the character which is now attached to the life of a German student, is the inheritance of other days, and was acquired when the indirect restraints were far less than they now are. Until within the last few years, the requisitions of the governments were much less strict than at present ; and a mere residence at a university was assumed as a sufficient qualification for office, without further or with slight examination. Under such circumstances, of course, those who entered the universities without any love of study, and merely to while away the requisite number of years, plunged at once into all the temptations and snares to which every assemblage of youth are exposed ; and the whole burden of reproaches which the student of the present day must bear, the feats of drinking, smoking, duelling, etc. may be referred back to those earlier periods. But this evil belongs not to the system, any more than it is inherent in our own schools of law and medicine, where the students are in like manner left wholly to themselves. It is in fact di-

minishing ; and in the universities of Berlin and Munich, situated in large cities, duelling and the other peculiar characteristics of a university life are comparatively unknown ; and the students have become, in a great measure, assimilated to the ordinary forms of social life.

On the other hand, we may also remark two evils, which seem to result from the system itself, and which cannot be corrected without a change in the whole form of education. The first arises from the plan of oral lectures, as at present conducted, where the student writes down the words of the professor. Now where such lectures are treated, as is often the case, simply as a clue to guide the learner's own reading and investigation, there is no plan of study more interesting or profitable ; none which excites to greater ardour, or prompts to more persevering effort. But the mass of young men engaged in study are not of this class ; they receive what is given them, and rest satisfied with believing it all on the authority of the professor. It cannot be denied, that the tendency of such a state of things is to fill the mind with superficial knowledge, without exciting it to the cultivation of its own energies ; and it would not perhaps be too much to say, that while the real scholars of Germany are in advance of any thing that we can boast, the great mass of her clergy and civilians, while they know accurately that which they have learned, are less trained to habits of independent thought and the application of their knowledge to practical purposes, than the corresponding classes in our own land.

Another and more serious evil arises from the exclusive devotion to particular studies, which constitutes one prominent trait of the German plan of education. Indeed, the system of a division of labour is here carried to as high a point in regard to intellectual employment, as it is in England in respect to manual occupations. One theological professor devotes himself exclusively to the literature of the Old Testament ; another to that of the New ; a third, to systematic theology ; a fourth, to the history of the church ; a fifth, to practical theology. The same holds true in all other departments ; and the consequence is, that while they become radically acquainted with all that relates to their particular branch of study, they cultivate less thoroughly the other departments connected with it ; and leave entirely untouched many kinds of knowledge, which belong still more to the practical and ordinary course of human life. The result of all this is a want of general practical information, which is a mark-

ed characteristic of the educated men of Germany. They will overwhelm you with stores of argument and illustration on all topics of religion, morals, philosophy, and classical or oriental philology; but if asked a question relative to the ordinary affairs of life, or in general history, or in geography, they are often compelled to be silent. It may probably be truly said of the character of the German mind, that, as a nation, they delight more than any other in abstraction, in pushing their reasonings to the utmost limits, regardless of consequences; and hence have speculated oftener and wider beyond the limits of the human faculties, than any other people. Nothing is more true than that, in the words of their own Jean Paul, they 'hold the empire of the air,' and have had more strange conceits and fancies than any other nation. The general causes of this state of things seem to have been, in part at least, the condition of society and the system of education among them, by which so many are trained up remote from the active duties of life, and thus lose all relish for practical objects. Of the 15,000 pupils at the universities, the greater part can never have the opportunity of becoming practical men; while they yet are taught to *think*, and their intellectual powers are urged to a high state of cultivation. In this way they are compelled to build their speculations, without any foundation of experience and practical common sense. What wonder, then, that these speculations should often prove baseless; the mere dreams of busy intellect, without the guidance of practical wisdom.

In closing this first part of the present article, we may properly recur again for a moment to the question alluded to in the early part of it: Whether it would be practicable or advisable, in our country, to establish institutions on the German plan. After the facts already spread before him, the reader will be able to form a judgment on this question for himself. Institutions of a similar kind might no doubt be established here; but could they be expected to flourish, with any degree of success corresponding to those of Germany? Where are our preparatory schools, which shall furnish students for such institutions? We have none but our colleges; and will our young men, after having spent four years at one of these, and received its honours, as a general rule, repair voluntarily to an university? The avenues to influence and reputation and emolument are, with us, too many and too easy of access, to permit us to indulge this expectation. Where then is the power, either in our states or in our

general government, that can compel them to such a step? that can make the tenor of office, or of professional employment, depend on a residence at any university? Where too is the individual, or the state, or the congress, that will annually appropriate fifty thousand dollars, or the moiety of that sum, for the support of such an institution? In this land of civil freedom, we can use no legal force to compel young men to obtain an education. We can bring only a moral influence to bear; and when this shall have been long enough employed; when the moral wants of community shall demand other institutions; they will no doubt spring into existence, of a rank and nature adapted to the exigencies of the case. In the mean time, the safety of our nation, the security of our civil rights and the duration of our free government, depend upon the exertions which shall be made, to diffuse the blessings of knowledge and religion among the people. It is here that the duties of the Christian and the patriot meet together; and the momentous question is thus brought home to the 'business and bosoms' of the present generation of the American churches, Whether they will gird themselves for the work of the Lord, and by their exertions secure the permanence of our free institutions; or whether, by their inactivity, they will suffer vice and irreligion to become triumphant; knowing that when that time shall come, the light of liberty, which has so long beamed upon us and scattered its rays on distant climes, must, in all probability, go down in darkness and be quenched in blood.

ART. II. INTERPRETATION OF PSALM XVI.

By M. Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

It has been said, as characteristic of the commentaries on the Scriptures of the Old Testament by Cocceius and Grotius, that the former found Christ everywhere in them, and the latter nowhere. This is not, indeed, literally true; nor was it intended to be so understood. But the substance of what is asserted in this often repeated declaration, is correct. Cocceius was a strenuous advocate of the *double sense* of Scripture. In other words, he believed that a multitude of texts and passages in the Old Testament were intended to convey a *literal sense*, as their primary and obvious meaning; while at the same time

the sacred writers designed, or at least the Spirit of God who guided them designed, also to convey a mystical, allegorical, spiritual, or *secondary* sense, which usually has relation to Christ or to his church. Thus, according to him, many a Psalm has relation primarily to the literal David, the ancient king of Israel, and should be so interpreted throughout, when our object is merely to develop the primary and literal sense of it. But such a meaning is nothing more than the shell. The nut itself is concealed beneath this envelope, and can be truly discovered by those only, who know how to strip off the shell with dexterity. But such as understand the true secret of this, have the key to unlock boundless treasures of spiritual wealth in the ancient Hebrew Scriptures. 'All Scripture (in this way) becomes truly profitable for doctrine, for correction, for reproof, and for instruction in righteousness.' In this way only can the 'man of God be perfected, and thoroughly furnished unto every good work.'

The friends of such a method of interpretation aver, moreover, that it is in this way only, very much which is contained in the Old Testament, can be made profitable to readers under the Gospel dispensation. They plead also the example of nearly all the ancient commentators, back even to the very age of the apostles. They are careful to suggest, that such a method of interpretation, existing at so early a period, and being so general in the Christian church, must in all probability have been derived from the apostles themselves; who, of course, would follow the method of their divine Master. Nay, they assert directly, that such is plainly the method of the New Testament writers; that we have numerous examples where they have given another and secondary sense, such as conveys a spiritual and Christian meaning, to words which, as they stand in the Old Testament, can never be made to have such a meaning, provided we confine ourselves merely to a literal interpretation or a primary sense. In their estimation, therefore, the Jewish Scriptures are made truly Christian by giving them very frequently, if not throughout, what they would call an *evangelical* sense; and in so doing, we only walk in the steps of apostles and ancient saints, who evidently admitted a double sense, and commended the practice of giving it by their own example.

My present object will not permit me to examine at length the correctness of these allegations. Some excellent thoughts respecting the subject of mystical and allegorical interpretation

in general, the reader will find in the essay of Professor Hahn, which is contained in the present number of this work. My design in the above remarks, is merely to give a general sketch of the state of feeling and opinion in the church, in past times, with reference to many parts of the Old Testament Scriptures; and particularly, in regard to such parts as have been supposed to contain a reference to the Messiah.

So long as such a method of interpretation prevailed, we need not wonder that little or no difficulty was found in the explanation of the sixteenth Psalm. David was the person, who was regarded as being primarily and literally meant, throughout most of the Psalm. Now and then, indeed, the writer looked beyond his immediate theme, and cast a prophetic glance on him of whom David was held to be a distinguished type, i. e. the Messiah. In this way it was easy to proceed with the interpretation of the whole Psalm. Whatever might seem to fit David better than Christ, was referred to David; and whatever could not be well applied to him, e. g. more or less of vs. 9—11, was applied to the Messiah. So, for instance, Calvin does; from whom one might expect better things, since he stands so pre-eminent above all the other commentators of his day, as to acuteness, sound judgment, and nice logical discrimination. But in respect to the sixteenth Psalm, he gives the contents thus: "*Initio David se Dei tutelae commendat; deinde ex meditatione beneficiorum ad gratias agendas se accendit. Et tanquam suo cultu nihil Deo commodet, se tamen unice addicit, et a superstitionibus alienum fore testatur. Causam quoque addicit, quia plena et solida sit felicitas, in uno Deo acquiescere, qui nihil suis deesse patitur.*" In other words, 'It is David who speaks in Ps. XVI; who commends himself to God, declares his firm adherence to him only in distinction from all idol gods, expresses his thanks for mercies received, and his confidence that it will still be well with him.' In this way, the last three verses of the Psalm, which doubtless presented a difficulty to the mind of the great reformer, are passed by with a simple *in uno Deo acquiescere, qui nihil suis deesse patitur.*

But let us see how he manages vs. 9—11, when he comes to particulars in his commentary. Vs. 10 he applies wholly to David. "Because," says he, "God protects our souls, and also our bodies, David had good reason to represent his flesh as participating in the favour of dwelling in security." Vs. 11 he applies literally to David also, representing its author as declar-

ing by it, that 'he confidently expected to be redeemed from the grave, and not to remain always there in a state of corruption.'

So then, the sentiment of the writer is not that *the body should not putrefy in the grave*, but that *it should not always remain there in a state of putrefaction*; directly in the very face of Peter, in Acts 2: 29—32, and of Paul, Acts 13: 34—37. But after proceeding thus far, he seems to call to mind that Peter and Paul have commented upon this passage, and to feel his obligation to pay a deference to their opinion. "Unless Christ," says he, "had come forth from the grave, the first fruits of those who rise from the dead, mankind would have always remained in a state of corruption. Hence Peter with good reason draws the inference (Acts 2: 30), that David could not thus have gloried, unless by a prophetic spirit, and in consequence of having respect to the author of life promised to him, who alone was to be endowed with such a privilege," viz. of bringing dead bodies from the grave. Still we see David only, in the text of the Psalm; David expressing a hope, which indeed relies upon the expected victory of the Messiah over the powers of death, but which refers to this tacitly or by implication merely, and not in express words. The difficulty, however, still presses upon the mind of Calvin. He is not prepared to overlook it wholly, or to pass it by without another effort to dispose of it. "That Peter," says he, "in Acts 2: 30, and Paul in Acts 13: 33, contend that this prophecy was fulfilled only in the person of Christ, you must construe thus; he (Christ) was *entirely* and *altogether* exempt from the corruption of the sepulchre, that gradually (*gradatim*) and in a manner accommodated to the condition of each, he might call his members (Christians) to be associated with himself." He then goes on to say, that "as all men go down to the grave, and there are subject to corruption, *fulness* of life (i. e. full exemption from the corruption of the grave) belongs exclusively to Christ the head; and flows only *guttatim et per partes*, by drops and limited portions, to the members," i. e. to Christians.

So then, after all, we come to a double sense. 'Entire freedom from corruption, was never had, or to be had, except by Christ alone. Therefore Peter and Paul could apply v. 10 to him.' But if they could rightly do this, then v. 10 must designate *entire* freedom from corruption; otherwise it belongs only to David, or at most, to all the pious who have the like hopes with

David. If Calvin's real opinion can be gathered, from such confused and dark expressions as those which have now been cited, I should think it must be this: That the whole Psalm, so far as the *words* are concerned, really and truly applies to David; that at the same time, David could not have thus spoken, unless he had entertained a hope of a resurrection from the grave, through Christ, whom in prophetic vision he anticipated, and foresaw that his resurrection would procure that of his followers. In a high and full sense, (*εν πληρώσει, εν τῷ πληρωθῆναι,*) the Psalmist must have intended his words in v. 10 to be applicable only to the Messiah; but in a modified sense, *guttatim et per partes*, they may be construed of David or any other saint, and David intended them for himself.

This then is a double sense; although it is indeed teaching it by innuendo, or, as the Jewish Rabbins say, *בְּרִמְזָה* or *בְּרִמְזָה*, *by hint, allusion*, in a kind of allegorical or enigmatical way. That Calvin himself had formed any clear and definite idea of the principle of interpretation to be applied here, no one, I think, can well believe, who examines the tenor of his exegesis. That he should have had any difficulty, however, in coming out fully with a mystical interpretation, i. e. with a double sense, I cannot well understand; for in his commentary on the second Psalm, and on the twenty-second, he fully recognizes such a sense, making the literal application to David, and the spiritual one to Christ.

Verse 11 he applies to the resurrection of the Psalmist and of the pious to everlasting life, through Christ their head, in the like manner as v. 10 is explained.

How convenient such a method of interpretation is, too many critics have long since discovered. Whatever one cannot well apply to David the type, may of course be referred to Christ the antitype. Where it would cost much study and trouble, and demand an extensive and accurate knowledge of the Hebrew language and idiom, in order to determine the precise nature and value of an expression in the Old Testament, the interpreter, who is hastening his work, or shrinks from protracted labour and minute investigation, or is wanting in that knowledge of the Hebrew which will enable him to pursue an investigation to its ultimate sources, makes use of the very simple expedient of applying one part of a passage to some individual in a literal sense, and another part to Christ, in a high and spiritual sense. The commentator is the more contented

with all this; because he can plead the example of ancient days, and of a great multitude of expositors in every age of the church. He is insensible, perhaps, at the same time, that the *difficulty* of making out another exegesis, which would refer a Psalm wholly to David, or wholly to Christ, has in reality been with him the most persuasive and powerful argument.

Can we believe that Grotius, who has been accused of 'finding Christ no where' in the Old Testament, adopts more fully than Calvin, the double sense of the sixteenth Psalm? Read a part of his note on v. 10. "Sensus historicus (latet enim mysticus, sublimior, ut in plerisque Psalmis,) est hic: Quamquam undique opprimor a Saule, tamen certus sum, ex promissione regni mihi facta, non fore ei potestatem me interficiendi." That is, the *historic* or literal and primary sense of the verse is, not that the Psalmist should be raised from the grave, or that he should not be suffered to putrefy there, but that he should not be permitted at all to be brought there; in other words, that although he might be in great danger, yet he should certainly be preserved from death. At the same time, this distinguished commentator says, that "a mystical and more sublime sense lies hid under the words" of this Psalm; and adds, that "such is the case with most of the Psalms."

It does appear to me, that this last declaration of Grotius develops something which is not altogether ingenuous, an accommodation to the prevailing opinions of his day, which ill became such a man. If most of the Psalms have a 'mystical and more sublime sense' than what appears by the letter of them, then why has not Grotius intimated this, in his notes upon them? And why has he generally interpreted the Old Testament, and of course the Psalms along with the rest, in such a way as to leave no small room for the saying so often repeated, that 'he found Christ no where?'

The hint of Grotius, that the historical sense of vs. 9—11, applies only to the exemption of David from imminent danger, and the bestowing on him subsequent peace and happiness in the present world, has been taken up by others, and has now become the predominant exegesis of neological commentators.

Le Clerc, as one might expect, treads in the steps of Grotius his predecessor and favourite model. "Hæc (says he) de Davide intellecta, hoc tantum sibi volunt, non passurum fuisse Deum ut occideretur, ac proinde in sepulchrum conjectus illic relinqueretur, ita ut caro ejus in eo jaceret;" i. e. preservation from danger merely, not a resurrection from the dead, is meant.

But the *secondary* sense, what says Le Clerc to this? He says, "that it is evident the ancient Jews so interpreted the prophecies, that when they were fulfilled only *in certo sensu eoque dilutiore*, and contained something which might be applied in a higher sense to Christ, they were accustomed to make this latter application. This usage the apostles followed, as in Acts II. and XIII. Inasmuch as the words of this Psalm are *ἐμφατικώτεροι*, and something greater than the literal sense is intended, Peter (in Acts II.) applies them to the resurrection of Christ." He then refers to other interpreters, in order that the reader may satisfy himself about this point; and adds at the close, "de *primo sensu* potissimum agere aggressi sumus."

There is then, even according to this very liberal commentator, a *secundus sensus*, which he (pro pace cum eruditis?) admits in a cursory way, but on which he cannot spend time to dwell; all which is rather less ceremonious than the demeanour of Grotius, and I fear about equally sincere.

In Grotius and Le Clerc's first and historical sense, one finds, as has already been intimated, the kernel of all that the later commentators of the liberal school, have avowed and maintained respecting the Psalm in question. For substance, Ruperti, Rosenmüller, De Wette, and Gesenius, with a multitude of less distinguished writers, have embraced and maintained the same sentiment. It is a matter of some curiosity and interest, to see how these critics dispose of the commentary of Peter and Paul, in Acts II. and XIII.

Ruperti, in an exegesis published in the *Commentationes Theologicae* by Velthusen, Kuinöl and Ruperti, (Vol. I. 104 seq. Vol. II. 199 seq.) speaking of referring Ps. XVI. to the Messiah, says: "Quae interpretatio non modo ab orationis poeticae, Ebraeorum in primis, indole et natura abhorret, sed ne notioni quidem Messiae, qualem Judaei ab omni tempore sibi informabant, respondet. Hi enim Messiam sibi heroem, victorem, regemque potentissimum, non sacerdotem vel hominem, cum adversa fortuna multisque aerumnis conflictantem, fingebant." He then goes on to say, that "if any one without prejudice, and who is endowed with a relish for Hebrew poetry, and *unacquainted with what the New Testament teaches*, and what ancient and modern commentators have inculcated, should read the sixteenth Psalm, he would venture to bet any thing, (*quovis pignore contendere ausim*,) that such an one would scarcely find any ground of persuasion in it that the Messiah could be

meant; much less could he be *compelled* to believe that he is actually meant." He then proceeds to describe '*quam misere se torserint*' the interpreters, who have given it an interpretation referring to the Messiah.

In the sequel he states, that no one probably would have thought of such an explanation, if the apostles Peter and Paul had not led the way in it. He then adds: "That this is not sufficient to weaken the sentiment which we have advanced respecting the object of the Psalm, needs not now to be proved by a multitude of words." He then refers to Eichhorn, *Biblioth.* II. 947 seq. III. 920 seq. Eckermann, *Theol. Beiträge* Fasc. I. II. Paulus, *Memorabilien*, IV. 96. Behn, *Lehrtart Jesu*, and others, as having rendered it unnecessary to lay out any more strength in order to shew, that the exegesis of Peter and Paul is no guide for critics of the present day.

After adverting to Grotius, Le Clerc, Dathe, and others, as holding to the double sense of this Psalm, and requesting the reader who wishes to see trifling of this sort in abundance, to read commentaries on the Canticles, he proceeds thus: "*Quis enim non sentit, his argutiis, quibus ad mysticam allegoriam seu diloyiam (double sense) omnia revocantur, pulcherrima poetarum phantasmata deleri, omnem eorum suavitatem, elegantiam, ac vim infringi, et perspicuum saepe sensum obscurari?.... Cur caecutire malumus in incertis, quam in certis et perspicuis adquiescere?*"

Having briefly, but (as he supposes) thoroughly, prepared his way, he advances to the exegesis of the Psalm, agreeably to the above principles, in which he displays a good degree of learning and acuteness.

If now one inquires, whether *Is. LIII. Ps. XXII. and XL.* were not adapted to give the Jews some expectation of a *suffering* Messiah; and whether *Ps. cx.* was not intended to represent him as a *priest* as well as a king; the answer to all this is, that none but mystical commentators could so explain these portions of the Old Testament; and that when Christ and the apostles *seem* to adopt the exegesis in question, they must be regarded as doing so, merely in the way of accommodation to the prejudices of the Jews in their day, who were accustomed to refer a multitude of passages in the Scriptures to the Messiah, which were never designed by their original author to have relation to this subject.

Such is, for substance, the argument of those writers, to whom

Ruperti appeals, as having shewn that the interpretations of the apostles are not binding upon us. They are not so, because they were made *κατὰ συγκατάβασιν*, or merely by way of *accommodation* to the prejudices of their Jewish brethren, and not *ex animo*, or agreeably to their own real opinions with respect to the meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures. Consequently, so often as we find any interpretation by the New Testament writers, which seems to be at variance with the reasonable principles of hermeneutics, (i. e. such as we deem to be reasonable,) so often we may understand them to be merely *κατὰ συγκατάβασιν*.

Rosenmüller, in his Commentary on Ps. xvi. merely quotes from Ruperti a part of what has already been exhibited above, expresses his concurrence, and adds in a marginal note a quotation from Maimonides, a Jewish Rabbi of the twelfth century, to shew that it was not expected by the Jews, that the Messiah would rise from the dead. The passage runs thus: "The Messiah will die, and his son and grandsons will reign after him; for that he will die, is predicted in Is. 42: 4."

I intentionally pass by an examination into the grounds of these and the like assertions and views, for the present. I shall have something to say respecting them in the sequel. I only remark here, that it is indeed somewhat singular, that the testimony of a bigoted Jew, so late as the very last part of the twelfth century, living in the midst of Christians, and violently contending at every opportunity against them; of a Jew as little skilled in the opinions of the New Testament times as many a commentator is, who explains away the declarations of Peter and Paul, because he thinks he understands the disputes and theology of their times better than these apostles did;—I say it is passing strange that such a sentence as that quoted, from such a Jew, should sweep away the whole fabric erected by him who was that *rock* on which the church was to be built, and of him who sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and was a most perfect adept in all the rabbinical lore of the day.

In respect to Gesenius, I have no other index of his opinions, excepting the notes of a friend, who has been a hearer of his lectures, and has an abstract of his course on the Psalms. By this abstract, it appears that he construes the Psalm as relating to a pious man in danger, who casts himself on God, with a grateful sense of past mercies, and a confident hope of future protection; especially (in v. 10) does he express a hope not to be given up to his enemies, so as to suffer a premature and vio-

lent death. Verse 11, *thou shewest me the path of life, means, 'thou disclovest to me the way out of danger.'* The remainder means, 'Near thee is great joy, thou dispensest blessings with thy hand.'

To the like purpose De Wette speaks, in the third edition of his Commentary on the Psalms, published in 1829. "That the apostles Peter and Paul," he remarks, "explain the four last verses of our Psalm not merely by way of accommodation, but from real conviction,—since they aver directly that this passage cannot be understood of David,—cannot influence us, who stand on the ground of historical exegesis, to alter our views."

So then, here is at least a departure from Eichhorn, Ecker-
mann, Paulus, Ruperti, and others of the older school of neolog-
ists, who would fain have it, that the apostles explained Ps. xvi.
in reference to the Messiah, merely by virtue of accommoda-
tion, *κατὰ συγκατάβασιν*. But De Wette, (with whom Rosen-
müller agrees, as appears by a note in his Commentary,) comes
out very honestly, and avers, (what indeed one would very nat-
urally think to be true of such men as Peter and Paul,) that
the apostles really believed what they said. At the same time,
this, he thinks, is no reason why we should change *our* views,
and believe the apostles to be in right.

The mystery in all this, if there be any mystery to the reader
not conversant with the rationalist critics, is merely, how it can
be reconciled with the acknowledgment of the divine veracity
and integrity and correctness of the Scriptures. The fact is
simply, that none of these writers believe in this. If the reader
needs proof of such an assertion, I refer him to declarations
of Dr. Röhr, in the essay of Prof. Hahn contained in the pres-
ent number of this work, and to the *Institutiones* of Wegschei-
der, which have been so popular that the sixth edition has al-
ready been printed, during the author's life time. Wegschei-
der and Röhr, each in a different way, may be considered as
the present Coryphaei of the neological party in Germany.

Little prepared, as we in general are in this country, for such
avowals with regard to the sacred writers, still, I deem them
far preferable to the fashionable *accommodation* doctrine of the
generation now passing off the stage in Germany. We know
where to meet those who openly make such avowals; and al-
though we cannot agree with them in opinion, we may commend
their frankness and honesty.

De Wette, however, seems after all to have some relentings

in respect to the position which he has taken. In the sequel he goes on to say, that "the writer of this Psalm looked indeed no farther than to the danger of an early and violent death, and to deliverance from it; and so the hopes of the pious, in ancient days, were in general of a mere earthly nature. But Christianity has taught us to look to eternal things, and cherish correspondent hopes. Now *all* hopes are fulfilled in Christ. And as earthly hopes comprehend heavenly ones, inasmuch as they are an index to them and the image of them; so the apostles understood and explained the hopes expressed in this Psalm. Their explanation of it amounts to this: *the full, entire, deep truth or reality of the Psalmist's hope, is fulfilled and rendered sure, only in Christ.* This, he adds, is not accommodation, but *ideal* interpretation; which the apostles every where follow, when they apply to the Messiah passages of the Old Testament."

After all, then, we are virtually brought back to the double sense of ancient times, the very one admitted by Grotius and Le Clerc. What a strange mixture of scepticism and mysticism De Wette often exhibits!

Turn we now from this view of commentary in modern times, to the ancient critics. Eusebius of Caesarea, the celebrated church-historian, is the first to whom I would direct the attention of the reader, because he evidently gives the usual exegesis of the day, and also that which was current in the church among writers of preceding times. His Commentary on the Psalms, which has become a rare book, may be found in Vol. I. of Montfaucon's *Nova collectio Patrum et Scriptorum Graecorum*, Par. 1706, the *editio princeps* of the work in question.

Eusebius observes, that 'if the inquiry be made, to whom the things said in Ps. xvi. are to be referred, Peter the apostle is a teacher worthy of our confidence.' He then cites the words of Peter in Acts 2: 29—32; after which he proceeds to say, that "it would be superfluous to inquire any further to whom this Psalm is to be applied, since we have the testimony *τηλικούτου μάρτυρος*. The Seventy, he adds, have entitled this Psalm *στηλογραφία*, *inscriptio, monumental inscription*, because it contains the victory over death obtained by Christ when he rose from the dead."

In accordance with this, he appropriates the whole Psalm to the Messiah, without admitting any mystical or secondary sense in the ordinary way. However, he admits a kind of qualified sense, when he expounds vs. 3 and 4. He supposes the Mes-

siah to speak here of the saints, as comprehended in his own person; *δύναται ιδιοποιούμενος τὰ πάθη τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ, τὰ προκείμενα ἐξ αὐτῆς λέγειν.* To these verses he gives the following turn: ‘The saints formerly multiplied their idols; but after they were taught the truth by my wonderful deeds among them, they hasted away from all their abominations, etc.’ This if it be not very solid exposition, may at least put in some claim to the praise of ingenuity.

To the same purpose almost exactly, does Jerome explain the Psalm before us. “The Psalm pertains to Christ, who speaks in it. . . . It is the voice of our King, which he utters in the human nature that he had assumed, but without detracting from his divine nature. David means Christ. The Psalm pertains to his passion.” The third and fourth verses, he explains in the same way as Eusebius. We see nothing at all of David in the whole Psalm. *Vox Christi, vox Christi ad Patrem*, is often repeated by Jerome, throughout his commentary. Brev. in Psalterium, p. 151.

In the like manner does Augustine also explain the Psalm. “Rex noster,” says he in quoting the title, “in hoc Psalmo loquitur ex persona susceptionis humanae, de quo titulus regalis (he refers to מֶלֶךְ which the Seventy render *σηλογοραφία*) tempore passionis inscriptus eminuit.” In the explanation of vs. 3 and 4, he also agrees for substance with Eusebius.

We see then, that there is no foundation for charging the ancient commentators, at any rate the most distinguished and conspicuous among them, with giving a double sense to the Psalm under consideration. They do not apply it at all to David. He does not seem to have even entered their minds as the object of the Psalm, but merely as the author of it. Of course, those modern interpreters, who, like Calvin, Grotius, Le Clerc, Dathe, and many others, find a primary and secondary, or a historic and spiritual or ideal meaning in the sixteenth Psalm, cannot make their appeal for support to the distinguished commentators of the ancient church. Mistake on this subject, however, has been so common, that I hope the true exhibition of the ancient exegesis, as made above, will not be regarded as superfluous.

If now we must declare, which of the various views that have been presented respecting the design and meaning of this Psalm we should choose, for one I should answer, that I agree with none of them; I mean, that there is no one among the whole, which I could adopt as my own, and be satisfied with

it throughout on critical and hermeneutical grounds ; although for *substance*, I should agree with the ancient commentators.

I cannot admit the double sense. There is a host of difficulties which rise up against this, too numerous to be particularly recounted on the present occasion. I can merely hint at some of the leading ones. If there be an occult sense to the words of Scripture, not conveyed by the language itself, to be attained in some way independent of the laws of language ; then it would follow, that he who reads the Scriptures, and applies to them the laws of interpretation common to all other books, can have no security, that he has arrived at the principal and most important meaning which they were designed to convey. If there be an occult meaning, couched under the words of Scripture, a second inspiration is needed for the readers, in order to determine it with any good degree of satisfaction ; for when the laws of language cease to be the guide, (as of course they most in the case before us,) then some substitute worthy of equal or greater confidence, must come in their place. But a substitute must be either conjecture, or inspiration. The first surely cannot lay claim to much certainty ; it is subject to no laws ; it has no bounds. A second inspiration then is needed, in order to understand a second or occult revelation, i. e. a second sense of words.

When God speaks to men, he speaks in a language which they understand. Otherwise a revelation so called, would not in fact be one. Nothing is revealed, which is not understood, or at least which is not intelligible. And when a communication is made by the use of language, how can it be understood, unless language is employed in the same way as men are accustomed to employ it ? For example, how could one who understands only the English language in its ordinary use, be able to expound a communication in which English words should be employed, but a sense given to them by the writer entirely foreign to the *usus loquendi* of the language ? It would manifestly be as impossible, in such a case, for a writer to be understood, as it would be if he were to make his communication in Sanscrit or Chinese.

It follows of necessity, that a *revelation*, in the true and proper sense of this term, which is made by the use of words, must be made by employing those words in a manner that accords with the *usus loquendi* of the language employed. And if this be true, it seems to decide the whole question ; for there

is no other book on earth, (if you except books of riddles, and some of the old heathen oracles,) where language has, or can have, a double sense. All men, who do not design to deceive or mislead, attach but one meaning to words, i. e. but one meaning to the same words in the same place. Even a book of riddles in reality does this; the enigmas have but one true meaning, and were not designed to have any more; although from the manner in which words are employed, it may be difficult to decipher it.

If I admit a double sense, then, in the Old Testament Scriptures, I admit that they are not to be interpreted according to the laws of human language. What should we think of a man, who should construe the classics, ancient or modern, in this way? What should we think of the sobriety and integrity of a speaker, who should design to attach more than one meaning to his words? And if I must come to the conclusion, that the Old Testament is not to be construed according to the laws of human language, then I must come to the conclusion that a second inspiration is necessary in order to understand it. If so, how did the *first* inspiration communicate a revelation?

I have only to add, at present, that whenever any interpreter will give me satisfactory proof of his being inspired, I will bow with implicit submission to his exegesis; but until he does this, I must believe that we are to come at the meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures, through the instrumentality of language employed in its ordinary way, according to its usages among men.

There are no limits to this second sense of the Scriptures. The man who adopts it, is cast at once upon a boundless ocean, without rudder or compass. He must himself be inspired, in order to know with any security, whether his interpretation is correct. But as I find no promise of such inspiration to writers of the present day, I must hold to the laws of language, as one of the indispensable means of investigating the true and only sense of the Scriptures.

That a double or mystic sense is unnecessary, the reader may see illustrated in the remarks of Prof. Hahn, to which I have already referred. Of course it seems, on all these grounds, to be inadmissible. The appeal to the writers of the New Testament in order to sanction it, I must think to be entirely without any good grounds. Consequently I cannot hold with Calvin, Grotius, Le Clerc, Dathe, Bishop Lowth, and many others, that the sixteenth Psalm has a historic sense applicable

to David, and a spiritual sense applicable to the Messiah. One greater than David is here.

Nor, in the second place, can I hold with the rationalist interpreters, that David only is meant in this Psalm. I have too much respect for the opinion of Peter and Paul to do so. I cannot receive the accommodation exegesis, which represents them as taking advantage of the erroneous and ungrounded notions of the Jews, in regard to the meaning of the Psalm in question, in order to persuade them that Christ had actually risen from the dead; a persuasion, by the way, which not a few of the rationalists believe to be as ungrounded as the interpretation itself. Neither can I admit, with Rosenmüller and De Wette, that Peter and Paul, although, very sincere in the opinion that the Psalm under consideration did apply to Christ, yet were altogether mistaken as to their views of the sense of the writer. When I am prepared to admit this, then must I be prepared to place the theology of Hesiod, the dreams of the Vedas, the wild conceits of the Zendavesta, and the hypocrisy and lofty pretensions of the Koran, side by side with the Jewish Scriptures; and to say of the latter what Dr Röhr has in effect once and again said, 'There is no difference in point of *authority*; all is the work of fallible men; all the distinction that can be made is, that the Jewish Scriptures are less replete with absurdities, than any other pretended revelation.'

I quit the modern schools then, and go back to the ancients. I cannot, indeed, accord with all the *particulars* of their exegesis. Far from this; for how could they explain the very difficult passages in the Psalm under consideration, while they held principally to the version of the Seventy? Indeed they hung entirely upon this; with the exception of Jerome, who, however, does not appear to have availed himself here of his Hebrew knowledge. But it is one thing to give a skillful explanation of minute parts, or particular words and phrases only, where nothing but a nice observation of the laws of language, and accurate acquaintance with the *minutiæ* of grammatical forms, can impart ability to satisfy a well informed inquirer. It is another thing to see and well explain the general scope and intention of a piece, and to point out its connexion and symmetry.

In regard to this last object, I should choose my lot among the interpreters of ancient days. All the distinguished men among them agree, that *the Psalm relates to Christ, in his passion and his victory over death and the grave, including his sub-*

sequent exaltation at the right hand of God. This strikes me as the best, and only sure interpretation. I can find difficulties enough in making the application to David alone, to deter me from it. Peter and Paul long ago found them. And in making the application to the Messiah, I can select no portion of his life, in which what he is here represented as saying seems so applicable, as some period not long before his passion and death, when he may be supposed to have been meditating on these, and on the consequences which were to ensue. The first instinctive feeling of his corporeal nature, was an involuntary shrinking from the prospect of suffering; and a cry to God (as in v. 1), that he might be preserved or supported under his sorrows, would be the natural consequence. In like manner the Saviour did actually pour out his sorrows and his supplications, in the garden of Gethsemane and on the cross. His devotedness to God, his love of his own disciples, his abhorrence of all wickedness, the joy that would be consequent on the work of redemption which he was about to accomplish, the 'goodly heritage' that would be given him,—all these pass in review before his mind, and serve to cheer him under the prospect of the agonies to be endured. Even death itself, the result of these agonies, was to be no bar to his triumph. He would burst the gates of the grave, even before it had any power to dissolve his body committed to it. He would rise to a glorious, endless life, and be exalted at the right hand of God, where is full and everlasting joy and happiness.

Such seems to me to be the general course of thought in Ps. xvi. One may compare it with Is. LIII; to which, in some respects, it has a great resemblance. There the sufferer, after he has made expiation by his death, is represented as "dividing a portion with the great, and the spoil with the strong," as "seeing the travail of his soul and being satisfied," as "seeing a seed who should prolong their days, while the pleasure of the Lord prospers in his hand." How much like to the "lines falling in pleasant places, and having a goodly heritage" (Ps. 16: 6) this is, the reader scarcely needs to be informed. The general course of thought is alike in both. Suffering precedes victory, and reward follows. The reward is the heritage bestowed upon him; and this is no less, than having "the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession," Ps. 2: 8.

Exactly the same course of thought, also, is presented in Ps.

xxii; where, after a description of great sufferings, follow declarations respecting the future triumph of the sufferer, in "the seed that shall serve him, in the generation to be accounted to the Lord, in the ends of the earth remembering and turning unto God, and all nations worshipping before him."

If we compare Ps. xl. also, it will be seen there, that in the midst of complaints and supplications for help, there are strong expressions of gratitude and joy, resembling those in Ps. xvi.

The course of thought, therefore, in the Psalm before us, is not singular nor without example. Other Psalms pertaining to the Messiah, (at least I deem them to be such, and on the like grounds as Ps. xvi.) express the like sentiments; with the exception that they are not equally minute and explicit in regard to the resurrection of Christ, and his victory over the grave.

Having thus given the views which I entertain of the contents of Ps. xvi. I shall proceed to assign, more definitely and particularly, the reasons why I feel compelled to refer it to the Messiah, and to him alone.

My principal reason, but not my only one, is, that the apostles Peter and Paul have done the same; and done it in such a way as does not seem to be compatible with any other mode of interpretation, unless we renounce all deference to the apostles as the interpreters of Scripture.

Peter, in addressing the Jews on the memorable day of Pentecost, adverts to the subject of Christ's crucifixion and death, and his consequent resurrection. He then adds (Acts 2: 25): "David speaketh concerning him (Christ), I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also, my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, (*ἵνα ψῆ, εἰς ἄδην, to the world of the dead,*) neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life, thou wilt make me full of joy with thy countenance." This is a quotation from Ps. 16: 8—11, in the words employed by the Seventy in their version.

Having made the quotation, the apostle proceeds to comment upon the passage. "Men and brethren," says he, "let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David." He was aware that what he was going to say, would be counter to the prejudices and the interpretation of his hearers; and so he begs permission to speak *μετὰ παρόψιας, with freedom, so as to con-*

ciliate their attention. The apostle continues: "He (David) is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day;" i. e. David died, and was buried, and remains still buried, for his sepulchre remains to the present time; he has never risen from the dead. All this his Jewish hearers could not deny; and if all this was true, how could the sixteenth Psalm refer to David? The apostle evidently maintains that it did not, and could not; for he goes on to say, that David "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, to raise up Christ, from the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, to sit on his throne; he (David) seeing this, *spake of the resurrection of Christ*, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Accordingly the apostle adds, "*This Jesus* hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." He then proceeds to say, that Christ is exalted to the right hand of God, but that David is not ascended into the heavens.

It has been remarked by Michaelis, that 'the writers of the New Testament very seldom undertake by argument to defend their interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures.' This is true; and the reason of it seems to be, that this interpretation was usually such an one as would not be called in question. But in the case before us, there is evidently an effort on the part of Peter, to defend his interpretation, by shewing the absurdity of the common one, which applied the words of the sixteenth Psalm to David. 'David,' says he, 'died, and was buried, and remains so,' i. e. he has never risen from the dead. 'But the Psalm in question speaks of a *resurrection*; and this has been accomplished only in the person of Jesus, whom David, by revelation of the Spirit, foresaw would rise from the dead, and predicted it in the words which I have repeated.'

Two things, then, seem to be clear from all this: (1) That both Peter and the Jews explained this Psalm as having reference to a *resurrection*; or at least to the body being preserved entire from all the influence of the grave; and (2) That the Jews, in Peter's time, were accustomed to refer Ps. 16: 9—11 to David; which is the reason why the apostle takes so much pains to shew the incorrectness of the then usual interpretation. It does not appear, therefore, that the Jews of that day, although they applied the Psalm to David, once thought of the exegesis which their modern descendants have invented, and which, having been sanctioned by Le Clerc, is now wide spread among rationalist interpreters, viz. that deliverance from great danger and

violent death, is all which the words under consideration mean. There are traces somewhat plain and striking, of the difficulty which the ancient Jews found in the interpretation of Ps. 16:9—11 as applied to David, in an ancient traditional saying of theirs, preserved in *Jalkut Shimoni* fol. 95. Frankf. edit. "Our Rabbins," says this Tract, "aver that there are *seven* persons over whom the (grave) worms have no power." After mentioning these, viz. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, and Benjamin, it proceeds: "Some add David to these, because it stands written of him, *My flesh shall rest in safety.*"

Here then we see, in this singular tradition, an effort of the early Jewish Rabbins to get rid of the difficulty which the sixteenth Psalm forced upon them, when interpreted of David. They never once seem to have thought of the facile expedient of their successors, and of Christian commentators, to get rid of all this difficulty by the simple expedient of calling the language *figurative*, and applying it to designate merely deliverance from danger and sudden death.

It must be too, that Peter's auditors thought as little of this expedient, as the older Jewish Rabbins who devised the fable above related. If it had been otherwise, if they had supposed that the words of the Psalm applied merely to deliverance from extreme danger, and that Peter might have known this to be so, how obvious would have been the reply to his reasoning or argumentation, which Michaelis says they might well have made: "With all your pretended sincerity, you are a mere hypocrite, and are aiming to blind the unlearned multitude. You pretend that the Psalm has reference to a *resurrection*, and is capable of no other meaning; whereas it plainly means nothing more than deliverance from great danger; which David, its author, very often experienced." What Peter could have replied to this, it is difficult, assuming the ground of recent interpreters, for me to imagine.

We have sufficiently seen, how far Peter and his contemporaries were, from the modern exegesis of this Psalm. But is Peter the only one of all the apostles who entertained such an opinion? We may be reminded, that there are things related of this apostle, which shew that he was capable of error. Once he denied his master; once he dissembled, and was reproved openly by Paul for so doing, Gal. 2: 11—14. Did Paul agree with him, in the explanation of the passage under examination?

The answer to this question is found in Acts 13: 29—37.

Paul here speaks to the Jews, as Peter did, concerning the *resurrection* of Christ. He appeals to the same text, vs. 34, 35. He is even more explicit, if this can be supposed, than Peter, in shewing the impossibility of applying that Psalm to David. "David," says he, "after he had served his own generation, by the will of God fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption; but he whom God raised up saw no corruption."

What then is the inference? Why plainly, that the Psalm cannot possibly be applied to David, but is capable of being referred only to the Messiah, over whom the grave had no power.

Here also, as in the former case, the apostle has clearly to contend against the interpretation of his hearers; for he produces reasons to show the impossibility of such an interpretation as they maintained. Here, moreover, all double sense of the Psalm is entirely excluded. Otherwise the apostle need not have opposed the interpretation of his kinsmen after the flesh. He might have said: 'True, brethren, the first and obvious meaning of the Psalm, has reference to David; but there is a higher and spiritual sense which can refer only to the Messiah, and was fulfilled only in him. This is the one on which I depend for argument.'

Nor could the Jews of that day have objected to his giving a double sense to the words; for this was a practice so common among them, in many cases, that one cannot well imagine they could have objected to it in the reasoning of Paul.

The double sense of Ps. XVI. then, is as much out of question, if Peter and Paul are to be our guides, as the literal application of it to David is. They admit neither the one nor the other. And indeed, both appear to be equally foreign from the meaning of the Psalmist and his inspired expositors. The latter see only a greater than David, in all that is said.

We may find some good reason to believe, also, that the apostles, at least Peter, derived their interpretation directly from the Saviour himself. After the resurrection of Jesus, he appeared to two of his disciples, as they were going from Jerusalem to Emmaus, and explained to them the Scriptures which have reference to his death and resurrection. "Beginning at Moses and *all* the prophets," says the evangelist, "he expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, *the things concerning himself*;" Luke 24: 27. Afterwards Jesus appeared in the midst of his disciples, and said: "These are the words which I spake unto you,

while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the *Psalms*, concerning me. Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to *rise from the dead on the third day*," Luke 24: 44—46. Now in what part of the *Psalms*, or indeed of the Old Testament, is there any passage which has so explicit a reference to the resurrection of Christ, as Ps. 16: 9—11? I know of none; and as Peter and Paul apply this directly to his resurrection, and Peter does this only a few days after the exposition of the Scriptures given by Christ as above related, and relies wholly upon it as establishing his point, may we not well suppose, that in the interpretation of the apostle we have that of his Master? I cannot help thinking this to be a very probable and reasonable conclusion.

The matter comes then to this; either we are to give up the apostles and their Master, as guides in expounding the word of God, or we must renounce the interpretation which applies the sixteenth Psalm to David. In other words, we must renounce their inspiration and infallibility in matters of religion, or renounce the old Jewish exegesis, which they have directly controverted. If Le Clerc, Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, Ruperti, De Wette, Gesenius, and others, have chosen, and do choose, the former; I may be permitted to choose the latter.

Let us suppose now for argument's sake, that the words of the Psalm are in themselves capable of either interpretation, of being applied to David or to Christ,—a supposition which may be admitted without any violent improbability, that can be urged against either part of the alternative,—and the question is, What interpretation shall be given to it? In what way are we to come at the decision of this question? Is no weight to be attributed to the opinion of Peter and Paul? I cannot see why we should not pay some deference to it; even if we set aside the inspiration of the apostles, as most of the neological interpreters in fact do. For whatever may be said of the learning of Peter, it will not be contended that Paul, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and most thoroughly versed in all the rabbinical lore of the day, did not understand Hebrew well enough to know what the idiom of the Psalm would bear. I can see no reason why, as a mere Rabbi, as much deference is not due to him, as to Maimonides, and Aben Ezra, and Kim-

chi. On this ground, therefore, there would seem to be no very solid reason for confidence in the interpretation, which refers the Psalm to David.

But I would go further, and say that the words of Ps. 16: 9—11 do more naturally and easily relate to a resurrection, than to preservation from danger. In the latter case, we are obliged to make them figurative; I will not say beyond example figurative, for there are examples which approach somewhat near. But in the former case, there is a plain, easy, and natural explanation of the whole, when applied, after the manner of the apostles, to the resurrection of Jesus. This can never be denied. Whatever difficulties may be found in the application to the Messiah, they lie not in the words of the Psalm; they lie in doubts about the actual existence of the spirit of prophecy; they lie in doubts as to the authority of the apostles, to bind us in any case of interpretation which thwarts our own particular views.

But I will even suppose, that there are difficulties belonging to the *words* of Ps. xvi. difficulties which I find myself wholly unable to remove, either by my own efforts, or by the aid of critics and commentators. What is to be done in this case? Am I to set myself in opposition to the opinion of Paul and Peter, because I cannot see clearly how they came to maintain such an opinion? In answer to this, the reader will permit me to introduce a paragraph from Michaelis' *Collegium** on this Psalm. It is as follows.

“I believe that one may rely with full confidence on the authorized interpreters, Peter and Paul. Their divine mission is confirmed by miracles, which are great and incapable of being contradicted; and therefore all suspicion of mere imagination or deceit falls away. But supposing now that I could not see the internal evidence, on the ground of which the Psalm is to be appropriated to Christ; I should then be disposed to accuse my ignorance of a language that had long been dead. I should say to myself, ‘There are so many things in this dead language, which thou knowest not, that it must be an easy matter for thee to be deceived. There may be many a phrase, and many a word, which thou knowest only by an etymology that leaves the meaning doubtful, or gives diverse meanings,

* *Critisches Collegium über die drey wichtigsten Psalmen von Christo, Franckf. u. Gött. 1759.*

which by the *usus loquendi* of the living language, signified perhaps the very thing that the apostles understood it as meaning. It is better, therefore, for thee to follow these unerring guides. In the very first verses of the Psalm, yea, in the title itself, occur many dark words ; perhaps in these very words, a more perfect knowledge of the language would find an easy solution of all doubts."

Michaelis pursues the subject still farther ; but I have quoted enough for my present purpose. I cannot refrain, however, from adding what he says of Le Clerc, and of his interpretation.

"I believe I could show the advantage of such an exegetical modesty, (a duty which I prescribe to myself,) to as good advantage here, as in almost any part of the Scriptures. Le Clerc . . . has not practised it, but set his own exegesis in array against that of the apostles. He had no good reason to do so. His knowledge of the Hebrew is so slight, and of the other oriental languages, necessary to illustrate the Hebrew, such a mere nothing (so gar nichts), that he must in truth have been inspired, if he could discover the true sense of half the passages which the apostles quote out of the Old Testament." After mentioning that various readings are to be found of the text in Ps. xvi. and saying that Le Clerc ought at least to have had some reference to these, before he decided against the interpretation of the apostles, he proceeds : "Since however the unlearned Le Clerc—for so I hold him to be in matters of oriental philology—supposes nothing of all this, but understands the Psalm better than the unerring interpreters of it, who, particularly Paul, must have understood the original of the Psalm (if we consider the thing merely *more humano*) much better than himself ; he seems to me like a pupil of Gesner's, who should express his astonishment, that a passage in Cicero should be explained by his master in a different way from that in which he himself had explained it. . . . I hold Le Clerc, compared with Paul, whether in a natural or supernatural way, as not quite a match for Gesner's pupil, and that this comparison is honourable and flattering to this commentator." Collegium p. 7 seq.

I am the more willing to introduce this passage from Michaelis, because it may serve to correct, or at least modify, in some good measure, the extravagant opinion that has spread far and wide, about the attainments of Le Clerc as a biblical scholar. His classical learning was indeed fine. His *Ars Critica* exhib-

its also, what fine taste and powers of mind he possessed. But as to a deep and radical knowledge of Hebrew idiom, and of the kindred languages, Michaelis, it must be owned, is nearly if not altogether in the right. Indeed, Michaelis is not apt to condemn with severity; never, when extensive erudition is manifested. But the severity in the case now presented, consists mainly in the fact that what is said has its basis in the truth. Men who do not understand Hebrew well, may contradict this; men who do, will be the last to call it in question.

I will add only, that if Michaelis himself had always exhibited the 'modesty' which he here so justly commends, as to going beyond Peter and Paul, or counter to them, it had been happy for the church, and for his own reputation. But strength of imagination, and the love of paradox, have sometimes carried him into regions, where, if a disciple of Le Clerc were to meet him, he might express his astonishment, and apply his reproof, in language as strong as Michaelis has used in respect to the Dutch critic.

But to return. My second reason for applying the Psalm under consideration to the Messiah is, that I find the exegesis more easy and natural throughout, when interpreted in this way, than in any other. I have already made a remark of the same tenor, in regard to vs. 9—11. What I now would say, is, that the same thing is true of the *tout ensemble* of the Psalm, which is one consistent whole, and applies only to one person.

How Dr. Steudel could find, (as he does in Progr. Disquis. in Ps. 16: 8—11,) that the writer, in v. 8, exchanges his own person for that of the Messiah, I do not well see. What is this, but to give a double sense in one of its most objectionable forms? It is, indeed, very convenient to apply one part of a Psalm literally, and another spiritually, to different persons, where a different interpretation would cost trouble; but the expediency of doing so, is a matter of very serious question.

There is most evidently but *one person* throughout the Psalm. It either relates to David only, or to the Messiah only. It is joined indissolubly together; and what God has thus joined, man ought not to put asunder. I can never doubt, that from beginning to end, one and the same person speaks; and this person I believe to be the Messiah.

With this view of the subject, I proceed to the particular verbal exegesis of the Psalm under consideration; a portion of Scripture truly replete, at least the first part of it, with *verbal*

difficulties, as all well informed interpreters of every class fully acknowledge. As my design is to give in some good measure a complete, and not a mere cursory, exhibition of the philology of the Psalm, I would hope that the reader, who desires to be more fully informed and satisfied, than he can be by mere short hints, will not be impatient with the minuteness and particularity of my investigation. What is worth doing, is worth doing well, provided one has the power to do so. I do not vindicate to myself this power; but I fully acknowledge the obligation to make what efforts I can, to accomplish the end in view. General notes and general hints impart general knowledge only; and this is not sufficient for any one who desires to be either a solid interpreter or theologian.

My plan for the remainder of the present dissertation is, first to exhibit a translation of the Psalm; next to explain the Hebrew words and phrases of it, and vindicate the rendering given to them; and lastly, to examine the principal objections made in modern times, against the interpretation which applies the whole to the Messiah.

PSALM XVI.

Michtam. A Psalm of David.

1. Preserve me, O God!
For in thee do I seek a refuge.
2. (My soul,) thou hast said to Jehovah, Thou art the Lord;
Source of my happiness! There is none beside thee.
3. In respect to the saints who are on the earth,
The excellent, all my delight is in them.
4. They shall multiply their sorrows,
Who have hastened another way;
I will not pour out their libations of blood,
Nor will I take their names upon my lips.
5. Jehovah is my allotted portion and my cup,
Thou wilt render my lot secure.
6. A heritage in goodly places has fallen to me,
Yea, (my) inheritance is well-pleasing to me.

7. I will bless Jehovah who careth for me,
Yea, by night my reins admonish me (to bless him).
8. I set Jehovah continually before me ;
Because he is at my right hand, I am not moved.
9. Therefore my heart rejoiceth, and my soul exulteth,
Yea, my flesh shall rest with confidence.
10. For thou wilt not leave me to the grave,
Nor suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.
11. Thou wilt shew me the path of life,
In thy presence is fulness of joy,
At thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.

Verse 1. In the title of this Psalm a word occurs (מִבְּרָכָה), which has given occasion to almost boundless speculation, etymology, and conjecture. It is not my design, here or elsewhere in my notes on the Hebrew text, to give a particular history of what has been said respecting each word and phrase, by commentators of all ages and nations, and to refute the manifest errors into which some of them may have fallen. I shall, in general, mention such opinions only as have a claim to be examined, and which are entitled at least to our consideration, if not to our approbation.

In tracing the etymology of מִבְּרָכָה, we look of course either to the verb בָּרַךְ, or the noun בְּרָכָה. Unfortunately, neither of these give us any good satisfaction. The verb occurs but once; and this is in Niphal Jer. 2: 22, where it evidently means *to be spotted*, i. e. to have a mark or spot on one's self; as we say in English, *he has a black mark*. The same verb has the same meaning in Chaldee and Syriac; where also the noun בְּרָכָה means *spot, mark, macula*.

In Arabic, we fare no better as to etymology. The verb كَتَمَ means to *hide* or *conceal*. This helps us, indeed, to explain the poetic בְּרָכָה, rendered *gold, choice gold*; because it points to that treasure which was *carefully hidden* or *concealed*, viz. gold; as it still is in the East, unto this very day, in pits, in unsuspected places, etc. But how does this explain מִבְּרָכָה?

Not satisfactorily, we may answer. Still Aben Ezra (by a hint), Kimchi, Solomon Ben Melek, Luther, Geier, Le Clerc, and others have rendered מִבְּרָכָה, *golden, golden jewel, gold,*

etc. after the analogy of זָהָב ; and this sense of זָהָב has been compared to the $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta$, the *golden verses*, of Pythagoras, or to the $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\ \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\iota$ of Democritus. But why the six Psalms (xvi. lvi.—lx.) having the title in question should be *golden* rather than many others in the book of Psalms, one would find it difficult to say. Most evidently they are not superior to others in the excellence of their composition, or in the nature of their subjects. Some of them, indeed, (as Ps. xvi.) have a most exalted theme, the triumph of Christ over death and hell; but some other Psalms also have kindred themes; and many of them are more attractive, considered merely in a rhetorical point of view, than Psalms lvi.—lx.

Inviting therefore as the version *golden* is, at first view, and especially so because of its analogy to זָהָב , we cannot see any good reason why this title should have been given, with designed significancy, to all the Psalms which bear it.

As to the opinion of some ancient Rabbins and of Aquila and Symmachus who divided זָהָב into two words, and made of it זָהָב and זָהָב , *humble* and *upright*, or *humble* and *blameless*; it does not deserve refutation. If we may first make the text into what we please, and then transpose its order, it is true enough that any critical difficulties whatever can be managed without much trouble. These critics have done both; for זָהָב and זָהָב are not זָהָב ; and if they were adjectives (as they make them to be), they must of course stand *after* זָהָב , which these writers make them qualify, and not *before* it, as they now do; see Heb. Grammar § 452.

There remains, however, three other suppositions in respect to זָהָב , which must be briefly examined.

Among the ancients, there is a remarkable union in respect to the sense of it. The Seventy and Theodotion translate it $\sigma\eta\lambda\omicron\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\iota\alpha$, *inscription on a monument, epitaph, Grabschrift*, as Michaelis renders it, without being, however, entirely authorised to do so by the word $\sigma\eta\lambda\omicron\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\iota\alpha$. The Vulgate and Jerome (Jerome did not translate *anew* the book of Psalms), render it *titulus*, or *inscriptio tituli*, which mean the same as the Greek $\sigma\eta\lambda\omicron\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\iota\alpha$. Jerome has commented on this meaning: "Tres sunt tituli, qui scribuntur: Unus super tumulos mortuorum; alius, in liminibus civitatum, vel domorum; tertius, in *victoria regis*." In respect to this last, which was an inscription on some durable monument, celebrating the victory of a king, Jerome adds: "Hic ergo (in titulo Ps. xvi.) de titulo victoriae

regis dicit;" i.e. the Psalmist speaks of the victory of the king Messiah, and מְכַתֵּם is designed to show that such is the subject matter of the Psalm.

Even the Chaldee interpreter seems to have so understood מְכַתֵּם, having rendered it גְּלִיפָא תְרִיצָא, *inscriptio recta*, or *inscriptio erecta*, as Michaelis and Rosenmüller translate it, with some latitude indeed, but possibly *ad sensum*.

Could now all these interpreters, each having a knowledge of the original Hebrew, have so much mistaken the meaning of מְכַתֵּם? Could they, in merely *guessing*, have all guessed so much alike? I must confess, with Michaelis, that I do not well see how to get away from the evidence that מְכַתֵּם does mean *inscriptio*, or *titulus*; nor from the opinion of Jerome, that it is here a *titulus victoriae*. I am the more embarrassed in any attempt to throw away this interpretation, because the other Psalms which have מְכַתֵּם in their title, are all ἐπινίκια, *Psalms of victory*, in one form or another; as the reader may easily see, by turning to them. Certainly, this is a circumstance which deserves notice.

To all this we may add, that the opinion of recent critics, viz. that מְכַתֵּם is equivalent to מְכַתֵּב *writing* (Is. 38: 9), and especially *song*, would nearly coincide with the above *στυλογραφία*. The ground of this last opinion, held by Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Winer, and others, is, that the letters ב and מ are frequently exchanged in words of the same import; e. g. דְּיִבּוֹן and דְּיִמּוֹן, the name of a river; מְרִיא and מְרִיא, *fat*; זְמֵן and זְמֵן Chald. *time*, etc. If it apply to מְכַתֵּם, it would make but a small departure from the version of the ancient translators in question. Rosenmüller, indeed, objects to the meaning *στυλογραφία*, because he thinks that it is not probable so long compositions as Psalms xvi. lvi.—lx. were inscribed on brass or stone; Comm. in Psalm. I. p. li. But is it necessary to suppose them actually to be inscribed? I take the title to mean, *what might be inscribed*, a *triumphal song*, an ἐπινίκιον. And even if the title means an actual inscription, (would it not be strange, however, to put מְכַתֵּם in such a sense, on an actual *σῆλος*?) yet I do not feel the force of his objection. Look at the inscriptions on the monuments of ancient Egypt, e. g. the one found at Rosetta, which gave rise to the discovery of a hieroglyphic alphabet; and it is easy to decide, that the objection of Rosenmüller cannot have much weight.

I must subscribe, then, on the whole, to the *στυλογραφία* of

the *Seventy*, as the proper translation of מִכְתָּם. But whether it was placed here by the author of the Psalm, in order to designate the *matter* of the Psalm; or whether it was designed as a name of the measure of his verse, or of the music to which it was set, or of the musical instrument by which the singing of it was to be accompanied, (many Psalms have such inscriptions,) it would be difficult to say. Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and others have regarded the last supposition as the most probable. So thought Calvin. I do not see any imperious reason for dissent; at least, no certain and well-grounded reason can be given. Even if we translate מִכְתָּם by *σηλογραφία* or *ἐπιύμιον*, as I am inclined to do, it does not stand in the way of this supposition.

We may conclude, then, that the *most probable* sense of the word מִכְתָּם, is *σηλογραφία* or *inscriptio*; but whether it is intended to designate the *condition* of the writing, the character or subject of it, or the measure or music of it—who can tell? No one with certainty; yet from the fact that all the Psalms which bear this title, are, in one form or another, *ἐπιύμια* or triumphal songs, it does seem most probable that Jerome has hit the mark in his *titulus victoriae*.

גִּירוֹר, *genitivus auctoris*, as grammarians say. So authorship is denoted throughout the Psalms. On this ground, we may assign Ps. LXXII. to Solomon as its author, because it has גִּירוֹר prefixed to it. The Hebrew often employed ה before a genitive, i. e. to indicate that a noun held the relation of a genitive case, either after some noun expressed, or some one understood. When he wished to avoid a repetition of the *status constructus* too often, he put in a genitive designated by ה. The most common use of ה in such a relation, is to prefix it to nouns where *possession* or *belonging to* is indicated, as אֶהָרִים לְשִׁדְרִים, *the tents of the robbers*; בֶּן גִּירוֹר, *son of Jesse*; or where time is designated, as in *the 600th year* הָחַיִּי נֶחֱ of *Noah's life*; or where another word intervenes after a construct form, which is more intimately connected with it, as דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *the Chronicles of the kings of Israel*. There are other niceties of construction in regard to this use of ה, which are well exhibited by Ewald, in his Hebrew grammar. The idea that a genitive case in Hebrew, can be made only by the *status constructus*, is altogether groundless. This is the *dependent* genitive, so to speak; while that formed by ה is a kind of *independent* genitive; as in the case before us, which is a genitive, without a *previous construct state*. As to מִכְתָּם, it may be construed in-

dependently of לְרִוּד, and probably it should be so construed here, i. e. it should be regarded as the title of the Psalm *per se*, for in Psalms LVI.—LIX. inclusively, מִבְּחֵט stands after לְרִוּד, thus showing plainly that it has no definite relation to it. So here, the probable word implied before מְזַמֵּר is רִוּד.

For the sake of the young student, who is anxious to extend his acquaintance with the grammatical niceties of the Hebrew, it may be remarked here, that the genitive with לְ is a kind of free or unshackled one. Thus the Hebrew could say, either אֲהַבֵּי לִנְרוֹם, *loving slumber*, or אֲהַבֵּי לְנֹוֹם. Such a choice in poetry, was doubtless a matter of great convenience. So he could make a genitive independently of any preceding noun, as in our text, and say simply לְרִוּד *of David*, when רִוּד would have meant nothing more than *David*. In the same way the Arabians use a לְ *auctoris*. In the last edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, however, all these cases are solved by giving to לְ the sense of *through, by*, when it stands before the *efficient cause* of any thing; a solution, which if well grounded, commends itself to all by its simplicity.

שָׁמְרֵנִי . . . שָׁמְרֵנִי, *preserve me, O God! for in thee do I seek a refuge*. The verb שָׁמְרֵנִי is in the imperative here, notwithstanding the Methegh after the Qamets, and is to be read *shōm-rē-nī* (not *shā-merē-nī*); Heb. Gramm. § 66 note. Such a remark may be deemed superfluous; but as an apology for it, I observe, that no less a critic than Michaelis here reads *shā-merē-nī*, and makes a new conjugation (שָׁמַרְתִּי), like the third conjugation in Arabic, in order to get at this form in the perfect tense. He could not have noted the cases of Qamets with Methegh, where it is clearly to be read as short *o*; see the note referred to above.

As to the meaning of שָׁמְרֵנִי, it may, with equal fidelity to the Hebrew, be rendered *preserve me*, or *watch over me, keep me in remembrance*. Either of these senses will fit the passage. We may suppose the Saviour, in prospect of the agonies before him, to be filled, for the moment, with distressing anxiety, like to that which he endured in the garden of Gethsemane, and to utter his earnest supplication that God would *regard him*, or *remember him*, or *watch over him*, i. e. so regard him as to be 'a very present help in time of need.' It matters little which of these versions we choose. The supplication goes to the simple point of being so watched over as to be sustained, and kept from sinking, when the hour of trial should come. And surely nothing

can be more appropriate than such a prayer in the mouth of the Saviour, under circumstances such as have been noted.

To render *הִסְתִּירָהּ בְּךָ*, *I have trusted in thee*, does not give the full force of the Hebrew original. *הִסָּה* means *to seek a refuge, to seek protection* in any one, by resorting to him. The colouring of the Hebrew, therefore, is here of a nicer shade, it is more appropriate to the circumstances of the speaker, than what is represented by our general word *trust*.

If the reader feels any objection to such a prayer being uttered by the Saviour, he is desired to answer the question, Whether the Saviour did actually *pray* at all? And if he did, was his prayer a request that God would grant any thing? And if so, was this acknowledging his dependence for the thing? In other words, and in order to remove all difficulty, had Jesus truly and properly a human nature? If so, then so far as this was concerned, he was dependent; he prayed, he suffered, he lived, he died, as human nature must. He did not die as *God over all*, but as 'a man of sorrows.' He did not pray as *God over all*, but as one 'poor and needy,' although possessing all things; as one who, *having* truly taken our nature upon him, felt its wants, was agitated with its fears, and truly suffered its sorrows. And if any one could ever sincerely aver, that he went to God for protection, or looked to him for refuge, Jesus above all others could do this.

Verse 2. *אָמַרְתָּ*, an *offendiculum criticorum* to past and present interpreters. The sum of all that need to be said, may be briefly said. We may read it as it stands, in the 2 pers. fem. of the praeter tense, and suppose *נַפְשִׁי* *my soul* to be understood; or we may point it *אָמַרְתָּ*, as of the first pers. sing. and translate it, *I have said*.

Most of the recent critics incline to the latter; and so almost all the ancients have translated it, as the Seventy, Jerome, the Syriac, the Arabic, the Vulgate, etc. The Chaldee alone has preserved the second person. Twenty of Kennicott's manuscripts also read *אָמַרְתָּ*. But with all this evidence before us, it seems to me that *אָמַרְתָּ* must be retained, by the sound laws of criticism. It is, as Schnurrer has justly observed, a sound law, that 'of two readings, the one is to be preferred which might most easily originate the other, but from which the other could not well be derived.' So here, it is very easy to see, how the ancient translators could render *I have said*, and how modern transcribers could write *אָמַרְתָּ*; because it is so obviously *ad*

sensum. But when אַמְרֵי is so perfectly plain and facile, how could any one ever think of putting אַמְרֵי in its room, 'lectio difficilior et valde rara;' one indeed, in some respects, almost if not quite without an example?

On these grounds, and because the Chaldee translator most certainly found אַמְרֵי in his text, and the great body of Hebrew manuscripts exhibit it, it must be preferred. I acknowledge, that the pointing אַמְרֵי is a possible one; for cases we have, where the final Yodh is actually omitted in the first person singular; e. g. Ps. 140: 13. Job 42: 2 יָדַעַתָּה. Ezek. 16: 59 קָשַׁף. But the first two of these three examples, may be of the very same nature as the one before us, in case the punctuation be changed into יָדַעַתָּה.

But if we read אַמְרֵי, how shall we defend or support the reading? I answer, the only difficulty is, the ellipsis of נַפְשִׁי. That the Hebrew was accustomed to address his soul i. e. himself, there can be no doubt; e. g. *O my soul, come not thou into their secret*, Gen. 49: 6. *O my soul, thou hast trodden down strength*, Judg. 5: 21. *Why art thou cast down, O my soul*, Ps. 42: 5, 11. Ps. 43: 5. Ps. 103: 1. So elsewhere often.

That the Hebrew often used *soul*, in the same manner as we do *self*, need not be shewn; as one cannot escape knowing it, who merely opens an English concordance on the word *soul*. But the Hebrew nation was not the only one which employs, or have employed, this word in the like manner. So Homer, speaking of Ulysses, Od. v. 17.

Στήθος δὲ πλήξας, καρδίην ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ,
Τέτλαθι δὴ, καρδίη, καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης.

'Striking his breast, he chided his heart with these words: Bear it, heart, for thou hast endured worse things than these.' So also Pindar, Olymp. I. 5.

Εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαοῦεν
Ἐλδαί, φίλον ἦτορ.

'If, my dear soul, thou desirest to celebrate the rewards obtained by contest.'

The only difficulty that remains, then, as to the much contested אַמְרֵי, is, whether the word נַפְשִׁי *my soul* can be omitted, in addresses of this nature?

That the omission is exceedingly rare, all concede; so much so, that many are led entirely to deny it. But others believe

that examples of it do occur; and these must be suggested, in order to remove our difficulty.

In 2 Sam. 13: 39 we find *וַיִּבַּל דָּוִד* and *David ceased or omitted*, where the verb is the 3 pers. fem. apoc. fut. Piel of *בָּלָה*, while *דָּוִד* of course is a noun of the masculine gender. Michaelis proposes to cut the knot, by introducing a new He-

brew verb into the lexicon, viz. *הִבַּל*, like the Arabic *تَكَلَّه*, *he desisted*; an expedient to which he is exceedingly prone. That this is a possible solution, must be admitted; that it is a probable one, can hardly be maintained. The idea of *omitting* or *desisting*, is one of so frequent occurrence in the Scriptures, that it would be almost marvellous, in case the Hebrews did use a verb *הִבַּל*, that neither this verb, nor any derived form of it whatever, should any where be found in the whole compass of the Hebrew Bible. We must then, (which seems more probable,) admit that *נָפַח* is to be supplied as the nominative to *וַיִּבַּל*; and if so, it is a case in point, and affords an analogy for the one before us.

Schnurrer also appeals to Ps. 137: 5 *הִשְׁכַּח יְמִינִי*, which he would render, *obliscatur* (anima mea, *נַפְשִׁי*) *dextrae meae*. But this is too doubtful a phrase to be much insisted on. It is more simple here, to change the punctuation, and read *הִשְׁכַּח יְמִינִי*, *let my right hand be forgotten*.

The Arabic affords some better examples of the omission of *נָפַח*. Like the Hebrews, the Arabians use this word in numberless cases for *self, selves, person, etc.* So they say, when they wish to express the idea that a person is very dear to them: "Let my soul be thy ransom," or "Let my soul redeem thee," i. e. 'Let me die in your stead, or I am willing to die in your stead.' There does not seem, as Rossemüller has remarked, to be any good reason why a word so often and familiarly used, cannot, like other words of a similar nature, be occasionally omitted. Accordingly, he produces an example from *Atnabites*, an ancient Arabian poet, preserved by *Abulfeda* in his *Annales Moslem*. I. p. 306, which runs thus: *Dico, quoties pavida trepidat, Acquiesce! celebraberis, aut requiesceris*; where *שָׁפָה*, *his soul*, is plainly addressed in the second person fem. (so it is in Arabic), although the word itself is omitted. This then seems to be a case of usage exactly in point. And although we must concede, that the ellipsis of *נָפַח* in such a case is exceedingly rare, yet that it does exist, seems probable from the case under examination, and from the other cases produced to confirm it.

Michaelis himself, who contends earnestly against reading אֲמַרְתָּ, and solves, as we have seen, יְיָ וְהַכֵּל by making a new verb אָכַל, unconsciously affords, almost on the very pages where he is exclaiming against the possibility of such an ellipsis in any language, an example of exactly the same nature, in his own composition. He is speaking of the modesty and diffidence with which a man ought to write and speak, when his opinion would thwart the exegesis of the New Testament writers. "I should think thus," says he, "There are so many things in this dead language (the Heb.) which *thou knowest* not—how easy it must be for thee to err here." This is a clear case of ellipsis in regard to the very word in question, *soul, self*; for שָׁמַע means either. This only shews, that system and theory may be one thing, while practice is another.

אֲדֹנָי, *the Lord*, i. e. Jehovah, the only true God. Instead of this, the ancient Chaldee version, the Syriac, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and Jerome, read אֲדֹנָי or אֲדֹנֵי, *my Lord*. This is easily accounted for, inasmuch as the text of the earliest of these translators was unpointed, and the rest followed the Septuagint. The distinction between אֲדֹנָי which is exclusively appropriated to designate *Jehovah*, and אֲדֹנֵי or אֲדֹנָי which designates a *master, lord, or possessor*, must be familiar to every Hebrew student. That אֲדֹנָי is the appropriate word here, there can scarcely be room to doubt. The true God is placed in opposition to all idols, comp. v. 4. His highest supremacy the speaker here intends to acknowledge. It is no valid objection to אֲדֹנָי, that it makes a repetition, viz. *I have said to Jehovah thou art Jehovah*; for (1) in the Hebrew, this repetition does not occur in form, the two words being יְיָ וְהַכֵּל and אֲדֹנָי; and (2) the idea, that Jehovah is here asserted to be אֲדֹנָי, *supreme Lord, only living and true God*, needs no gloss and no amendment to render it perfectly proper, and harmonious with the sequel.

The words אֲדֹנָי בִּלְעָדָי have been a real *crux interpretum*. It would weary the patience of writer and reader, to detail one half of the speculations upon them. He who wishes to see these drawn out somewhat at length, may consult Rosenmüller on the passage. I shall notice but one interpretation, besides those which I think may be tolerably well supported. This is an ancient one, and has been adopted by many modern critics. *My goodness extendeth not to thee*. So in effect the Seventy; οὐ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μου οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις, which Eusebius, Augustine, and Jerome (in Breviario in Psalmos) have followed. The

meaning of this is explained to be, either that God stands in no need of our services, or that our happiness is bestowed by him without any merit on our part, which lays him under obligation; all of which is sufficiently foreign to the connexion of the piece, and the design of the writer. Jerome has even ventured to suggest, that the incarnation, passion, resurrection, etc. of Christ may be meant by טוֹבָתִי; all which were designed for the church, גְּלוֹתֵינוּ, and not for God the Father.

It is a sufficient answer to all this, that it is out of place. The speaker is expressing his entire subjection and devotedness to God. A clause on merit, or rather want of merit, in respect to good works, interrupts the whole course of thought.

Most commentators, therefore, have inclined to interpret טוֹבָתִי as having respect to the *goodness* or *happiness* bestowed on the speaker; not of the good conduct or deeds which he has exhibited.

Passing by various expositions of the phrase, where טוֹבָתִי is thus passively understood, I propose only those of them which seem to me capable of being supported. The first is suggested by the version of Symmachus, ἀγαθόν μοι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνευ σου, *I have no happiness without thee*. So Jerome in his version, *Bene mihi non est sine te*. So the Chaldee interpreter, טוֹבָתִי לֹא מְחִיבָא בְּרַךְ, *my happiness is not given except by thee*; and to the same purpose, the Syriac. To the same purpose also, Schnurrer, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Gesenius, Winer, and others; *mea felicitas nil sine te, or nihil quidquam prae-ter te, my happiness is nothing without thee, or besides thee*.

In support of this rendering, instances are produced in which על means *praeter, besides, i. e. beyond, over, or (exactly as we say in English) over and above*. The instances directly in point for this signification, are Gen. 31: 50. Deut. 19: 9. But other cases may be produced in which על means *over and above* in the sense of *more than*, e. g. Gen. 48: 22. Deut. 28: 1. Ecc. 1: 16. Job 23: 2; exactly as the Greek ὑπὲρ and παρὰ with the accusative. So also על is employed, in denoting the idea of *accession* or *adjunction*; e. g. "I fear lest he (Esau) . . . will smite אִם עַל בְּנֵיהֶם, *the mother with the children, or the mother besides the children, i. e. both mother and children*, Gen. 32: 12. See the like usage in Ex. 35: 22. Judg. 15: 8. Ezek. 16: 37. Amos 3: 15. In all these cases, על signifies *accession, i. e. something over and above, more than, besides, the thing first mentioned*.

We come, then, virtually to the meaning *ἀνε σου*, as given by Symmachus, for *אֲנִי עִיִּי*, and render the whole phrase thus, *My happiness is nothing without thee*, i. e. 'Thou art the supreme source of all my good,' or 'All my happiness is comparatively nothing without thee.'

These words, in the mouth of Jesus, would certainly be very appropriate. Who ever trusted in God as he did? Who ever loved God, and rejoiced in him, to such a degree? Who then could ever so appropriately say, 'God is my chief or supreme delight?'

But although I can easily acquiesce in such a version, especially as the sense is good and congruous, still another translation seems to me altogether possible, which I have seen in no critic, ancient or modern. One may divide the Hebrew text so as to translate thus; and in perfect accordance, too, with the accents as they now stand:

Thou hast said to Jehovah, the Lord art thou,
Source of my joy! there is none above thee.

That is, there is no Lord *above* or *besides* thee, and no source of happiness *above* or *besides* thee; thus making *בְּלִי עִיִּי* relate to both of the preceding clauses, instead of making it relate only to the latter. In regard to the sense here given to *בְּלִי עִיִּי*, the reader has only to compare Ps. 18: 3 (2) "The Lord is my rock, my fortress . . . my strength, my buckler . . . my high tower." So Ps. 27: 1 "The Lord is my light . . . the strength of my life," etc. He may also compare the declaration of the Saviour, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," John 14: 6; which plainly means, 'I am he who points out the way, the teacher of truth, the author of life.' So *בְּלִי עִיִּי*, *author of my joy or happiness*.

The meaning thus given, is, 'Jehovah is supreme Lord, and the chief source of all my happiness. There is none *above* him; I acknowledge none to compare with him;' a sentiment which accords well with the sequel in v. 4, where the speaker disclaims all subjection to false gods, and expresses his thorough detestation of them. It accords, also, with vs. 5, 6 seq. so that one may almost say, that v. 2 contains the text or theme, of which the rest of the Psalm is only an illustration or enlargement. I do not observe that any of the critics have noted this internal arrangement of the composition.

Verse 3. *בְּלִי עִיִּי*, either *to the saints*, *τοῖς ἁγίοις*, or *as to the saints*. In the latter case, *בְּלִי עִיִּי* would be regarded and

supplying אָרֶץ from the preceding σιγος; as in a vast number of cases, words are thus mentally carried forward in poetry. All is facile, with this construction. But even without this, cases can be produced, where the form of the *status constructus* exists, without any word in the text which can regularly make it. The truth is, no doubt, that the construct state has been considered by grammarians, as too exclusively connected with a following genitive. But this is by no means a necessary condition of it. It denotes not merely such a case, but in general, an *intimate* connexion with what follows. That this is the essence of a *status constructus*, seems clear from the fact, that a great number of cases in which it is employed, have no genitive after them, but admit pronouns, prepositions, and even verbs after them, provided there is an intimate connexion between them and the previous noun in such a state.

As this is a principle of great importance to the student, in order to liberate him from apparent grammatical difficulties, I will illustrate it as briefly as possible. The Hebrew could say, שִׂמְחָה בַּקְצִיר, *joy in harvest*, Is. 9: 3; אֶהְיֶה לְנוֹם, *lovers to slumber*, Is. 56: 10; יוֹרְדֵי אֶל אַבְנֵי בּוֹר, *descenders to the stones of the pit*, Is. 14: 9; מְשֻׁרְתֵי אֲחִי, *servers of me*, Is. 8: 6; אֱלֹהֵי מִקְרוֹב, *a God near by*, Jer. 23: 23; הֹלְכֵי עַל דְּרָךְ, *the goers by the way*, Judg. 5: 10; all with prepositions following a construct state, but which cannot be duly exhibited to the eye in any English translation. So before the relative אֲשֶׁר, as מְקִיִּם אֲשֶׁר, Num. 4: 24; and even before the copulative וְ where a very intimate connexion is designed to be expressed, as חֲכֻמַּת וְדַעַת, Is. 33: 6. So before adjectives, specially אֶהְיֶה, as אֶרְוֹן אֶהְיֶה, 2 K. 12: 10. All these illustrate the assertion made above, that the construct form is not confined to cases, where a noun in the genitive follows.

But the principle extends still further. The construct state may be followed even by verbs or parts of sentences, when the sense of these is equivalent to the genitive of a noun of the like meaning. E. g. 1 Sam. 25: 15 כָּל יְמֵי הַחֲהֹלְכֵנוּ אִתָּם, *all the days of our walking with them*, where יְמֵי is in the construct before the verb which follows. So Job 18: 21 מְקוֹם אֵל, *the place of him who knows not God*; Is. 29: 1 קִרְיַת הַנְּהָ דָוִד, *the city of David's dwelling*, or *where David dwelt*; Lev. 14: 46. Is. 30: 29; Hos. 1: 2. The same is the case, doubtless, in Ex. 6: 28. Lev. 7: 35. Num. 3: 1. Zech. 8: 9. Jer. 36: 2; although as יוֹם is the noun which precedes the verbs, there is no *visible* sign of regimen.

In accordance with this principle, which so far as I know has never been fully developed, Ewald proposes (Gramm. p. 577) to render Ps. 16: 3, *the excellent of all my delight*. None of the above cases, however, go to such an extent; and the rendering is somewhat repulsive. On the whole, I very much prefer the solution by ellipsis, which supposes that הָאֲרָץ is implied.

But even if this be rejected, that the construct form is sometimes used, where the *absolute* is required, seems to be proved by such cases as 2 K. 9: 17 $\text{שָׂעִתָּה אֲנִי רֹאֶה}$, *a multitude I see*; Ps. 74: 19 "Give not the soul of thy turtle-dove בְּהֵמָה , *to the wild beast*." If these are truly construct forms, and not the fem. form in תְּ , which though very uncommon yet does occur, (Gramm. § 319. note 1.) then they are examples directly to our purpose. And if they are to be solved by ellipsis, i. e. by supposing אֲנָשִׁים to be implied after the first and עֲרֵבָה or הָאֲרָץ after the second example, still they are directly in point.

We come then to the conclusion, that we may translate without any change of the Hebrew text, and render the whole verse thus: *As to the saints in the earth, even the excellent (of the earth), all my delight is in them.* The וְ before אֲדִירֵי I take to be a וְ *explicativum vel affirmans*, like the Latin *imo*, *inmo*, and the Greek *καί*.

We deduce from the verse thus explained, the sentiment, that the speaker took great pleasure in, or cherished a high regard for, the saints in the land or on earth. And who could ever say this with as much truth, as he who 'laid down his own life for them, who died that they might live, who bought them with his own precious blood?'

The sentiment of vs. 2, 3 seems then to be, that the Messiah loved God as the supreme object of adoration and source of all good, and loved those who are redeemed by his obedience and sufferings. And did he not love them? Yea, was it not 'with an everlasting love, an affection stronger than death, which many waters could not quench, nor floods drown?'

Were I to recount the conjectural expositions which have been made of v. 3, it would occupy much time and patience. The great difficulty of the verse, from the uncommon and anomalous constructions in it, will be readily acknowledged by every one who has even a slight knowledge of the Hebrew. This difficulty has occasioned almost endless conjecture, and a multitude of proposed alterations of the text itself. All I can

do, in respect to these, is merely to present a few of them to the reader ; leaving him, if he prefers them to an explanation of the text as it stands, to choose for himself.

1. My goodness extendeth not to thee (to God), but to the saints, who can be profited by it, etc. So J. Kimchi and others.

2. Say to the Lord, my Lord art thou ; and to the saints, all my delight are ye. D. Kimchi.

3. The good which thou bestowest, thou art not under any obligation to bestow on me, but thou givest it on account of the saints, who lie buried in the earth, etc. Jarchi.

4. Thou art my happiness ; there is nothing superior to thee, for the saints who are in the land, etc. Teller.

5. To the saints who are in his land, he hath made wonderful all his pleasure in them. So the Sept. and Vulgate, making a verb out of אֶדְרִי, i. e. either הִאֲדִיר according to Ferrandus ; or מִהֲאֲדִיר according to Michaelis, who translates, *In his saints, who are buried in the earth, he shews his miraculous deeds, (viz. by raising them from the dead,) for he greatly delights in them ;* or הִאֲדִיר according to Köhler, who renders, *In his saints, who are in his land, Jehovah hath shewed miracles ; all his delight is in them.*

6. In the saints, who lie buried in the earth, how magnificent does he (Jehovah) exhibit himself (מִהֲאֲדִיר) for he delights in them. Dr. Knapp.

7. I call the saints happy who are in the land ; yea, I dwell with them (דִּוֵּר אֶדְרִי from אֶדְרִי), and I delight in them. Doederlein.

These are only a part of the *sylva critica*, which has grown up from the verse before us. Late critics, Schnurrer, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, and others, agree for substance in the version which I have given above, and consent to take the text as it stands, instead of transforming it into something which we may conjecture it ought to be. I would that all who meddle with sacred criticism, might imitate their caution in this respect. Eichhorn long ago made the remark, in his Bibliothek, that those who understand Hebrew the least, will most feel the need of changing the Masoretic text, or *textus receptus*, because it presents difficulties which they cannot solve ; but those who understand it well, will seldom find any reason to depart from the reading given by the Masorites.

A bare inspection of the above discrepancies and variations of critics, I would hope, will be a sufficient apology for my having

endeavoured to illustrate and confirm the version I have given, and the exegesis which I have attached to it.

Verse 4. יָרְבוּ עֲצָבוֹתָם, *they shall multiply their sorrows.* My reason for this version (instead of *idols*) is, (1) That עֲצָבוֹת is the proper word for *idols*, as any one may see by consulting 1 Sam, 31:9. 2 Sam. 5:21. Hos. 4:17, etc. This comes from עָצַב, and has a Pilel formation, (i. e. belongs to Dec. VIII. of nouns,) as one would naturally suppose, in order to distinguish it from עֲצָבוֹהַ, which is the plural of the fem. Segholate עֲצָבוֹהַ. (2) The sense of the passage seems to me in this way preferable.

I observe however, that Gesenius, and after him Winer, has given to עֲצָבוֹהַ the sense of *idols*. But as Ps. 16:4 is the only passage to which they have appealed, or can appeal, in confirmation of it, I cannot accede to this criticism. It is a safe and good rule, that a new sense of a word ought never to be introduced, when it is unnecessary. That in this instance there is no necessity, I appeal to the judgment of the reader. Nay, not only does this appear to be so, but that even a better meaning is given to the passage, by following the sense which עֲצָבוֹהַ has in all other cases. Then as the Hebrews had their עֲצָבוֹת, always and only appropriated to designate *idols*, there is no good degree of probability that עֲצָבוֹהַ was used in like manner.

The Chaldee Targum, Symmachus, Fischer and others, in like manner translate עֲצָבוֹהַ *idols*; but Aquila, the Seventy, the Vulgate, the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, Ruperti, Rosenmüller, De Wette, and most modern versions, render the word *sorrows*.

אָחַר מִהֵרָא, (who) *have hastened another way.* So I feel compelled, on the whole, to render this 'locus vexatissimus.' The word אָחַר is often used to designate *another god*, i. e. an idol or false god. But then, in such cases, the word אֵל or אֱלֹהִים is either actually written, or else obviously and necessarily implied by contrast, as in Is. 42:8. 48:11. Unmindful of this idiom, many critics have here rendered אָחַר *another god*, i. e. an idol god. So Jarchi, Michaelis, and others. But the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Chaldee Targum read it אַחֲרָא (not אָחַר), and translate it *μετὰ ταῦτα postea*, i. e. *afterwards*. Others, as Schnurrer, point the word thus, אָחַר (for אָחֹר), and translate it *backwards*. To this last rendering we may object, that the Hebrews used סוּר, זוּר, סִיג, (not מִהֵרָא,) before אָחֹר, when they meant to designate revolt from

Jehovah. To the preceding one it may be objected, that if it make any sense, it is at least very difficult to see what it is.

We come back then to אָחֵר, leaving the text unchanged, and render it adverbially, viz. *alioſum*, *another way*, *a different way*. So Gesenius, Rosenmüller, De Wette, and other recent critics.

But what means מְהֵרָה? It appears no where else in Kal in the sense of *hastening*. It is found twice in this conjugation, in the sense of *giving dowry*, or rather, *giving money of espousals*, or paying the price of a wife, viz. in Ex. 22: 15. But elsewhere the forms in Piel only appear, and these mean *to hasten*, etc. The Chaldee translator appears to have taken the verb here in the sense of *presenting offerings*. But as the word is used in the sense of *giving*, only when it means to *give a dowry-present*, so this rendering cannot be defended.

We come then, by a kind of necessity, to the meaning *hasten*; although we have no other example of the like nature in Kal. But the kindred languages do not lead us here to a different meaning; and we must acquiesce in this, as Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, and others have done. I render the two words אָחֵר מְהֵרָה, then, in this manner, *who hasten another way, alioſum*. The meaning I take to be, 'Who leave the true God, the supreme object of the speaker's worship and delight, and eagerly seek after idols, who forsake the way of truth and salvation, and go in another way, that of idol-worship and of destruction.'

בַּל אֶסְקֶה נְסִיבָהֶם מִדָּם, *I will not pour out their libations of blood*. Libations of wine were a part of the daily offerings made to the true God, Num. 15: 5, 7, 10. But libations of blood, frequently of human blood, as is well known, were and still are made by very many of the idolatrous heathen. The speaker expresses in this Psalm his horror or detestation, with respect to offerings of this nature. He loathes those sacrifices or libations, which the worshippers of idols regarded as the most efficacious.

Others understand the passage figuratively, in this manner: 'I will not present offerings to idols; for this would be like presenting *blood* instead of wine, for a libation to Jehovah.' I prefer the former sense.

It has been frequently remarked by commentators, that the action of presenting an offering to God, belongs to a *priest* only; and consequently, that the Messiah is here speaking of himself as a priest. But I do not feel the force of this reasoning. The people, who present offerings or libations *by* a priest, do them-

selves present them in the most important sense. So here, the speaker may be expressing the offering which he himself is unwilling to make; not those which he would decline to make for others. In other words, and taking off the costume, the Messiah expresses his abhorrence of idol and false worship.

But how can this be? At the time when Jesus made his appearance, the Jews had no idol-worship. They had abandoned idolatry for centuries.

True; but did the Messiah come only to reform the Jews? Were three millions of people the only objects of his pity, among the seven hundred millions then living? 'Is he the Saviour of the Jews only? Is he not also the Saviour of the Gentiles? Yea, of the Gentiles also.'

Why may he not then be represented as expressing his abhorrence of idols and idol-worship? Ruperti himself being judge this might well be: "Quid enim," says he, pio Judaeo, vel etiam Messiae magis convenit, quam cultum idolorum damnare atque detestari?" p. 132.

If any difficulty remains, the subject may be viewed in another light still. The Psalmist undertakes to represent to the men of his time a suffering, triumphant Messiah, who also is "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." Now in order to make his picture striking in this last respect, he must present him as opposed to the prevailing vices of the times. And what were these? Affinity with the heathen and idol-worship. But the Messiah would abhor all conduct of this nature. His character would be wholly the opposite of that, which the wicked and apostatizing of that day sustained. It is *costume*, then, and this only, which makes any difficulty in this case. But who will refuse to allow a writer of David's time, to employ the costume of the day? Surely no difficulty can be made here, to one conversant with the style of the Hebrew prophets, who every where employ the drapery of the times then present, to designate the objects of future and distant periods. In what other way can men write, so as to be understood by their contemporaries?

קִפְּתֵי . . . נִבַּל, *nor will I take their names upon my lips*, i. e. I will not even utter their names, in such abhorrence do I hold them. The suffix in שְׂמֹחֶם may refer either to the libations of blood mentioned in the preceding clause, or to the persons who present them. The latter seems to be the most congruous.

Verse 5. יְהוָה . . . רֶכֶּזִי, lit. *Jehovah is the part of my portion, and my cup*, or *Jehovah is my part and portion*, etc. The

word מְנָה is the fem. form with immutable Qamets, like זִמְרָה, צִוְרָה, פְּרָה, etc. Hence the Qamets is not changed by the construct state, in which the word here stands. The sentiment of the passage seems plainly to be, 'Jehovah is the author of all my good.' The image of *good* is represented by מְנָה הַיָּקָר and כּוֹסֵי, the first signifying the portion of goods or estate which falls to one, and the second, the supply of his food and comforts. The speaker then means, 'Jehovah is my portion, in distinction from the worldly inheritance which others seek.'

In this point of view, the מוֹבְחָי of v. 2 gives and receives light from the present passage.

אָתָּה תּוֹמֵךְ גּוֹרְלִי, *thou sustainest my lot*, i. e. thou maintainest or defendest the *lot*, *inheritance*, or *portion*, which has fallen to me, or which is mine. The sense is, 'Thou dost establish, render stable, keep in safety, preserve, the portion or inheritance, which thou hast given me, i. e. thou art mine, and ever will be; I have an unfailling portion.' Comp. vs. 7, 8.

As to תּוֹמֵךְ, if from תָּמַךְ, it may be an irregular participle of the present tense, like יוֹסִיף for יוֹסֵף, מוֹצִיא for מוֹצֵא; or it may be the 2 pers. masc. fut. Hiphil from תָּמַךְ, a root not put down in our lexicons, but one altogether probable, and having the same sense as תָּמַךְ; or perhaps the same as the Arabic *تَمَجَّ*, *to enlarge, to amplify*. Schultens adopts this last supposition. I prefer the former.

Verse 6. The idea of *portion* or *inheritance* being thus introduced, the image is continued; בְּצַדִּיקִים . . . חֲבֵלִים, *my heritage has fallen to me in a goodly place*. The word חֲבֵל in its first sense means *line*, then *measuring-line*, by which land, an inheritance, was marked out or apportioned. Here it is the same as חֶלֶק and כּוֹס and גּוֹרֵל above, i. e. it stands (as frequently) for the *inheritance* or *possession itself*, that has been apportioned. The word נָפְלוּ, *have fallen*, I take to refer to the custom of dividing heritages by lot; comp. Josh. 17: 5. Amos 7: 17.

אֵף . . . אֵף, *yea, my inheritance is pleasant to me, or, yea, I have a delightful inheritance*; a repetition of the thought in the preceding στίχος. The word נַחֲלָה is another example of the feminine ending with Quamets immutable. נִשְׁפְּרָה is a verb in the 3 pers. fem. of the praeter tense, agreeing with נַחֲלָה.

The meaning of vs. 6, 7 is, 'Jehovah is my chief good; he has made this good a sure heritage to me; it is like a heritage in a pleasant place; it is delightful to me.'

Who among the sons of men could ever say this, with as much emphasis and truth as he, who 'came to do the will of God, and in whose heart the law of Jehovah was written?'

But if vs. 5—7 be understood not simply of God himself, as being the portion and joy of the Holy Saviour, but also of all else which God bestows, (so that God is here called *portion* and *lot* as the *author* of these,) then we have a more widely extended meaning still of the paragraph in question. When we consider the circumstances, in which the Saviour is represented as uttering the words of this Psalm, viz, in prospective view of suffering, is it not natural to suppose that his mind looked beyond the season of distress and humiliation, to that of consequent happiness and glorification? We know, from the close of this Psalm, that such was the case. But may we not suppose, that the dark hours of trembling anticipation were cheered by the prospect of that *heritage*, which was to be won by his struggles and triumph among the sons of men—the glorious heritage of redeemed sinners? I think we may. "For the joy set before him, he endured the cross, despising the shame." What was this joy? His own resurrection from the dead and glorification in heaven, doubtless made a part of it. But was this all? Was this what most deeply affected the heart of him, who left a throne of glory to suffer and die for sinners? It would seem that such was not the case. The *glorious heritage of the saints* then, given to him by God the Father, *his portion and his lot*, may have been the objects of contemplation by him, when in the state represented by this Psalm; and in accordance with this, I have considered the tenor of the Psalm on p. 66 above. This will more fully still explain the triumph and exultation of the Holy Sufferer, in the remainder of the Psalm.

Verse 7. What now is the consequence of having such a delightful portion, one which is confirmed or made sure to him? יְצַנֵּי... אֲבָרְךָ, *I will bless Jehovah who careth for me.* So יְצַנֵּי means in Psalm 32: 8, and so the participial noun from it in Is. 9: 5; and so Gesenius renders it here; יְצַנֵּי, *consulere alicui, für jemanden sorgen.*

יָאָה לַיְלֹתַי יְסֻנֵּנִי בְלֵילֹתַי, *yea, by night my reins admonish me,* viz. to bless or praise Jehovah. In this simple and easy way, suggested by Gesenius, the unnumbered speculations about the passage are rendered useless. The Hebrews used בְּלֵילֹתַי, *reins*, to denote the *interior man*, the part which meditates or thinks deeply or intensely in retirement. And surely, he who retired

from the wondering multitudes that surrounded him, to a lonely mountain, where he might spend the night in prayer; he who rejoiced in spirit, and thanked his Father, the Lord of heaven and earth, for the spiritual success which he had given him; he who was to have a spiritual seed more numerous than the stars of heaven; he may well be supposed to say, that 'he will ever bless the Lord, and that his soul admonishes him to do so, in the secret hour of meditation by night.'

Another turn may be given to the verse, viz. 'I will bless Jehovah, who hath instructed or counselled me, viz. to choose the goodly heritage which I have chosen; my inmost affections and desires warn me also not to abandon this choice.' So Rosenmüller and others; but the former method is more simple, and more congruous with the context.

Verse 8. שְׁרִיתִי . . . תָּמִיד, *I set Jehovah constantly before me*; i. e. I keep him constantly in view; I look to him as being continually present, and ready with his aid to protect me. So the sequel.

אֲמִיט . . . בְּיָמֵי, *because he is at my right hand, I am not moved*; i. e. because he is in very deed always present as my helper, and I do always look to him as being with me, or being my helper; therefore I am not agitated, or driven hither and thither, by any perplexity or fearful anticipation. *To be at one's right hand*, is to be present with him in such a manner as most effectually to give him aid. Thus we have a kind of proverbial expression in English, to designate an auxiliary on whom we place great reliance: 'He is my *right-hand man*.' In the like sense does the Psalmist employ מְיָמֵי. The verb אֲמִיט is the fut. Niph. of מָרַט.

If the reader finds any difficulty in attributing such expressions of confidence to Jesus, when meditating on the sufferings and death which awaited him, because he finds, in the history given by the evangelists, that Jesus was in great agony at the prospect of them, when he prayed in the garden of Gethsemane; he has only to call to mind, that the agony of the garden was a part of the consummation of Jesus' sufferings,—a part of the bitter cup itself which he was to drink, 'who bore our sins, and carried our sorrows; who was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.' But it was not always thus with the Son of God. Nothing can be more certain, than that previous to this period, he had looked forward to his sorrows, with the firmest calmness, and the most unwavering resolution. And

why? Because 'God was in all his thoughts,' because 'he set the Lord always before his face, and therefore could not be moved.' 'For the joy set before him,' he could look with entire calmness on the agonies of the cross, and all the shame with which that would be accompanied. He did so; for he knew that although the powers of darkness must triumph as it were, for an hour, yet that he himself should speedily triumph over death and him that had the power of death, and rise to eternal blessedness, majesty, and glory, in the upper world. How is it possible to doubt, that he who knew all this, could exult, and did exult, even in prospect of the cross? Such an exultation our Psalm expresses. To what extent David saw all this in his own mind, when he wrote it, I do not pretend to determine; but that the Spirit of God who moved and aided the sacred writer, clearly saw and knew it all, who can reasonably venture to call in question?

Accordingly, we need not deem it strange, that the sequel of the Psalm presents us with a theme of joyful anticipation. Jesus in view of his sufferings, is represented in the first verse as exclaiming: "Preserve me, O God, for to thee do I betake myself for refuge!" But the agitation of the 'man of sorrows' is calmed, in reflecting on what God has done for him, and what he has promised to do. Before his mediation is at an end, his heart even exults in the prospect of the future.

Verse 9. לִבִּי טָמְחָה לְבָרִי, *therefore my heart rejoices*; i. e. I rejoice. The Hebrews were accustomed to employ every distinguished part of the external or internal man, as a representative of the whole person, or as the pronoun *I, myself*, etc. So we often do in English, without being sensible of it; e. g. every *soul* present perished; the vessel had forty *hands*; wise *heads* do not think so; *hearts* of steel will not flinch, etc. see Heb. Gr. § 475. 2. The sentiment of the passage is: 'Because God will always be a very present help in time of trouble, I am not agitated at the prospect of it; and considering "the joy that is set before me," I can exult in the prospect of the future.'

וַיִּגְדַּל כְּבוֹדִי, *my soul exults*. Literally כְּבוֹד means *honour, fame, majesty, splendour*, etc. It is in a *figurative* or *secondary* way, that it is employed by the Hebrew poets in the room of כָּבֵד; but this latter sense, in all probability, comes from כֶּבֶד in the sense of *liver*, which the Hebrews regarded as the seat of the passions and affections, as well as the heart; and which, therefore, might very naturally be taken by them as the representative

of the person, *I, myself*, etc. The idiom would be the same to them, that *heart* is to us when employed in the like way; although to us, the expression seems very strange, *my liver exults*. But physically or literally considered, it is no more strange than that the *heart* exults; and as to the figurative sense, this depends entirely on the *usus loquendi*. In the view of the Hebrews, they had as much ground to make the liver represent the whole man, as we have to employ the heart in the same office. The Arabians also use the word **كَبِدٌ** for *liver*. For the sense **כְּבוֹד**, as given above, compare Gen. 49: 6. Ps. 57: 9. 108: 2.

אֶתְּנֶה לְבָרְטָח... *yea, my flesh shall repose in confidence*; i. e. my body will I commit to the grave with confident expectation as to the future, viz. expectation that thou wilt not suffer it to remain and dissolve there; as the sequel expresses.

So Peter and Paul interpret this passage, as we have already seen; and so all commentators, who fully acknowledge their authority in matters of interpretation. But let us hear the other side. Ruperti says, 'My body shall sleep securely by night, and no evil befall me.' Kimchi, and after him Rosenmüller, De Wette, Gesenius, and others: 'While I live, I shall live securely, relying on thine aid: for thou wilt defend me from every evil.'

That the words are in themselves susceptible of such an interpretation, no one well versed in the idiom of the books of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, will undertake to deny. That they are capable of the interpretation which Peter and Paul give them, is equally plain and certain. The verb **שָׁבַן** means, *to lie down to rest, to encamp for the sake of rest, to rest, to dwell with or in*, etc. Now as no accusative case is supplied in our text, who shall decide whether **אֶרְיץ** must be added, or **קֶבֶר** *sepulchre*, or **בַּיִת קֶבֶר** *pluce or house of the grave*? The context must decide this point; and what does the next verse say? "Thou wilt not leave me to **שְׂאֵיז**, i. e. the grave, *thou wilt not suffer me to corrupt or consume there*." Why should we doubt, then, that the writer has in view a 'resting of his flesh in the grave,' in this case, as the apostles understood him to have?

Verse 10. **בִּי לֹא תַשְׂאִיז**... *for thou wilt not leave me to the grave, or thou wilt not abandon or give me over to the grave; viz. thou wilt not suffer the grave, or שְׂאֵיז, to have power over me, so as to retain me in it.*

For the meaning of the word לַאֲשֵׁרֹל, I must refer the reader to the "Exegetical Dissertations" which I have recently published, on this and other kindred words. Peter and Paul both understood לַאֲשֵׁרֹל of the grave or region of the dead. And so the following στίχος leads us almost necessarily to explain it. That the world of misery, γέννα, is here meant, there is no good ground to suppose. At any rate, philology cannot make this out; and whether you construe the passage of David or of Christ, it would be very difficult for *theology* to maintain such a position. The soul of neither went to γέννα, neither expected to go there. 'To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,' intimates something very different from this, in the case of the Messiah.

As to נַפְשִׁי, it is the usual Hebrew periphrasis of *me, myself*, etc. according to the idiom just explained in commenting on the preceding verse. That the Hebrews used this word to denote *soul* in distinction from *body*, the immortal in distinction from the mortal part, remains to be shewn. That they sometimes designate the *animus* of man by it, I feel no disposition to doubt.

Our translation, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*, in two respects varies from the Hebrew original. *Soul*, as here employed, naturally misleads the mere English reader, who takes it for the immortal part. In this way, the Romish church has made out the descent of Christ's soul into hell, in order to deliver souls from purgatory; a doctrine which, if it has any foundation, surely has none in this passage. Then to render לַאֲשֵׁרֹל, *in hell*, does not seem to be accurate; for although לַאֲשֵׁרֹל sometimes may be rendered *in*, as לַבְּטַח *in confidence*, לַבַּד *in separation*, yet before a noun of *place* it does not signify *in*, but *at*, as לַפְתָּח *at the door*, etc. The truth is, that in the present case, the לַאֲשֵׁרֹל belongs to the verb יָצַב, and לַאֲשֵׁרֹל means *to give over to, to abandon to, to give up or leave to*; see Heb. Gr. § 506. The word לַאֲשֵׁרֹל is here personified, or represented as a rapacious monster ready to destroy; comp. Is. 5: 14.

The simple meaning, then, of the passage before us is: 'Thou wilt not give me over to the power of death, nor abandon me to the region of the dead.' So the next clause indicates.

לֹא תִּרְאֶה שְׂדֵי קָדְשׁ... לֹא תִּרְאֶה, *Thou wilt not permit thy Holy One to see corruption*. In this sense did Peter and Paul understand this στίχος. But Rosenmüller derives שְׂדֵי קָדְשׁ from שָׁדַד, *to sink down*,

and renders it *foveam, pit, ditch, grave*. The whole passage he renders thus: "Non permittes ut pius tuus cultor sepulchro committatur." So for substance, Ruperti, Gesenius, De Wette, and others. But although it is true, that the form שָׁחַת may be derived from שָׁחַת, like נָחַת from נָחַת yet it is equally true, that it may be derived, as a regular guttural Segholate, from שָׁחַת, *to corrupt, to destroy*. So Gesenius himself admits in his lexicon; and he gives to שָׁחַת, as coming from שָׁחַת, the sense of *corruption, destruction, Verderbniss*. We may be permitted then to follow Peter and Paul, as philology allows us to do.

To see corruption, is to experience it, to be made a partaker of it. So *to see death, to see the kingdom of God, to see good* etc. are familiarly used, and in a way that entirely corresponds with the לְרֵאיוֹת שָׁחַת of our text.

But what means הַסִּידֵיךָ? In the margin, we have a Masoretic note, יִחִיר י, i. e. *Yodh superfluous*. Accordingly, the vowel points are adapted to הַסִּידֵיךָ the singular, and not to הַסִּידֵיךָ the plural form, which stands in the *Kethibh* or text.

With the *Qeri* or marginal reading, to which the vowel points are adapted, i. e. the singular number, agree Peter, Paul, and the Seventy, all of whom have τὸν ὄσιόν σου, the Chaldee, Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic, Ethiopic, Jerome, Talmud of Babylon, the ancient Rabbins, (see Kennicott, Diss. II. pp. 108. 563.) also 156 Codd. of Kennicott and 85 of De Rossi, and 44 editions of the Hebrew Scriptures. Seldom is a reading as well vouched for by external witnesses, which stands unquestioned in the text. And in addition to all this, it may be justly said, that the tenor of the whole Psalm seems plainly to demand הַסִּידֵיךָ and הַסִּידֵיךָ.

But after all, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Stange, Bruns, Fischer, De Wette, and others, have declared for the *Kethibh*, הַסִּידֵיךָ, principally on the ground, that the more difficult reading is to be preferred. This indeed, in a case *caeteris paribus*, must be regarded as a correct rule; but if a more difficult reading has great weight of versions, manuscripts, and internal connexion and probability against it, it would be stretching the rule very far, to extend it to such a case. In fact, one might in this way prove that a reading which makes no sense, or an incongruous one, is preferable to a reading which makes a good and congruous sense; which seems to be proving quite too much.

The Masoretic reading, in the case before us, is הַסִּידֵיךָ, as the vowel points themselves, and the note in the margin fully prove. How then can any one indulge, as some have done, in

violent declamation against the Jews, for having *corrupted* the text here? The ancient Jews did it not. Modern Rabbins, indeed, have laid hold of the plural form of the word here, in order to shew that the Psalmist is speaking of *all* the righteous or saints; and therefore that Peter and Paul have mistaken his words, when they applied them solely to Christ. Rabbi Ben Chaim was the first who *published* the plural reading חֲסִידֶיךָ, in his Rabbinical Bible (Venet. 1520), all preceding editions having omitted the Yodh which is the *index pluralitatis*. Fischer, whom Rosenmüller quotes at length, and with great approbation, urges the difficulty of finding any adequate reason for introducing this Yodh, unless the ancient manuscripts had read thus. And this is the sum of all his argument respecting it. But whether a speculative reason of this nature is to weigh against the testimony of the New Testament, of every ancient version, of the Masora, of all the older Hebrew manuscripts and editions, and against the internal necessity of the passage, is indeed a serious question in criticism.

In other cases of the like nature, such critics as Gesenius, Rosenmüller, and De Wette, do not hesitate to receive the Masoretic marginal reading or *Qeri*, instead of the *Kethibh* or reading of the text, because it makes a more facile sense; e. g. Is. 9: 2 'Thou hast multiplied the nation, *thou hast increased its joy,*' לֹא הִגְדַּלְתָּ רֵעִימָהּ. Literally translated, as the text stands, it reads, *Thou hast not increased its joy.* But here Gesenius appeals to the ancient versions, to the *Qeri*, and to the connexion of the passage, in order to justify the exchanging of לֹא for לִי, which latter he adopts, because he is supported by these vouchers. We hear nothing here about the more difficult and improbable reading (לֹא), in preference to לִי. How is all this to be accounted for? לִי is surely not so well supported, or so necessary to congruity, in Is. 9: 2, as חֲסִידֶיךָ is in Ps. 16: 10. But alas! the cases are very different. In the latter, חֲסִידֶיךָ would help to support apostolic claims to correctness of interpretation, and would favour the reference of the Psalm to the Messiah. 'Away with it then from the earth.' 'The more difficult reading is to be preferred,' i. e. one which will not thwart the opposite interpretation. But in Is. 9: 2, there is nothing dependent on the criticism, which can favour rationalism. The rigid rule of criticism, then, may lie by undisturbed. Truly if there be bigotry among those interpreters who refer the Psalm to Christ, they are not the only examples of it among the sons of men!

I have only to add, that the meaning of *הַסִּיד* seems primarily to be *affectionate*; then, in reference to God, it designates one who is *affectionately and piously devoted to him* or *to his service*; a characteristic which belongs by way of eminence to the holy Saviour. I have retained the translation *thy Holy One*, *τὸν ὁσίων σου*, because it is sufficiently near to the Hebrew, which means *thy pious one*, and our ears have been too long accustomed to it to dismiss it, unless it were substantially erroneous.

Verse 11. *תְּהַדְרִיעֵנִי אֶרְחַ הַיִּים*, *thou wilt shew me the path of life*. Life, in Hebrew, like *ζωή* in the New Testament, very often means *happiness*. The meaning of the present phrase, then, may be: 'Thou wilt make known to me the way of happiness, or shew me the way of safety and joy; thou wilt instruct me as to the best method of being happy.' If verses 10, 11 be rightly divided, this is, on the whole, the most probable sense; inasmuch as the clause under consideration seems to stand connected with the two *στίχοι* that follow, and to contain the like matter. But if it be viewed as a summary of the preceding verse, (a thing which often happens in Hebrew parallelism), then the meaning would be: 'Thou wilt restore me to life; or, thou wilt disclose to me the way of life, after I have been laid in the grave.' This sense Michaelis and others adopt; but the objection seems to be, the probability that the sense of this clause has a special relation to the matter of the succeeding *στίχοι*.

שָׂבַע שְׂמֵחַת אָתָּת־פָּאָרָה, *fulness of joys is with thee*, i. e. in thy presence, or thou being present, there is the highest joy, this is the completion of joy, supreme delight. *אָתָּת־פָּאָרָה*, lit. *with thy face*. But *פָּאָרָה* very often stands for *person*, *I*, *thou*, *he*, or for *presence*. Our English version well renders the phrase, *In thy presence is fulness of joy*.

But where is this presence? In the temple, says Rupertus; or at least, in living piously and religiously, the good man enjoys this presence. This is in itself all true; i. e. God is present with the good man; he was present in his temple; the Hebrew could speak of seeking his face (*פָּאָרָה*); and of enjoying his *presence*, in either respect. But could he speak of no higher enjoyment still? Did he acknowledge no other presence; Did he not know that God dwelt in heaven, and that his presence was there?

'Yes, he did,' it will be said; 'but then he had no expectation of seeing God there, or of enjoying his presence there. At least David had no idea of the soul's immortality.'

So Ruperti, Rosenmüller, De Wette, and others of the same school. Yet De Wette allows, that Ps. 17: 15, *I shall see thy face in righteousness*, contains a clear intimation that the writer expected eternal felicity in beholding the face of God in heaven: “*Offenbar ist von dem Anschauen Gottes in der ewigen Seligkeit die Rede.*” He concludes, therefore, that the inscription to this Psalm, תַּפְּיֵהָ לְיָהוָה, cannot be correct, and that the Psalm must be set down to some period after the Babylonish exile; because it was not until then, that the Jews had any hopes of future existence and happiness.

Fortunate people, we may exclaim then, fortunate indeed that you were carried away to a distant heathen land, and a seventy years exile! For there, among the gross idolators of the Euphrates and Tigris’ plains, you learned what all the patriarchs and prophets of the living God had never taught you—you learned that you were made in the image of God, and destined to live forever! Happy people, who came to such instruction by exile—instruction more important than all which they had ever before received! But seriously; are we then to believe, that when Paul says, (or if not he, at least a writer of his age, and one of high authority in the church,) that ‘Abraham looked for a city whose builder and maker is God;’ that when he asserts that the ancient patriarchs ‘all died in faith, having seen the promises afar off, and embraced them, and desired a better country *even a heavenly*’ (Heb. 11: 10, 13—16); are we to believe that such men had no hope of immortality? Who does not know, moreover, that the Egyptians of the most ancient times, had, of all the heathen world, the most distinct and palpable hopes of immortality and belief in it? So the immortal monuments erected in the times of the patriarchs and of Moses, do testify abundantly at the present moment; as Champollion has shewn in the most convincing manner. Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus help to confirm all this, in their account of the ancient Egyptians. Now was not Moses, the great leader and lawgiver of the Hebrew nation, “learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians” (Acts 7: 22); and was he not therefore acquainted with the doctrine of immortality which lay on the very face of their religion? And if the patriarchs and Moses knew all this, (to speak of no more,) was this knowledge all lost before the time of David? Was the king of Israel, the man after God’s own heart, the anointed of the Lord, more ignorant than the tyrants of a heathen throne, the worshippers of oxen and blocks

of wood and stone? Believe this who will; but when the opposers of *credulity*, the rationalists of our times, lay such a tax as this upon our understandings, for one I must decline to pay it. I revolt, if it be at the expense of being regarded as superstitious. I am yet, and for aught that I can find, am still likely to be, a great way off from believing that the people of God were so much inferior to their idolatrous and heathen neighbours, that they did not even indulge the expectation of immortality.

It is to be hoped, after all the severe remarks we have heard and read about *dogmatic* prejudice, that the Christian public will sooner or later see, that prejudice is not confined to one party, nor to those who believe in the reality of a divine revelation.

Fulness of joy, then, the holy Redeemer expected, when he should "ascend to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God." There he has gone, "far above all heavens;" there he experiences "the joy that was set before him;" there "he ever liveth to make intercession for us;" there, crowned with everlasting glory, and highly exalted on account of his merits and sufferings, he experiences "fulness of joy," which no heart can conceive, no tongue describe.

נְצַח בְּיַמֶּיךָ נְצַח, *at thy right hand are pleasures everlasting, or in thy right hand.* The latter rendering is adopted by Ruperti, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and even admitted by Michaelis. That it is a possible one, need not be said even to a tyro in Hebrew. The נְצַח often indicates such a relation as the rendering *in thy right hand* would shew. The meaning of this would be, 'Thou hast power to bestow lasting favours, or thou art ready to bestow unceasing happiness,' i. e. unceasing so long as the present life endures; for so the recent commentators are obliged to qualify נְצַח.

But the other rendering is equally possible, *at thy right hand*; for what is more common than נְצַח before the nouns which indicate *place where*? It is one of its leading significations, and is so arranged by Gesenius himself, in his lexicon; e. g. "The Philistines enamped בְּצֶדֶן *by the fountain, at the fountain* of Jezreel, not *in* it surely, 1 Sam. 29: 1. So 1 Kings 5: 13, "The hyssop which shooteth up בְּקִיר, *by the wall.* So נְצַח signifies *coram, in conspectu, before, in presence of, in view of*; and accordingly the Hebrews said, בְּצֵינִי, בְּאַזְנוֹי, בְּפָנָי, *before or in presence of the eyes, ears, face.* In just the same way would they say, בְּיַמֶּיךָ, *at the right hand, by the right hand.* The only question then in the present case, is, what method of interpretation is

most congruous with the context? To this I must answer, the latter; for in this case, *בְּיָמֶינֶיךָ* will correspond to *אַחֲרֵי-פָּנֶיךָ*, both designating place *where*. This seems to me the most natural, facile, and congruous construction.

If, moreover, the Psalm does truly predict the resurrection of Jesus, his triumph over hell and the grave, then what more natural than to suppose, that it also predicts the ascension of the Prince of life to heaven, and his being placed there 'on the right hand of the Majesty on high?' Michaelis rejects this meaning; but if the interpretation which refers the Psalm to the Messiah be retained, I see no good reason why we should reject it. Certainly we are not compelled by philology to do so.

Thus have I gone through this difficult Psalm, in a manner more copious, perhaps, than my readers will approve. It is only when one has before him all the difficulties that have been made in respect to its interpretation, that he can know how much is necessary to be said in order to meet them all. On the candour of those who are able to judge in such a way, I would cast myself without any fears.

If I have rightly interpreted the Psalm, it contains an exhibition of the Messiah, in view of his approaching sufferings and death, rejoicing in God, as his portion and supporter, expressing his deep abhorrence of all departure from him, his love to those who are devoted to his service, his joyful hope of a triumph over death and hell, and of a glorious, blessed, and everlasting state of happiness 'at the right hand of the Majesty on high.' So Peter and Paul seem plainly to have viewed and interpreted the Psalm. I would fain inquire how they have led the way, and follow on in their steps, not doubting that they conduct to truth and happiness.

It remains only that I should, agreeably to the plan proposed, briefly canvass the principal objections made against such an interpretation.

OBJ. 1. Verse 3 seems to indicate that the writer was in a foreign land, and expresses his longing after the society of the pious. Were not these words of David, respecting his own feelings, when he was banished from Judea by the persecuting zeal of Saul?

This objection depends entirely on the mode of translating and interpreting v. 3. The method of translating which I have adopted, and which agrees with that of Gesenius, De Wette, and Rosenmüller, removes all difficulty in applying the words to

the Messiah, and renders the interpretation just proposed altogether needless.

OBJ. 2. The reading in v. 10, הַסִּידִירָה in the plural number, shews that the Psalmist is speaking, in this verse, of the saints in general, and not of the Messiah in particular.

The answer to this has already been given. Overwhelming evidence speaks against the plural form of this word. Even Fischer and Stange, who strenuously contend for it, make it nothing more than a *pluralis intensivus*, a plural of intensity, which has reference only to the Saviour. Not so, however, those interpreters, who find here no allusion to a Messiah. They, with the modern Jews, contend that David is speaking in the whole verse, merely of deliverance from danger and sudden death, and that the word הַסִּידִירָה (for so they point and read it,) refers to all the pious, who enjoy the promises of special favour from God. But it may well be asked, supposing the reading in question had been הַסִּידִירָה, and Peter, Paul, all the ancient versions, 236 manuscripts, the sense of the passage itself, i. e. its congruity with the rest of the Psalm, had exhibited and required הַסִּידִירָה, whether they would have hesitated to receive it? Such is the mighty difference which is made in a question of criticism, by previous views and wishes, even among those who believe themselves of all men to be most free from prejudice!

OBJ. 3. The Psalm agrees with others, viz. Ps. LVI. LVII. LIX. which have the same title, מִכְתָּם, and which were written during David's exile from his country. It is probable, therefore, that Ps. XVI. was written during the same period, and has reference to the dangers and distresses of David during that period, and his hope of deliverance.

So Rosenmüller. But De Wette acknowledges that he does not perceive the resemblance alleged, between the Psalms in question; and it would be difficult, I believe, to make out any greater resemblance in this case, than exists between Ps. LVI. LVII. LIX. and many other Psalms where complaints are uttered. An allegation of this nature should have strong support, to render it worthy of very serious regard.

OBJ. 4. In v. 10, לֹא יִצְּלֵנִי לְשֵׁאוֹל means, *Thou wilt not deliver me to Sheol or the grave*, i. e. Thou wilt not suffer me to go there or to be at all within its power; so that לֹא יִצְּלֵנִי is the *terminus ad quem*, the boundary to which the writer of the Psalm was not to come.

So Hufnagel, in his dissertation on this Psalm. But the dif-

faculty here is, that philology will not support the criticism. The verb *קָצַב*, followed by *לְ*, *אֵל*, *עַל*, means *to give over to, to abandon to, to give up to*, the power or disposal of another; e. g. Ps. 49: 11. Their wealth *לְאֲחֵרִים קָצַבוּ* they give over to others, i. e. they leave it to their disposal; for the Psalmist is here speaking of those who die, and leave their property to their children. So Ps. 10: 14, The wretched *לְיָצֵב יָצִיף*, leaves himself to thee, or gives himself over to thee. Surely the *terminus ad quem* is out of question here. So in Ps. 16: 10, *יָצֵב לְשָׂאוֹל* ... means, *to give up to the power of, to abandon to the disposal or dominion of*; all which is explained by the succeeding *σικκος*, "Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption," i. e. to putrefy or consume in the grave.

OBJ. 5. In v. 10, *עֲרִיחַ* comes from *עָרַח*, and means *grave, pit*. So Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, Ruperti, and others, after the Jewish commentators. I have already examined this, in my remarks on the verse in question. I only add here, that *עֲרִיחַ*, in the sense of *wasting or destruction*, has a clear parallelism in Job 17: 14, as Gesenius and Winer both acknowledge; and the case is almost equally clear in Ps. 55: 24, Thou wilt bring them (men of blood) down *לְבִאֵר עֲרִיחַ*, to the pit of destruction, not the pit of the pit; although this last form of expression is not an impossible one in Hebrew. Rosenmüller himself, with an inconsistency rather to be wondered at, here makes *עֲרִיחַ* to mean *destruction*. 'Si naturam furcâ expellas, usque recurret.'

OBJ. 6. In v. 4, the writer expresses his abhorrence of idolatry. This shews that he was surrounded by it; and how can this be put into the mouth of the Messiah, in whose times there was not a vestige of idolatry among the Jews.

So Knapp and Jahn. The answer has already been given in the commentary above. Nothing could be more appropriate, in order to present a picture of perfect devotedness to God, to the men of David's times, than to present the pattern of such devotedness as abhorring every thing connected with idols and idolatry. Such a picture v. 4 presents. And did not he, who came to redeem almost the whole of the human race from the service of idols, abhor idolatry?

OBJ. 7. But the Jews expected a victorious conqueror, a mighty hero, in their Messiah; not a persecuted, despised, suffering, and dying man.

True; the Jews of Christ's time had such an expectation.

But was it well grounded? Is there any good reason in their Scriptures, in favour of such an opinion? So Jesus did not think; for, from the first to the last of his ministry among the Jews, he contended against their erroneous views relative to this very point. He often rebuked his disciples for the same extravagant and ungrounded expectations. Let us hear him, when addressing them, after they had expressed their disappointment on account of his death, by saying, "We trusted this had been he who would have redeemed Israel," i. e. from the yoke of the Romans. "O fools," said he, "and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Mark the sequel: "Then beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." And again, when addressing all his apostles: "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day." Luke 24: 25—27, 46.

So Paul also thought and reasoned. "Paul . . . reasoned with them (the Jews) out of the Scriptures; opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead," Acts 17: 2, 3. So thought all the apostles, after they had become truly enlightened. But it would be useless to accumulate evidence, in regard to a point so perfectly plain.

The question now is, not what bigoted and misled Jews, groaning under a foreign bondage, puffed up with pride on account of their descent and privileges, and filled with darkness, thought and believed. The true question is, What did the sacred writers of the Old Testament Scriptures teach; and how did Christ and the apostles understand and explain them? If a candid Jew could read Ps. xxii. and Is. liii. and not find in it a *suffering* Messiah, it would seem strange indeed. In fact, so generally has this been acknowledged among the Jewish Rabbins, that in modern times the fiction of two Messiahs has been invented; the one the son of David, who is the reigning and conquering prince; the other, the son of Joseph, who is the suffering and dying Messiah.

Such a fiction as this arose, no doubt, from deference to the opinion of the ancient Rabbins, who so clearly held to a suffering Messiah, that their opinion could not be overlooked or fairly set aside. Such for example are the following views: "In tres partes divisae sunt omnes castigationes et poenae; unam sustinuerunt David et patriarchae; alteram, generatio nostra;

tertiam, Rex Messias," Mechilta in Jalkut Rubeni II. fol. 90. 1, 2. So in the Zohar, Genes. fol. 29. col. 113, "Supremus inter illos qui in hoc mundo castigationes et dolores sustinuerunt, est Messias." Midrash Mishle, fol. 52. 2, "... a tribus castigationibus et poenis liberamini, a die Gog et Magog, a dolore Messiae, (i. e. such sorrows as the Messiah would suffer,) et a die judicii magni." Zohar, Numer. fol. 69. col. 274, "Ille dominabitur et occidet multos, et ipsum, quoque Messiam." Ille is the tyrant king of the Persians, of whom the writer is speaking.

But enough of these ancient Jewish traditions. Whoever wants to see overwhelming proof, in regard to the point of a suffering Messiah, may read Schoettgen's ample collection of rabbinic testimonies, in his *Messias*, Lib. VI. cap. 3. I add only, that the Targum of Jonathan exhibits the most indubitable evidences that he referred Is. LIII. to the Messiah; see the Targum, and especially in chap. 52: 13. 53: 10. Indeed the whole of the paraphrase evidently refers chap. LIII. to the Messiah, although most of the expressions that regard his sufferings, are construed away in some good measure.

If then the blinded, darkened, unbelieving, worldly-minded Jews expected a triumphant and splendid conqueror and king in their Messiah, it proves nothing more than that such men may pervert the Scriptures, and cherish expectations entirely different from those which they are designed to support. Is not this done every day, amid all the light and knowledge diffused among the present generation of men?

OBJ. 8. But the Jews did not expect their Messiah to rise from the dead. Of course they could not have understood Ps. xvi. as predicting such an event.

So Rosenmüller. But what is the evidence? We have already seen. The evidence is an *obiter dictum* of Maimonides, at the close of the twelfth century, a mortal enemy to the Christian religion, and gladly seizing on every occasion to traduce it. But why did not this celebrated critic examine further? In the Zohar, (now conceded to be one of the most ancient of all the rabbinical writings,) he might have found a different opinion; e. g. "Moriatur his Messias, et occisus in statu mortis *ad tempus* permanebit." Does *ad tempus* mean *always*?

So Bereshith Rabba ad Gen. 44: 8. "Quando? Cum ascendent captivi *ex inferno*, et Schechina (Messias) in capite

illorum, q. d. Mic. 2: 13." Zohar, Genes. fol. 73. col. 290, in Esai. 60: 22, "Quidnam vult vox *בְּעֵתָא*? Idem est, ac tempore He (ה); illius, inquam, He (ה) quod ex pulvere resurget." He (ה) is the last letter in *הִנְיָה*, and stands among the Rabbins for the mystical designation of the Messiah. Bereshith Rabba ad Gen. xxii. "Multae sunt in sacra Scriptura dies ternae; quarum una est profecto resurrectio Messiae." So Finus (in Flagello Judaeorum, VI. 79) quotes this passage; although it has been ejected from the later copies of the Bereshith Rabba.

Why now should the *dictum* of a Jew in the twelfth century, be produced as evidence of so important a matter as the creed of the ancient Jews respecting the resurrection of the Messiah, while all these testimonies are not even adverted to? Had they been confined to the rabbinic treatises, and lurking only there, the question would have been very different. But they lie before the whole world, in the laborious, and in many respects excellent, work of Schoettgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, Vol. II. Truly there is reason to complain, that impartiality is more limited than professions of liberality and fairness.

'Sed . . . manum de tabella. If the Psalm in question is to be wrested from the hands of Peter and Paul, it must be done by more strength and fairer combatants than have yet attempted to do it. That I may not have committed errors myself, in such a protracted investigation, I do not even pretend. If so, let them be exposed; truth will be a gainer by it; and I shall surely rejoice. I only offer my humble contribution to illustrate and to vindicate a much abused, and (as I believe,) a much misunderstood portion of the Scriptures, to which every Christian ought to attach a high interest, who acknowledges the authority of Jesus and of his apostles. If I have succeeded in my aim, and my contribution should be so fortunate as to meet the approbation of the Christian public, I may, if Providence permit, resume at a future period the subject of the predictions respecting the Messiah, and endeavour to explain other portions of the Old Testament, which have relation to this deeply interesting subject.

ART. III. ON THE GRAMMATICO-HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION
OF THE SCRIPTURES.

By Augustus Hahn, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Translated from the German by the Editor.*

INTRODUCTORY NOTICES.

THE following article from the pen of Professor Hahn of the University of Leipsic, will be interesting to the lovers of biblical literature, as giving a clear and practical view of the proper method in which the Holy Scriptures are to be interpreted; and as pointing out the reasons, why other modes prevalent in some countries, are not to be adopted. With many readers also, the article will have an interest from the circumstance, that it so fully develops the manner in which the Scriptures are regarded and treated by the rationalists of Germany.

Professor Hahn was born in Thuringia in 1792, and is now therefore in the vigour of life. In 1819 he became professor extraordinary in the university of Königsberg: and was afterwards ordinary professor in the same institution, and superintendent of the churches in and around that city. Of course, he must have been a stated preacher in one of them. In 1826 he was called to Leipsic, as ordinary professor of theology in that university, where he has ever since delivered lectures on systematic theology and the exegesis of the New Testament, and still occasionally preaches. While at Königsberg, he had acquired a high character as a man of learning and an oriental scholar, particularly by several publications on the subject of the Syriac language and literature; of which he was the first to discover the metrical principles. An occurrence which very unexpectedly took place not long after his removal to Leipsic, gave a new turn to his efforts, and called him forth as a prominent champion of the cause of revelation and of evangelical principles.

In most, if not all, of the German universities, a professor when he enters upon his office, is immediately eligible to all the duties and privileges of it, with the exception of being *decanabilis*, or dean of the faculty to which he belongs. In order to

* From the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, for April 1830.

enjoy this privilege in the theological faculty, he must first hold a public disputation in Latin *pro loco in ordine theologorum olim obtinendo*. For this purpose he usually prepares a printed dissertation,—to which sometimes theses are appended,—which he undertakes to defend at a stated time in public. In ordinary cases there are generally three opponents, selected by the disputant himself; in a case like the present the whole faculty to which he belongs seem to be *ex officio* opponents, and thus have an opportunity of testing the qualifications of their new associate. After the stated opponents have finished, the lists are thrown open to all who may choose to enter.

For the subject of his disputation, Professor Hahn had prepared a dissertation entitled *Commentatio hist. theol. de rationalismi, qui dicitur, vera indole*; the object of which was to shew the identity of modern rationalism with the earlier naturalism. He gives the following, as the results of an accurate historical examination: That the term *naturalism* arose in the sixteenth century, and in the seventeenth had become general; it was applied to those who admitted no other religious knowledge than such as is natural, which every man can acquire for himself with his own powers. As to the different forms of naturalism, theologians distinguished three; the refined, which they also called Pelagianism, which holds the heart of man to be in itself purer than it really is, and therefore also his religious knowledge to be clearer; the low naturalism, which directly denies a special revelation; and the lowest of all, which holds the world itself to be God. The term *rationalism* was already used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of those who declared reason to be the only source and standard of faith. It seems first to have been employed by Amos Comenius in 1661; and was never used in a good sense. In the eighteenth century, it was customary to give the name of rationalists to those who had formerly been called low naturalists. From these facts the dissertation derives the following conclusions: 1. That rationalism has ever been regarded as hostile to Christianity. 2. That the name is not modern; but was given to those who were before called naturalists. 3. That this unholy name, as well as the thing itself, was introduced into Germany from England, France, Italy, and Holland.

Although the contents of this pamphlet were merely historical, they afforded matter enough to excite the opposition of the friends of rationalism. So long as the dispute was confined to

the members of the theological faculty, who are mostly orthodox, though not evangelical men, it was conducted with dignity and calmness. But so soon as the lists were thrown open, an eager and zealous champion of rationalism pressed forward to the contest, in the person of Professor Krug, a member of the faculty of letters, and a teacher of philosophy; who has written more or less on almost all subjects, and therefore been often slightly called the Abbé de Pradt of Germany. With him the bounds of dignity and decorum were soon overleaped; and the dispute degenerated on his part into a conflict, in which neither the "untimely jest" nor the "fearfully bitter earnest" were wanting, to attest the unhallowed zeal of the defender of rationalism.

The excitement produced by this occurrence was not confined to Leipsic, but spread throughout Germany, and gave rise, as usual, to a host of pamphlets. Among others, Krug published also a further exposition of his views; and Hahn wrote a pamphlet addressed "To the Evangelical Church, especially in Saxony and Prussia." His object in this work was to shew, that rationalism stands in such direct opposition to biblical Christianity, that the friends of this anti-biblical doctrine can have no claim to be members of the evangelical church; and he therefore repeatedly calls upon the rationalists at length to come forward openly, do homage to the truth, and separate themselves from the Christian church.* This little work displays the devoted character of Hahn's piety in a very striking manner, and produced a powerful effect on the minds of the friends of evangelical religion throughout Germany. Indeed, many of us may yet live to see the day, when the effects of it shall become visible, in an open and general purification of the German churches.

I have dwelt at more length on the subject of the Leipsic disputation,† because it will hereafter form an important epoch in the history of the revival of true religion in Germany; and because also it serves to explain several allusions in the fol-

* It should be borne in mind, that in the Lutheran and Reformed churches, members are admitted by confirmation, and not by profession; and it is very rare to meet a person who has not been confirmed.

† For a review of this dispute and of the writings occasioned by it, see an article by Prof. Tholuck in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* for July and August 1827.

lowing article. Since that time, Hahn has published a *Manual of Systematic Theology*,* and is now engaged in superintending a beautiful edition of the Hebrew Bible from the press of Tauchnitz, for which he furnishes a revision of the text.

Emanuel Kant, the extraordinary man whose labours have caused an entire revolution in the philosophical systems and speculations of Germany, and whose name occurs so often in the following pages, was the son of a saddler, and born at Königsberg in 1724. In 1740 he entered upon the study of theology, which he abandoned for classical and polite literature; and after spending several years as a tutor in private families, he became in 1755 a private teacher in the university of his native place. In this station he remained fifteen years without salary, receiving only fees from his hearers, until 1770, when he was appointed to the chair of Logic and Metaphysics in the same university. In this capacity he remained active until 1794, during which period he composed and published most of his philosophical works. The decays of age compelled him afterwards to retire from his more active duties; and he died in 1804, at the age of 80 years, having never in his life been out of Königsberg farther than to Pillau, a distance of about thirty-three English miles.

His person and character are thus described by Reichart (*Urania, Taschenbuch für 1812*). "Kant was both in body and soul a perfectly dry man. Leaner and thinner than his diminutive body, had perhaps none ever existed; colder and more shut up in himself, a sage had never lived. A high and serene forehead, fine nose, and clear sparkling eyes, were very advantageous features in his countenance. But the lower part of the face, on the contrary, was the most perfect expression of gross sensuality; which manifested itself in him immoderately, especially in eating and drinking.—He loved a good table in cheerful society; and was himself a pleasing companion, who knew how to put every company in the best humour by his genuine wit, exhibited in the happiest retorts and remarks, and through his vast reading and exhaustless store of entertaining anecdotes, which he related in the driest possible manner, without himself ever joining in the laugh. Kant's society was so much the more welcome in the best houses and most respectable families, because, through his perfect integrity and that genuine

* *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, Leips. 1828.*

dignity which became him, not only as the most intellectual man of the city, but also as one of the deepest thinkers of the human race, he knew how to secure every where to himself the most entire respect and esteem. In his external appearance he was not only always neat, but elegant. Kant was also the better suited both for large and small parties, in that he was fond of cards, and rarely passed an evening without a party at ombre. He regarded this as the only entirely sure means of relieving and quieting his head, after severe thinking. The fine arts he neither practised, nor particularly admired. It seemed rather as if he was all deep intellect; along with which, it is rare to find so boundless a memory as Kant possessed. His lectures were, on this account, in the highest degree interesting and instructive. He read the greater part of the forenoon; seldom in the afternoon; and left himself twenty minutes between the lectures, to prepare for the following one. Logic and metaphysics he commonly read publicly; and then alternately natural law, morals, anthropology, physics, and physical geography. This last was a particularly pleasing and instructive course for young people, through his immeasurable reading in history, travels, biography, romances, and in every branch, which can in any way furnish materials for enriching or illustrating that science. His memory shewed itself here in its full strength; for although he had his papers before him, he yet seldom looked at them, and often repeated long rows of names and dates, entirely from recollection. His lectures also on abstract philosophy, received great clearness and perspicuity from the treasure of illustrations and examples which his memory presented; and his writings have probably so long remained difficult and obscure to many, merely because he thought it unnecessary to subjoin to them those illustrations, which he was accustomed to give in the lecture room."

This is not the place to give a view of the philosophical principles of Kant. His system lies in ruins in the land which gave it birth; other systems have rolled onward over it, and crushed it into comparative oblivion. These again have yielded in their turn; and of those that are now predominant, who shall say that they are founded on principles more consonant to truth, or will endure longer than that of Kant; who supposed that his own system was, like truth, indestructible and everlasting; and who was blasphemously compared, by some of his disciples, to Jesus Christ? At present there would scarcely be found an

intelligent man in Germany, who would call himself a follower of Kant; and the highest praise now assigned to him as a thinker is, that he was *scharfsinnig, aber nicht tiefsinnig*, sagacious, but not profound.

The principal works of Kant, in which his system and the various applications of it are developed, are the *Critique of pure Reason*, Riga 1781. Leips. 1799. 5th ed. *Critique of practical Reason*, Riga 1787. *Critique of Judgment*, Berlin 1790. 3d ed. 1799. *Religion within the bounds of Reason*, Königsb. 1792. 2d ed. 1794. etc. The English reader who wishes to obtain a view of Kant's philosophy, may be referred to an article of Sir James Macintosh in the first volume of the Edinburgh Review; to the articles *Kant* and *Kantism* in the several Encyclopædias, especially to that of the forthcoming Encyclopædia Americana; and to a biographical account of Kant by Prof. Stapfer of Paris, translated from the "Biographie universelle" by Prof. Hodge, and published in the Biblical Repertory for July 1828. The best German works on the biography and philosophy of Kant, are given in the note below.*

It is somewhat singular that the system of Kant should have been regarded, both by friends and foes, as tending to establish the orthodox faith. In this respect the view given by Prof. Stapfer is too favourable. The developments of the following article shew, that whatever sentiments Kant may have intended ostensibly to convey, his heart at least knew nothing of a revelation. This is confirmed too by the accounts of Hasse, the orientalist, referred to in the note below. About a year before Kant's death, Hasse asked him what he promised himself in regard to a future life? after reflecting, he replied: 'Nothing certain.' In answer to a previous question of the same kind he said: 'I have no conception of a future state.' See Hasse, p. 28 f. and comp. Borowski, p. 195—202, who is also positive as to his repugnance to admit the supernatural origin of Christianity.

* *Hasse*, Letzte Aeusserungen Kants, von einem seiner Tischgenossen, Königsb. 1804.—*Borowski*, Darstellung des Lebens und Characters Kants, ib. 1805.—*Wasianski*, Imm. Kant in seinem letzten Lebensjahre, ib. 1805.—*Jachmann*, Imm. Kant, geschildert in Briefen, etc. ib. 1805.—*Kiesewetter*, Darstellung der wichtigsten Wahrheiten der kritischen Philosophie, 4te. Aufl. von *Flitner*, Berlin 1824.

The name of John Frederick Röhr occurs also in the following pages. He was born in 1777, studied theology at the university of Leipsic, was then settled as a pastor near Zeitz, and since 1820 occupies the former station of the celebrated Herder, as general superintendant and first court-preacher at Weimar. He is regarded as one of the boldest and most tolerant leaders of the rationalists. His 'Letters on Rationalism' were published in 1813; and for many years he has conducted a 'Preacher's Journal,' which is of course the organ of his rationalist views. He has also published a small popular Geography of Palestine, which is necessarily superficial. ED.

HAHN ON INTERPRETATION.

The assertion has often been made within the last ten years, and especially in the latter part of this period, that the modern rationalism, which may be referred to Emanuel Kant as its founder, has a character entirely different from the earlier rationalism. It has been asserted to be decidedly evangelical, or at least far more evangelical than the older system, which is also called naturalism, inasmuch as it declares the belief in a divine revelation to be an illusion, and rejects the Holy Scriptures, because it esteems them merely as human productions. Kant himself also wished to establish this distinction between rationalism and naturalism.* But history affords no ground for such a separation of

* In his treatise entitled *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, 2nd ed. Königsb. 1794 p. 230 ff. "That (religion) in which I must know that any thing is a divine command, in order to acknowledge it as my duty, is a *revealed* religion (or one which needs a revelation). On the contrary, that in which I must first know that any thing is my duty, before I can acknowledge it a divine command, is *natural* religion. He who holds only natural religion to be morally necessary, i. e. to be duty, may be also called a *rationalist*. If he denies the reality of all supernatural divine revelation, he is called a *naturalist*. If now he admits the possibility of a revelation, but asserts, that to be acquainted with it and to adopt it as real, is not necessary to religion, he may be called a *pure rationalist*. If, however, he holds a belief in a revelation to be necessary to religion in general, he may be termed a *pure supernaturalist*. The rationalist, by virtue of his very name, must of course confine himself within the limits of human knowledge. Hence, he will never as naturalist de-

the two,—as is now conceded even by opposers, who respect her frequent testimonies for near two hundred years,—and just as little would there seem to be room for such a distinction, if we regard the declarations of the founder of modern rationalism himself.

In Pt. III. Sect. 5 of his work entitled “Religion within the bounds of Reason,” where he is endeavouring to show “that the constitution of every church always arises out of some historical (revealed) system of belief, which may be called the ecclesiastical faith; and that this is best founded upon sacred records;” he goes on among other things to say:* “Since then it is not now to be avoided, that an authoritative ecclesiastical faith should thus be connected with a pure religious belief, as the vehicle and means of publicly uniting men for the advancement of the latter; it must also be conceded, that the permanent support of this ecclesiastical faith, the gradual and general spread of it, and even the proper respect for the revelation incorporated in it, can hardly be sufficiently provided for by tradition, but only by written documents; and these again must, as a revelation, be an object of reverence both to contemporaries and to posterity. This is necessary for mankind, in order that they may have some certainty in regard to their religious duties. A holy book acquires for itself the highest respect with those—and with such indeed most of all—who cannot read it, or at least cannot gain from it any connected idea of religion (!); and no reasoning

ny, nor call in question, either the intrinsic possibility of revelation in general, nor the necessity of a revelation as a divine means for the introduction of true religion; for on such points no one can decide any thing by reason. Consequently, the question in dispute can only be as to the mutual claims of the pure rationalist and the supernaturalist; or, it can concern only that, which the one looks upon as necessary and sufficient for the only true religion, while the other regards it as only accidental.” That Kant himself doubted the reality of any actual revelation, and held that of the Bible to be only *professed* and *imaginary*, (poetic fiction, *Dichtung*.) is wholly undeniable from many declarations, some of which will be given in the sequel. See e. g. p. 150 ff. 160 ff. of the work above cited.

* This and the other passages are here quoted *in extenso*, partly in order to refer to them afterwards, and partly for the sake of avoiding the reproach of misconception.

can effect any thing against the decisive reply, which vanquishes all objection, *It is thus written.*"

In the next section, where a pure religious belief (i. e. natural religion) is said to be *the highest interpreter of the ecclesiastical faith* (i. e. of revelation), we read :* "In order now to connect with such an empirical faith, which, as it would seem, accident has played into our hands (!), the basis of a moral belief, (either as object, or as auxiliary,) it is necessary that the revelation which has thus come into our hands, should receive a particular interpretation, i. e. *be explained throughout in a sense, which shall coincide with the general practical rules of a religion of pure reason.* For that which is theoretical in the ecclesiastical faith, cannot interest us in a moral view, unless it influence to the fulfilment of all human duties, as being divine commands; which indeed constitutes the essential part of all religion. This mode of interpretation may often appear, even to ourselves, to be forced as it regards the mere text; often it may really be so; but still, if the text can possibly be made to bear it,† this interpretation must be preferred to such a literal one, as either contains in itself nothing favourable to morality, or even goes so far as to operate against it.—It will also be found, that the same course has been adopted in regard to all ancient and modern forms of belief, which have been in part consigned to sacred books; and that judicious and reflecting teachers have interpreted these books, until they brought them by degrees to coincide, as to their essential contents, with the principles of a moral belief. The moral philosophers among the Greeks, and afterwards among the Romans, did the same thing with their fabulous systems of mythology. They at last found out a mode of explaining the grossest polytheism, as being the mere symbolical representation of the attributes of the one divine Being; and of imparting a mystical sense to many a profligate action, and even to the wild but beautiful dreams of their poets; and thus they converted, in a measure, a mass of popular superstition—which it would have been unwise to have subverted, because it might have been succeeded by an

* P. 157—160.

† How many such interpretations, however, will the text *not* bear, if they are not supported by usage, by the connexion, and by history?

atheism, still more dangerous to the state—into a system of moral precepts, intelligible and profitable to all men. The later Judaism, and even Christianity, is made up of similar interpretations, some of which are exceedingly forced; but in both, this is done for purposes unquestionably good and essential to all mankind. The Mahometans (as Reland shews) know how to give to the description of their sensual paradise a spiritual sense; and the same is done by the Hindus in the interpretation of their Vedas; at least for the enlightened part of the people.”

By way of justification he adds:* “Nor can this mode of interpretation be charged with any want of honesty or good faith; provided we do not assert, that the sense which we thus give to the symbols of popular belief, or to the sacred books, is precisely that which they were originally intended to convey; but *leave this undetermined*, and assume only the possibility of understanding the authors of them in this manner.”—This possibility is afforded us in the *germs of true reason*, or the doctrines coincident with reason, which are found in all sacred records, and especially in our own. “That this can be done,” says the founder of modern rationalism,† “without ever offending too much the literal sense of popular belief, arises from the circumstance, that long before the existence of this latter, the tendency to a moral religion lay hid in the reason of man; of which tendency, however, the *first rude manifestations* had reference only to external religious observances; and, for the furtherance of these, gave occasion also to *those professed revelations*: so that in this way, they imparted even to these *fictional productions* (Dichtungen), although unintentionally (!) ‘something of the character of their own spiritual origin.’”

The part which Kant thus assigned to theologians, as interpreters, by this proposal of an arbitrary interpretation in any sense which they might choose, under the pretence of interpreting according to pure reason, was certainly very difficult and hazardous; notwithstanding his assurance, that in undertaking it they need not fear to bring upon themselves any well grounded reproach of dishonesty. Nevertheless, Kant expressed also the hope, that this forced moral exegesis would no longer be necessary, when once the pure religion of reason should have

* P. 161.

† P. 160 f.

become generally diffused, and thus the kingdom of God, of which at least the principle is given us in Christianity,* should have come to us in a fuller sense. "It is a necessary consequence," he says,† "both of the physical and moral tendencies of our nature,—which last are the *foundation* as well as the *interpreter* of all religion,—that religion should at last be gradually freed from all empirical motives, from all ordinances which rest merely upon history for their support, and which, by means of an ecclesiastical faith, unite men for the time for the promotion of good; and that thus the religion of pure reason should come at last to rule over all, that so *God may be all in all*.—The envelopes in which the embryo is first formed into man, must be thrown off, when he is now about to enter upon the light of day. The leading-strings of holy tradition, with their appendages of statues and observances, which did good service in their time, become by degrees no longer indispensable; yea, they become at length shackles, when the infant grows up into youth. *So long as he* (mankind) *was a child, he was wise as a child*; and was able to connect with ordinances, which were laid upon him without his knowledge or assent, a degree of learning and even of philosophy, that was useful to the church; *but now that he is a man, he puts away childish things*. The degrading distinction between laity and clergy ceases, and equality springs up out of true liberty. Yet all this takes place without anarchy; for every one yields obedience to the (not prescribed) law *which he imposes on himself*; a law which he must nevertheless regard as a revelation to him, through his reason, of the will of the Ruler of the universe, who in this way unites, in an invisible manner, all those under a common government into one community, which before was but meagerly represented and introduced by the visible church."

Kant could hardly have expressed more clearly the fact, that to himself all that is called revelation was so *only in name*; something unreal and imaginary, the result of fortunate accident; and that he considered human reason as the exclusive source of all religion, just as much as the most decided rationalists of an earlier age. It follows naturally, that to him the Holy Scriptures were *holy* in no other sense than were the Koran and the sacred books of other oriental nations; and that he could assign to the Scriptures a rank above these, only so far as the

* P. 181.

† P. 179 f.

former coincide more with the supposed precepts of a pure moral religion, than the latter.* He censured in former naturalists (few of whom however are more affected by this reproach than himself) only the *injudicious* rejection of the Holy Scriptures, the offensive *public* opposition to a belief founded on revelation, and the *unseasonable* subversion of the wholesome institutions of the church. In so far as they exposed themselves to these charges, he would distinguish them, as naturalists, from the rationalists; who indeed hold essentially the same views, but seek to promote the higher development of man, and the universal prevalence of natural religion, through a skilful use of sacred precepts, narratives, and institutes, which have come down through a course of venerated tradition.

The currency which these views and proposals obtained, is well known; although many even among the theologians were not inclined to adopt Kant's moderation, nor his distinction between naturalism and rationalism; which indeed related merely to the form. Dr Röhr in particular, in his "Letters on Rationalism," rejected this distinction as arbitrary and groundless; and declared plainly, that as the advocate of rationalism, he acknowledged Herbert of Cherbury and his friends and followers as his own predecessors.† In accordance with this, he also says:‡ "With the rationalist it is *reason alone* that decides in matters of faith, and in the adoption of religious doctrines.—THE SCRIPTURES ARE TO HIM NOTHING MORE THAN ANY OTHER HUMAN BOOK. He allows their authority, only where they coincide with his own convictions; and that not as the determining ground of those convictions, for these he regards as true on their own grounds of reason; but simply as an *illustration*, that others also, wise men of former times, have thought and believed in the same manner.—The rationalist considers the assumption of a direct and supernatural revelation as *INADMISSIBLE AND GROUNDLESS*.—He sees in the Scriptures nothing more than a human book, in which noble and wise men of former times have laid up, entirely in the ordinary manner, the results of their reflection and investigation upon the truths of religion."

These and other views, more or less kindred to those of Kant, which occasioned an essential change in the modes of re-

* Comp. p. 153 f.

† E. g. p. 12, 13, 39 and often. ‡ Ibid. p. 15 and often.

ligious thinking and in theological pursuits, naturally exercised also an influence upon exegesis; and indeed an influence of different kinds. With some of our theologians, through a want of the requisite interest in the doctrinal precepts of the Bible, the interpretation of the Scriptures assumed a character almost entirely historical and archaeological; with others, it became altogether grammatical; others still, who were swayed by a philosophic-dogmatical interest, allowed themselves an incredible arbitrariness, in order to explain away unpleasant doctrines out of the text. On the other hand, however, exegesis became less constrained; because a holy awe, which had circumscribed former interpreters and critics more than was necessary, no longer hindered them from departing from the received interpretations of particular passages, or from adopting different views in respect to whole books.

But for some time past, the natural and necessary effects and consequences of rationalism, as long ago foreseen by evangelical theologians, have manifested themselves in such a way, that many, even of the most decided friends of that system, have proved more or less unfaithful to its fundamental maxim, that *human reason is the first and last principle of all true religion*; and have again recognized the principle of the evangelical church, viz. 1) That Christianity is really derived from an extraordinary divine revelation; and 2) That this revelation, presented to us in authentic sacred records, is the source of all our knowledge respecting our religion; and is such, by means of free investigation and interpretation.*

* Even Dr Röhr has several times recently, at least in words, declared again for the evangelical principle; and has thus far given up his former opinions. E. g. in a *Gegenerklärung* in the *Allg. K. Zeitung* No. 39, for March 8, 1829, he requests M. Justus, and all those who judge like him, to observe, that "Christian rationalism (a) does not deny the fact of an *extraordinary revelation from God* in the Holy Scriptures; but only the irregular, i. e. miraculous mode (by inspiration) in which it was effected; that (b) it does not, in respect to finding and pursuing the way to eternal bliss, refer man to his own reason, as the source of the highest ideas and truths; but only claims for him the right, and imposes on him the duty, of sifting and proving that which the Christian revelation makes known on this subject, by comparison with the religious ideas and principles of human reason; in order that in the concerns of his eternal salvation, he may shew himself to be

If now it be one of the chief problems of a scientific, evangelical theologian, to ascertain for himself, and to prove to others, that the primitive, and consequently scriptural form of Christianity corresponds to the laws and to the wants of the human mind, and is therefore true and a source of good; it is then, consequently, and will ever remain his first object, to become acquainted with the original and simple form and character of Christianity, unadulterated by foreign additions, and not disguised by arbitrary alterations and corruptions. This object can only be attained by **THE RIGHT INTERPRETATION OF THE AUTHENTIC RECORDS.** Hence the question becomes so important: Which of the different modes of interpretation that are followed, and which of the hermeneutical theories that have been set up, is the right one? Accordingly, this question has of late, when so many are returning to the principle of the evangelical church, been brought forward in various quarters; but has nevertheless, contrary to what one would expect, been answered in several different ways.

The writer of this essay does not suppose, that in the following pages he has deeply enough weighed this important question in all its bearings, nor that he has satisfactorily answered it in its full extent. He entreats the reader rather to consider these thoughts, in which he hopes very many will again recognize their own, only as a preliminary attempt to answer this question.*

If now we ask, among all the modes of interpretation that have been proposed and practised, which is the right one? the general answer can surely be no other than this: That the right interpretation is that one, *which deduces from the Holy Scriptures the very sense which the writers of them intended to convey.*†

neither blind nor—credulous.”—The evangelical church, in opposition to the Roman catholic, has always required *fidem explicitam*, and not *fidem implicitam et coecam*. This requisition, therefore, does not originate with rationalism; but it is an old *evangelical* one, as well as in itself *rational*.

* The principal thoughts in the following pages, and the literature that belongs here, may also be found in the author's *Lehrbuch der christl. Glaubens*, § 28. p. 146—152.

† This definition is expressed in the original with a peculiar felicity, which cannot be given in English: “*Dass diejenige Erklärung die richtige sey, durch welche der von ihren Verfassern in die heiligen Schriften gelegten Sinn ausgelegt wird.*”

But the *sense* is the thought, or the sum of the thoughts, which one will express by his words. To *understand* a writing, therefore, is to connect with the words of it, the thoughts which the writer wished to designate by them; and to *interpret* a writing, is to exhibit, in a perspicuous manner, the thoughts which the author connected with his words, and intended to express by them.

I. Characteristics of a correct Theory of Interpretation.

1. Such an interpretation as that above described, can only take place, when we understand the *language* of the writer, i. e. not only the language generally in which his work is composed, e. g. the Greek, but especially the *dialect* in which he wrote, e. g. the Hellenistic; and if possible also the *style* peculiar to him, e. g. that of Paul, John, etc. We must also have reference to the internal and external circumstances and relations, in which he was placed; to his mental character and education, as known from his history or deducible from circumstances; to the *manners and customs*, and to the opinions of the people or community to which he belonged. In this way we arrive at the *grammatico-historical sense*. This is what we must look for, in explaining the Holy Scriptures, as well as other books; and the more certain and perfect our knowledge of the language and of the particular idiom, and the more full the historical accounts, an acquaintance with which is presupposed by the writings or passages to be explained, so much the more sure is the interpretation.

2. These general remarks serve to render apparent the importance and necessity of another hermeneutical canon, for determining the true sense in each particular passage, viz. the canon which is founded on the assumption, *that every writer best explains himself, and that no intelligent writer will, as such, be inconsistent with himself*. This canon, in the hermeneutics of the New Testament, has often been called the *analogy of faith*; more correctly, the *analogy of the Holy Scriptures*. It is the relations of the various declarations of the Holy Scriptures to one another; according to which, no real and essential contradiction can have place in them; while, on the contrary, they illustrate and supply each other. Thus the more obscure passages receive light from those that are clearer and generally intelligible; the metaphorical from those that are literal and without metaphor. It is also said: *Scriptura Scripturae interpres*.

3. Since the writings of whose interpretation we are here speaking, are *holy* writings, i. e. composed by men of holy minds and lives; and since they profess to contain a divine revelation, respecting truth and the means of becoming truly good and happy; we must, in order to be or to become capable of fully understanding them, come to the reading of the Holy Scriptures with a *holy feeling*, or with a heart open and longing for all that is good and true and divine. Then will the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures reveal themselves to us. In the contrary case, or if we are already prejudiced against them, although they contain the word of God, they will yet address us in language to us unintelligible and without effect. Indeed it cannot be otherwise, even considered philologically. In order to understand and fully to enjoy the poets, and consequently in order to explain them, a poetical feeling is requisite, which shall be capable of following out the vast variety of the poet's creations, and of accompanying the flights of his fancy. Whoever will understand the works of a profound philosopher, must have inclination and capacity to trace the course of his ideas, and penetrate the depths of his investigations. In like manner, there is every where required for the understanding of a writer a kindred spirit, qualified by preparation. Just so a holy feeling is requisite for the understanding of the Holy Scriptures. In acknowledgement of this truth, therefore, our older interpreters required, in an entirely correct sense, that the Scriptures should be explained *in* or *cum Spiritu sancto*, and that no one should enter upon the reading of them without prayer.*

This theory of interpretation is (1) in its principles applied to all writings in the world; they must be explained in accordance with the usage of language, with the history of their time, and with their internal connexion and spirit; and (2) this theory alone affords a certainty of rightly understanding a work, because it is exercised according to certain rules, that are clear and of easy application. This holds true of no other mode of interpretation.

* Even Origen, in his time, wrote to his pupil Gregory, that in addition to other learned helps, prayer was the most necessary: *ἀναγκαιοτάτη γὰρ καὶ ἡ περὶ τοῦ νοεῖν τὰ θεῖα εὐχή*. Declarations of later evangelical divines, see in the *Lehrbuch des christl. Glaubens* p. 146 f.

II. Other modes of Interpretation.

All modes of interpretation besides the grammatico-historical, are either exercised in a *spirit* foreign to the Scriptures; or under the influence of a *material* principle,* in like manner more or less foreign to them.

In the first case, when the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures takes place in a *spirit* foreign to them,—a spirit therefore not holy, and consequently *profane*,—the Scriptures are not explained nor interpreted, but *travestied*; and the result of such an interpretation of the Gospels is, e. g. a life of Jesus, such as has lately been given to the world by Dr. Paulus.

In the other case, when the interpretation takes place under the influence of a *material* principle foreign to the Scriptures, their true sense is distorted or corrupted.

This material principle may be of different kinds, viz.

a) An *historical* or *traditional* element; e. g. some symbolical or dogmatic system,—a circle of doctrines, definite and exclusive as to both matter and form, which are alone regarded as the pure biblical doctrines—consequently a *traditio dogmatica*, which now becomes a criterion for the possible results of interpretation, and is therefore at the same time *hermeneutica*. Or this element may be a subjective partial mode of conceiving the biblical doctrines, which one already brings with him to the reading and interpretation of Scripture, and according to which the sense of the Scriptures must be modified, abridged, or enlarged. Now instead of this, if it be an object to obtain a pure and evangelical system of doctrines, corresponding to the principle of the church, the opposite course ought to be pursued; and the system or the tradition purified, and its deficiencies supplied, by means of the true original sense of revelation, to be ascertained by free and impartial interpretation, in the manner above pointed out.—This *historical*, *ecclesiastical*, or *dogmatical* interpretation can also assume a *critical* character, viz. when all that does not coincide with the *regula fidei*, (the material principle,) and yet is undeniably contained in the holy records by the fair rules of grammatico-historical exegesis, is nevertheless, according to certain assumed principles, set aside as not essential, and is thrown out as being e. g. something local, temporary, symbolical, or mythological; as something, in short, merely accessory

* This term is here employed simply in opposition to *spirit*.

and external.*—The historico-dogmatical interpretation in its strict and narrower sense, proceeds upon the assumption, that certain individuals or bodies of men (e. g. the Fathers at Trent, or Luther and Calvin with their assistants, or the authors of creeds and confessions, when they, as such, are held to be infallible) have already fully and completely understood and explained the contents of the Holy Scriptures. And now this received mode of understanding and interpreting Scripture, which must ever be partial, and certainly does not exhaust the subject, is employed to determine what the Scriptures in general *can* mean, *traditio s. regula fidei Scripturae interpretis*.—The friends of the historico-critical interpretation in the proper sense, also, do not admit all that the Holy Scriptures contain according to grammatico-historical exegesis; but the Scriptures serve to confirm to them so much only as they please, i. e. so much as can be united with their subjective conceptions of the essence of Christianity. In general, these interpreters are guided by some philosophical system or other, according to which they have more or less altered their *regula fidei*. Nevertheless, the material principle by which they are directed, is at least still made up of biblical elements; although a wide departure may already have taken place, through the influence of some system of contemporary philosophy.

b) On the other hand, the material principle thus brought to the interpretation of the Scriptures, may be also a purely *philosophical* one, either subjective or objective, i. e. it may be either a philosophical system of one's own, or adopted from another; *philosophia sacrae Scripturae interpretis*. The character of this interpretation is, as to form, the same with that above described; † except that here the Holy Scriptures are not made to conform to a received dogmatical or symbolic system, but to some philosophical scheme or to the ideas of some thinker,—to some subjective *ratio* or other,—which schemes or ideas are by preference held to be the true ones, and which therefore can alone

* See *Bretschneider*, Die historisch-dogmatische Auslegung des N. T. Leipz. 1806.—De Wette prefers to call it *historico-critical*, and declares himself a follower of it in his *Biblische Theologie*, § 57 ff.

† It is often difficult to determine, whether such an interpretation is more historical or philosophical.

be contained in Scripture, provided the Scripture contains the truth. This philosophical, or, as it is also called, *rational* interpretation, which was already practised in the schools of the Socinians and Cartesians,* has been often termed, since the middle of the last century, the *liberal* interpretation; because in homage to the philosophy of the time, it has relaxed so much from the strictness of the biblical doctrines, as the spirit of the age demanded. This so-called philosophical exegesis has made its appearance in the greatest variety of shapes and modifications, according to the change of systems and of the spirit of the age. Its most striking form was that of *moral* interpretation. This was recommended by Kant, in the passages quoted at the beginning of this essay, and in various other parts of his "Religion within the bounds of Reason." His fundamental idea was the following: So long as mankind shall not be ripe enough to receive the precepts of a purely moral religion, which Kant deduced from the mere postulates of practical reason; so long as they cannot do without the authority of a supposed divine revelation, and of a church regarded as holy by the multitude; so long must the doctrines of the Scriptures and of the church, and the facts of sacred history, not be contested as untrue and unfounded, not even so far as they are so in reality; but they must be so explained away, without reference to the real meaning of the sacred writers, or of the ancient teachers of the church, as to have the sense of them coincide, in the greatest possible degree, with the religion of pure reason.—In this manner interpreters deduced from the Scriptures, not the sense of the sacred writers, but the ideas of Kant; which, indeed, they first had to *put into*, or, to speak more correctly, to *connect* in some way or other with the biblical text—to *imply* and to *apply*. And so it is with every so-called philosophical interpretation. They all extract from the Scriptures, or rather they *imply* in the words of Scripture, those opinions or ideas which the interpreter already brings with him to the work. Cartesians, the followers of Spinoza, Kant, Schelling, Fichte, Hegel,—or whatever they are called, or whatever they may be,—all found and find in the Scriptures the sense of *their masters*, but not the sense of

* See *J. F. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, 1727. p. 1794 sqq. *J. Jac. Rambach*, *Erläuterungen üb. s. eigenen Institut. herm.* 1738. p. 323 ff. See also the author's *Commentatio hist. theol. de Rationalismi vera indole*, p. 47 seqq. 56 seqq.

Christ and his apostles. Such interpretation can therefore not properly be called *explication*.

c) Kindred to these modes of interpretation, and often not at all distinguished from them in its form, as well as in its results, is the *allegorical* interpretation. As this mode of exegesis has been again revived in our day, and employed by some very learned and intelligent men, I may be permitted to make here some remarks on the nature and origin of it, and assign some reasons why it ought not to be adopted in practice.*

(1) As to its *nature*. The allegorical interpretation adopts, as its fundamental principle, the idea, that certain words, besides their natural (grammatico-historical) sense, have also another meaning, *ἄλλα ἀγορεύειν*—*ἕτερα, ἃν λέγουσι, σημαίνειν*. Those interpreters who have applied this method to the Holy Scriptures, have either assumed, that every passage *besides* the literal (grammatico-historical) sense, contains also a hidden (spiritual, higher, deeper) sense, or even several senses; or they assumed,—which however is not essentially different,—“that the Scriptures have indeed no other sense *besides* the simple literal meaning, but they have another deeper sense *under* the literal one; i. e. an obvious and literal sense of the words, and a deeper significancy of this literal sense, *ὑπόνοια*,”—according to Olshausen. Both these classes of allegorical interpreters, who may be again subdivided into very many under-classes according to the various modifications of their opinions, accord in the belief that the Holy Spirit, which filled the sacred writers, so guided their words or representations, as that these should have *two* or even more senses.†

* For the literature of this subject, see the author's *Lehrbuch des christl. Glaubens*, p. 148 ff.

† In this respect, the allegorical class of interpreters are distinguished essentially from the philosophical or rationalist class; since the latter do not inquire after the meaning of the sacred writers, but only after what their own system recognizes as valid; and thus with little or no regard for the grammatico-historical sense, they only seek to attach their own opinions to the words of Scripture. These two methods, however, have often been confounded. And it is true, that allegorical interpreters among the Greeks and Romans, as also among the orientals, with the exception of the ancient Jewish and Christian expositors, (who deduced the double sense from inspiration,) were nothing else than philo-

(2) As to its *origin*, the allegorical interpretation is the offspring of a mental departure from the faith of one's ancestors, and of the community to which one belongs; arising sometimes from a really higher cultivation of mind, as in the case of Plato and other Greek philosophers, and sometimes from wrong education and prejudice; but occasioning a difference, which one wishes either to conceal, or to excuse and render venerated. This is obvious in regard to the allegorical interpreters, both among the heathen and the Jews. The Greek philosophers explained their mythological and other fables, in which the people believed, but to which they themselves could at least no longer attach entire credit, allegorically or spiritually; in order that while they thus retained their own really or supposed better views and opinions, they might avoid offending too harshly and publicly the popular belief. Just so the Jewish philosophers, theosophists, and Pharisees, who had an interest in finding and pointing out in the Scriptures their own opinions, imaginations, and ordinances, which according to the grammatico-historical interpretation were not to be found there. In others, of whom we know that they had the most implicit faith in the simple contents of the Bible, there is not a trace of allegorical nor spiritual interpretation to be found.

With some, moreover, the want of proper insight into the nature and connexion of divine revelation, compelled them to take refuge in this method of explanation, especially in disputes with the adversaries of revelation; inasmuch as this method renders it easy, particularly for adroit, sagacious, and fanciful minds, under the appearance of truth and right, to remove from the Scriptures every thing offensive, as well as to understand in them all that one pleases. So especially the Alexandrine Jew Philo.* The very same thing we find again in the Christian church. Catholics, theosophists, and mystics in general, the scholastic orthodox, secret rationalists,—in one word all those follow by preference the allegorical method, who wish to find and

sophical interpreters. Hence also Kant, in justification of his so called moral interpretation, appeals to them as precedents. See his work above quoted, p. 158. See also above, p. 119, "It will also be found," etc.

* Compare *H. Planck*, *Commentatio de principiis et causis interpretationis Philonianaæ allegoricae*. Goett. 1806.

point out in the Bible their own *extra-biblical* or *contra-biblical* opinions. Besides, among Christian interpreters of this species, there is also another and nobler motive for seeking allegories in the Old Testament at least, viz. the opinion that the New Testament is already contained in the Old, but under a veil. And although this idea is repelled by the Old Testament (e. g. Jer. 31: 31 ff.) as well as by the New; yet because so much is true, that the former announced and prepared the way for the latter, these interpreters do not scruple to employ the allegorical interpretation, by means of which they are able to find their own preconceived notions in the writings of the ancient covenant.*

(3) That the allegorical is not an *admissible* method of interpretation may be gathered from the preceding remarks. It is, however, also to be rejected on other grounds.

* This too favourable view of the Old Testament is doubtless the motive, which has reconciled the writer's learned and respected friend Olshausen with the allegorical interpretation.—Many, however, go still farther than he, and suppose that the doctrines, which are usually regarded as peculiar to Christianity, e. g. the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, are to be found in the Old Testament (if we can only seize its spiritual sense) far more clearly and extensively, than even in the New.—But this is essentially the same thing that was censured by Isidorus of Pelusium in many of his contemporaries; who, believing that they must find Christ every where in the Old Testament, rendered in this way the real prophecies concerning him suspicious to the heathen and to heretics; only, that they did not always do this by allegorical interpretation, but often by other arbitrary explanations. In his *Epp.* lib. II. cap. 195, he says: *Ὅτι πᾶσαν τὴν παλαιὰν διαθήκην εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν μεταφέρειν πειρώμενοι, οὐκ ἔξω αἰτιάσεως εἰσιν, ἐπέπερ καὶ Ἕλλησι καὶ τοῖς μὴ ἔγκρινονσιν αὐτὴν Αἰρετικοῖς ἰσχυρὴν ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμῶν διδασκίᾳ μάχη. Τὰ γὰρ μὴ εἰς αὐτὸν εἰρημένα ἐκ βίαζομενοι καὶ τὰ ἀβιαστῶς εἰρημένα ὑποπτεύεσθαι παρασκευάζουσι. Δι' ὧν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι αὐτοὺς ἀνατρέπουσι ὡς παραποιούντας, διὰ τοῦτων καὶ ἐν τοῖς διαρρήδην περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρημένοις νικᾶν νομίζονται.* "Those who attempt to refer the whole Old Testament to Christ, deserve censure; since they give to the Greeks and to the heretics, who do not admit it, an advantage in the contest against us. For by straining those things which are *not* said of him, they render suspected those things which really do refer to him. And thus the adversaries, having vanquished them as perverters of Scripture, suppose themselves victorious also in respect to what is clearly spoken of Christ.

(a) *It is not recommended in the Scriptures themselves.* In the *Homologoumena* of the New Testament, there is to be found only one instance of this method of interpretation, viz. Gal. 4: 22 ff. and here, according to the previous intimation of the apostle himself, it is a formal accommodation; in which shape it often is and may be applied in popular writing and discourse. In v. 19 ff. he says: *Τεκνία μου, ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι καὶ ἀλλὰ ἄξιαι τὴν φωνήν μου· ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν. Λίγετε μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;* ‘Gladly were I now with you, my children, and would speak with each one of you in particular, according to his special wants, consequently, with each one differently, in order to convince each of you after his own opinions and prejudices, that this union of Judaism with Christianity is to be rejected, and to retain him in the confession of pure Christianity, which alone makes free; comp. 9: 19 ff. For I am hesitating in respect to you; i. e. doubtful how I shall rightly address you.—But ye now, who would gladly retain the yoke of Judaism, (and how the Judaizing teachers and their Rabbins allegorised is well known,) tell me, do ye not then understand the law? I will explain it then to you—*ἀλλάξας τὴν φωνήν*—in your own way; in order thus to convince you, that the emancipated Christian should no longer bear the yoke of the Mosaic law; *γέγραπται γάρ*—’ and now follows a rabbinical interpretation in their own taste.—According to this mode of viewing the connexion of the passage, and after the express intimation of the apostle, that he was about to speak *ἄλλως otherwise* than he had been accustomed to do, and that he would gladly enter into their views and wants, in order to convince them at all events of the correctness of his teaching, this passage can surely not be brought forward to exhibit or to justify the application of allegorical interpretation to the whole of the Scriptures, as being of apostolical authority.

In all the other passages, which the friends of allegorical interpretation have cited in favour of it, (leaving here the *Antilegomena* out of view, on the ground that they alone could not decide the question,) we find either simply *metaphorical* or *symbolical* applications of earlier biblical passages, doctrines, ordinances, and narratives; or *disclosures and explanations in the New Testament of the revelations and events of the Old Testament*, according to their *true and proper* sense, ground, essence, and object. E. g. 1 Cor. x. where we are taught, that the *Jehovah*, who according to the Old Testament led the people of

Israel in the desert, and gave them food and water, was the *Son of God*; an explanation which also accords well with the general contents of the Old Testament, and especially with Jer. 23: 5 f. 33: 15 f. comp. Mich. 5: 1 f. Is. 9: 5 f. and other passages.

It is often the case, moreover, that the so-called spiritual, deeper, or higher sense of the allegorical interpreters, is nothing more than the real and proper sense, and the assumption of a double or threefold sense rests entirely on misapprehension. The true and proper sense is that which God intended in his revelation; and this sense can then be first and fully understood, when the higher communications which the sacred writers have expressed in words, whether they be doctrines, or commandments, or external ceremonial ordinances, are comprehended in their grounds and objects. If, for instance, the worldly minded are required to obey certain laws, with the promise that in so doing, it shall go well with them on earth; they surely would think merely of a physical and civil prosperity, and would perhaps for the sake of it, at least for a time, yield the required obedience. But this is by no means half the meaning of that requisition and promise; which referred at the same time, and chiefly, to an internal spiritual well being. In the commands, *Thou shalt not kill*, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, persons in a low stage of moral and spiritual attainment, think only of a destruction of physical life and gross breaches of chastity; although the divine command in its *full* sense, forbids in the one case every disturbance of the internal spiritual life of love; and in the other, all unchaste desires of the heart, although never uttered and never perceptible to man; comp. Matt. 4: 21—33. To understand, then, the true and proper sense of the words, is *to think of all that God intended in them*; and this proper and complete understanding of the revelations and institutions of the Old Testament, it was the object of Christ to make known; as well as fully to establish the kingdom of God, the foundation and plan of which are contained in the Old Testament; see Matt. 5: 17—19.—But from all this it is clear, that a double or manifold sense, a literal (grammatico-historical) and spiritual meaning at the same time, is out of the question; and that there can be only one, true, proper sense, which becomes the more fully and clearly manifest, the farther we advance in the higher spiritual life. Hence also, many of the pious and distinguished men under the old dispensation, approached in some degree the more perfect comprehension which ex-

ists under the new, although no one reached it fully; see Luke 7: 26—28. comp. Matt. 11: 9—13.*

* The question here, as has been already remarked, does not refer simply to *verbal* revelations of the Old Testament, whose full and proper import was for the most part first rightly apprehended under the New Testament dispensation, and was in part intended to be then first understood; but it refers also to Old Testament *institutions* and *appearances*, which in like manner first attained their proper object and full significancy under the New Testament, with which they ceased, or were to cease. This leads to the proper conception of *types*, which are no doubt found in the Old Testament.

In the stricter sense, types were institutions and appearances intended to deepen, expand, and ennoble the circle of thoughts and desires, and thus to heighten the moral and spiritual wants, as well as the intelligence and susceptibility, of the chosen people. This was done in order that there might ultimately be formed out of this particular nation, separated from all others by peculiar bounds, a people which should serve as a model for other nations, and who, after the future removal of the restraints in which they were trained,—which were to preserve them, till the time of fullness and ripeness, from the seductive intercourse of heathen tribes,—should be in the great family of nations as the *first born son of God*, (Ex. 4: 22. Hos. 11: 1.) already grown up and educated, a light to their heathen brethren, who yet stood and stand upon the various steps of pupilage, though some higher than others. Thus the *temple* with its sanctuaries and halls was a type, as being an image of the universe; and its arrangement served to declare to those who thought and reflected, that the whole world should be and become a temple of God; comp. Eph. 2: 17—22. Col. 2: 16—21. Matt. 27: 51. and Heb. 9: 11 ff. 10: 20. Its different courts for the reception of those who were more or less or not at all consecrated, pointed still more directly to this sentiment. So all the *sacrifices*, which at first were permitted, and then ordered and accurately assigned by God himself, were the expression and sustenance of the deep desire and necessity felt by the human heart, partly to thank the invisible Giver in some expressive manner for his benefits, and partly and especially, in the consciousness and excited feeling of his lost favour, to become again reconciled to him. Nevertheless, such sacrifices in their very nature can have such significancy only for an unripe age; since the blood of beasts cannot really purify and pacify the conscience, nor reconcile it with God. These sacrifices, then, led and pointed to the time of the New Testament, where the certainty of the divine

Most of the passages which the supporters of the allegorical method of interpretation cite in its favour, contain *metaphorical*

favour would be attained through the sacrificial death of the Messiah, (Is. 53: 4.) and where the true and reasonable worship of God would consist in the right knowledge of God, and in the devotion of the heart to him,—in the sacrifice of humanity, penitence, and holy, undivided love; Jer. 31. 31—34. Hos. 6: 6. Ps. 51: 19. comp. Rom. 12: 1. Heb. 9: 8—14. Above all, the great thank-offering of Israel for the deliverance out of Egyptian bondage,—without which the chosen race must have failed of its destination,—pointed to that sacrifice of the New Testament, which made an end of all external sacrifices to those who believe, and opened a way of approach to the holiest sanctuary of God's paternal heart, not only to the children of Israel, but to all his children of the whole human race. And thus we see the spotless paschal lamb, as a type of the spotless suffering Redeemer, the *Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world*; Is. 53: 7. John 1: 29. (19: 36.) 1 Cor. 5: 7. f. 1 Pet. 1: 19.—As a similar type, we are taught by Christ himself to consider the *brazen serpent* (John 3: 14.) which Moses raised up in the wilderness at the command of God, with the *immediate* object of delivering the Israelites from the danger of physical death; in order thereby to excite to the offering up of the heart to God, in sincere faith and more willing and perfect obedience; Num. 21: 8 f.

In a broader sense, *persons* of the Old Testament are also said to be types and figures of Christ or of his church, on account of some certain similarity or relation which subsists between them. Thus *Adam* is called, Rom. 5: 14, *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, the *figure of him that was to come*, the second Adam, i. e. the Messiah, (comp. 1 Cor. 15: 45 f. with v. 21 ff.) inasmuch as from the one, destined of God to be the father of blissful life to his posterity, there spread over all a moral corruption and a train of physical evils, whose end is death; while through the other, destined of God to be the deliverer of the fallen race, there has been acquired for all his spiritual posterity, i. e. all who believe on him, redemption and a life of eternal bliss.—The resemblance is less striking, on account of which some have held *Isaac* to be a type of Christ, (because of Heb. 11: 19, where the exegesis is still doubtful,) in so far as by the purposed sacrifice of him (Gen. xxii.) and his subsequent deliverance, the real sacrificial death and resurrection of Christ were prefigured, through which the promise given to Isaac and his father Abraham, was to be fulfilled; Gen. xvii. xviii.—So *Melchisedek*, as a type of Christ, is regarded as king of righteousness and peace; Ps. 110: 4. comp. Heb. 5: 6. 6:

or *symbolical* applications of earlier biblical declarations, institutions, and narratives. We find the same thing also, in almost all works in every language. Every man thinks in the forms of his own peculiar mode of observation, education, history, and occupation; these become to him types and symbols to designate his other thoughts. Warriors, shepherds, fishermen—all choose the pictures of their thoughts out of the circle of their experience. It was then natural, that the sacred writers also should express their thoughts, their hopes, their fears, their joy and sorrow, in forms of language borrowed from the circle of *their* experience—in the words and figures of earlier holy writ. The rite of *circumcision* consecrated the male children and all adults whom the Israelites wished to incorporate with themselves, to God, and separated them from the nations that were unclean. It was natural, therefore, that those who acknowledged, that this external rite could not in itself and by itself make any one a real member of the people of God, should call the true inward consecration, *circumcision of the heart*, or of the *foreskin of the heart*; Deut. 10: 16. 30: 6. Jer. 4: 4. Rom. 2: 28. Col. 2: 11. Similar metaphors occur very often; e. g. Ez. 11: 19. Jer. 31: 33. Is. 1: 10. comp. Matt. 24: 38 ff. Luke 17: 26 ff.—Matt. 13: 35. comp. Ps. 78: 2, 3.—Mark 9: 49. John 6: 49 ff. Eph. 5: 29 ff. 1 Pet. 2: 9.—Of the same general class, although of a different species, are the passages where peculiarities in the history of Israel, conceived as an individual person, or also of particular persons in the Old Testament, are applied to Christ, or to persons or events in the New Testament; e. g. Matt. 2: 15 *Out of Egypt have I called my Son*, compared with Ex. 4: 22. Hos. 11: 1.—Matt.

20: 7: 1 ff. and often. And because *David* was the most distinguished champion and statesman of God in the Old Testament kingdom; so therefore Christ—who was to descend from him, and should, as king of truth and peace extend God's kingdom on earth even to its remotest bounds (Is. 9: 1—6. 11: 1 ff. and elsewhere)—is often called of God *my servant David*, and is represented as sitting on David's throne; comp. Hos. 3: 5. Ez. 34: 23 ff. 37: 24 f. Luke 1: 32 f. In like manner in this broader (metaphorical) sense, all pious persons of the Old Testament, so far as *single traits* of the character of the true children of God were observable in them, may be called figures or types of the Son of God, in whom alone the divine life was manifested in *all* its fulness and glory.

2: 18. comp. Jer. 31: 15. (Gen. 37: 35.)—Matt. 2: 23. comp. Gen. 49: 26. (Is. 11: 1. comp. Jer. 23: 5. 33: 15.)—Matt. 12: 39 f. 16: 4. (John 2: 18 ff.) comp. Jonah 2: 1 ; and so a multitude of other passages.—Such appearances, the like of which are found in the writings of every nation, cannot surely justify the assumption of a double or manifold sense, intended by the Holy Spirit at the moment of inspiration.

(β) The allegorical interpretation, which grounds itself on such an assumption, is further not to be admitted, because there are *no clear and certain laws* by which it must be practised. The Holy Scriptures must, in this manner, become a prey to the subjective caprice of interpreters, who, being as they suppose at a higher stage of attainment, do not hold themselves bound to render any other account for their often fanciful and ingenious interpretations, than to admonish their opposers, that they must make further advances in the divine life, until they become able to look into the deeper sense and connexion of the revealed word. And since such admonitions may be expressed in words which have a very good sense, and one which all would approve, viz. that he, to whom the inner, deeper, holy life of the men of God is unknown, is also of course incapable of rightly understanding their language and writings ; it is therefore very difficult effectually to come at those, who favour this mode of proceeding.

(γ) This method moreover is *entirely superfluous* ; which alone is reason enough against it. It can give throughout no new and tenable results, which the grammatico-historical method, when exercised in a pious spirit, does not give. For since the Scriptures themselves authorize us to hold the Christian revelation as *closed*, (Gal. 1: 8 f. Rom. 16: 17. 1 Tim. 6: 3 ff. 2 Tim. 1: 13 f. and elsewhere,) the apprehension must ever remain, that everything professedly *new*, which an allegorical interpretation may derive from the Scriptures, and which is not clearly contained in the words and in the connexion,—and consequently known or knowable by grammatico-historical exposition,—must be merely human imagination, be it ever so well meant. And this just apprehension should restrain every judicious evangelical Christian and theologian, from adopting any such results as doctrines of divine revelation ; Rom. 16: 17. Col. 2: 18. 1 Tim. 6: 4 ff. comp. 2 Thess. 2: 2.

ART. IV. REMARKS ON HAHN'S DEFINITION OF INTERPRETATION, AND SOME TOPICS CONNECTED WITH IT.

By M. Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

It would be difficult, within the same space, to express in a plainer and better manner than Prof. Hahn has done, the correct, and only correct idea of genuine interpretation.* *To interpret* an author must mean, to give that sense to his words which he himself gave. To connect those ideas with an author's language which he himself connected, is the *first* step toward a real interpretation of him ; the *second* is, to express the result of this in language that is intelligible to others. Whoever does both of these, may be considered as a true and adequate interpreter. Whoever does either of them in a defective manner, has come short of the real design of all genuine interpretation.

From this simple and intelligible statement it follows, that all accommodation of the Scriptures to our own preconceived notions of truth and propriety, unless indeed these entirely agree with those of the sacred writers, is foreign to the business of true interpretation. This concerns itself exclusively and solely with the sentiment of the writer to be interpreted. All the principles of language and criticism which it applies to exegesis, are only means which common sense has pointed out, as necessary and proper to be used in the explanation of any written or spoken language. Mankind have universally been interpreters, to a great extent, ever since our first progenitors commenced the use of language in paradise. All men interpret, every day, what is addressed to them by their fellow men. The laws of interpretation are a consequence of the practical, exegetical *instinct* (I had almost said) of the human race. I mean, that the *interpretation* of language is as natural to man, as the *use* of it is ; and that this is natural, is sufficiently proved by a possession of the faculty of speaking and by the universality of its use. The *laws* of interpretation are neither more nor less, as to all their substantial and most important parts, than the practical principles by which men have always been guided, in interpreting each other's language. Language was not formed by the rules of grammarians and critics ; but grammarians and critics, by study and observation, obtained a correct view of the phenomena of language, and then delineated this view in writing. It was thus that grammars and lexicons originated. And it is in the like

* See p. 124 above.

manner, that systems of hermeneutics, or systems in which the principles of interpretation are developed, have arisen. Men interpreted for thousands of years, before they began to form systems and written rules, in order to aid in the business of interpretation. When this was done, it was done by first observing the phenomena of interpretation, the facts that respected the manner in which men were accustomed to interpret language. These facts being ascertained, the principles on which they were grounded, or from which they resulted, were made out by consideration and reasoning, and then presented in words. Repeated experience and long continued observation corrected, enlarged, amended, and reduced to more perfect order these rules; so that at last, like regular systems of science in other departments of learning, hermeneutics claim a place among the sciences of the learned.

The whole thing may be illustrated by an appeal to natural philosophy. The philosopher did not create or arrange or modify the laws of nature; nor was the world created, nor is it sustained, by any system of philosophy; but philosophers by observing phenomena, have deduced from them certain laws or principles which accord with these phenomena, and help us to comprehend and explain them. In this way, the systems of natural philosophy arose, which have at last come to a scientific form that is almost complete, in its essential parts.

It is so with the science of interpretation. It is, indeed, comparatively a new *science*, (not a new *practical* thing,) and is yet far from being perfected in all its minuter parts. Every ten years, however, is making some sensible progress towards a completion of the science, so far as its theory can be reduced to writing; and the hope may be rationally indulged, that at some future day, hermeneutics will be a science as definite and as well bounded and discriminated, as most other sciences which have long been taught as completed.

The design of these remarks is, to shew that the science of interpretation is not one which has its basis in imagination, or that it depends, as to its most important principles, on farfetched illustrations or recondite and obscure facts. The great excellence and certainty of this science is, that it is grounded in the experience of all nations and of all ages. In other words, it follows the laws which our very nature has prescribed, in the explanation of language; it does not make new ones.

If now principles such as nature prescribes, be regarded in

the interpretation of the sacred writers; if our sole aim be, (as surely it ought to be,) to find out and to develop the very same meaning which the writers themselves attached to their own words; and we endeavour to do this in the natural way already described; then we may act as *bona fide* interpreters. But this we cannot do, if we interpret in any other manner. If I bring along with me my philosophical creed, or my party theological creed, or my rationalist creed, or my convictions as an enthusiast, and in the explanation of Scripture permit either of these to influence or guide me, instead of the plain principles of exegesis which nature has taught all men in regard to the interpretation of language; then I do not make an *explication* of the sacred text, but an *implication*, (non explicatio sed implicatio,) i. e. I do not unfold to others what the sacred writers meant to say, and have actually said, but what I believed before I undertook to interpret them; I do not *deduce* from their words the sense which the writers gave to them; but I *superinduce* a sense which these writers never designed to convey. This is not to *bring a sense out* of the words of Scripture, i. e. it is not *explication*, but it is to *bring in* one upon it, or to add one to it, which is *implication*, in the Latin sense of this word.

On this subject Prof. Hahn himself has made remarks, in the course of his essay. I would call the attention of the reader, therefore, to some other important considerations, which connect themselves with the definition that this excellent writer has so truly given, of the *sense* of a writing and of the *interpretation* of it.

It would seem to be a necessary deduction from his definition, that the Scripture can never mean any more than what the writer of it meant to convey; that is, the words of Scripture convey the idea which the writer attached to them, and neither more nor less. If you deny this, you set aside the definition itself of the *meaning* of any writing. But as this definition is, one might almost say, self-evident; or at least, if it be questioned, a better one surely cannot be substituted in its place; so I must abide by it, and take the consequences which necessarily flow from it.

And what are these? *One* is, that the writer must have had some meaning in all that he uttered, i. e. he did not utter sounds without attaching ideas to them. *Another* is, that in interpreting his words, we must have reference simply to the times in which he lived and the views which he entertained, and not de-

duce our explanation from the present times, and the more perfect knowledge which may now exist.

I. The sacred writers attached some ideas to every word and phrase which they employed.

What are *words*? They are the signs of ideas. But of whose ideas? Surely of his who employs the words. If then words are the signs of ideas, and every word must be the sign of some idea in the mind of him who employs it, (I speak now, of course, of the rational, intelligent, sober use of language, and such must be that of the sacred writers,) then every word employed by a sacred writer, is the sign of some idea that was in his mind when he employed it, and is meant to designate that idea.

There is no avoiding this conclusion, except in one way only, viz. by denying that the sacred writers were themselves authors, in the usual sense of that word, or that they always understood, i. e. attached an intelligible idea to what they uttered. If we consider them as mere instruments in the hands of the Spirit of God, as a musical instrument is in the hands of him who plays upon it, and that they responded to the impulses of the Spirit in like manner as the musical instrument does to him who strikes its strings, then indeed it will not follow, that the sacred writers did attach ideas to all the words which they uttered.

But shall we so consider them? I am aware that this has often, perhaps I may say generally, been done. Nay, the advocates of this opinion may say, that they are pleading only for a most ancient tradition or belief; that even before the days of the apostles such an opinion was current among the Jews; that the apostles themselves have helped to confirm it; and that the early fathers, who received opinions from them, have in like manner taught it.

In all this there is some show of truth; and in fact some part of the allegations is strictly true. It is a clear case, that Philo Judaeus, for example, previous to the days in which the apostles wrote, fully declared a belief like that which has just been stated. "The prophets," says he, "are the interpreters [of God] whom he uses as instruments in disclosing what he pleases," Opp. I. p. 222 edit. Mangey. And again: "A prophet utters nothing at all of his own, but is an interpreter, merely uttering what another suggests; and so long as he is under the influence of inspiration, he has no proper consciousness of his own, for the power of thought departs and quits the

dwelling-place of the soul, and the divine Spirit comes into it and sojourns there, and influences all the organic powers of the voice, so that they will utter sounds which plainly reveal whatsoever he desires to foretell," Tom. II. p. 343. So in Tom. I. p. 510, "A prophet utters nothing of his own, but wholly that which belongs to another, and which he merely echoes from within;" and also in Tom. II. p. 417, "A prophet is an interpreter, echoing from within the words of God."

It must be acknowledged, that Philo's idea of inspiration goes so far as to destroy all the self-consciousness of the inspired writers, while they were under the special influence of the Spirit; and allowing this to be true, they are not to be reputed as the authors (in any proper sense of this word) of the Scriptures, but only as the *amanuenses* of the Spirit; which appellation, indeed, has very commonly been given to them.

It is unnecessary to adduce passages here from the early Christian fathers, in order to shew that many of them agreed, for substance, with this view of Philo respecting inspiration. I concede the point to those who insist on it; and turn to the New Testament, and ask whether the same view is there given also.

This is strongly affirmed by multitudes. It has been maintained almost in every age of the church, by many conspicuous and enlightened men. It is averred that such passages as the following fully support it; viz. 2 Tim. 3: 16, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God;" 2 Pet. 1: 21, "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

All this, however, proves nothing more, than that the sacred writers were under the influence of the Spirit of God; which they truly might be, and yet lose neither their own consciousness nor voluntary rational agency.

This has been conceded by the more argumentative part of the advocates for the Philonic idea of inspiration. But then they allege, that this does not reach the whole length of the case. They adduce another passage of Scripture, which serves, as they think, fully to shew that the inspired penmen did, at least sometimes, utter that which they did not understand; and consequently their words, in such cases, cannot be taken as the signs of ideas in their own minds, since by the very statement it appears, that they had no ideas which corresponded with the words. The passage alluded to is in 1 Pet. 1:

10—12, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow; unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you." This passage, it is alleged, declares that the prophets themselves were ignorant of the real import of what they uttered respecting the Saviour and the gospel-day, and that they made inquiry in order to understand it; just as others have done and must do, to whom their words appear dark or unintelligible.

I cannot turn aside from my present object, so far as to go into a detailed examination of this interpretation. I am fully satisfied that it is without foundation, and altogether incapable of being supported. I must content myself, however, with brief hints as to the ground of such a conviction. I observe, first, that no assertion is here made, that the prophets did not understand what they actually uttered; nor can any such deduction be fairly made from the text. It is asserted, that the prophets ἐξεζητήσαν καὶ ἐξηεὐρέσαν, *sought after and inquired into*—what? The next clause tells us, εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν, *at what time or what manner of season*, the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow, would be exhibited; these sufferings and glory themselves being revealed by the Spirit that testified in the prophets. That is, the Spirit of God discloses to them the future sufferings and glory of Christ. These they saw and believed; and being exceedingly affected by them, they were highly solicitous to know *when* or *during what kind of times*, these things should take place. It was, then, the *time when*, and the *manner of this time*, i. e. as we say familiarly in English, the *kind of times*, which they sought to know, and inquired after. So Peter expressly declares; ἐρευνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν.

Now if we compare the Old Testament prophecies respecting the Messiah with this, we find an entire correspondence. Most of them testify of the sufferings of Christ, or of the glory that should follow; yet few indeed speak with any definiteness of the *time*; or rather, I might say, few speak at all of the time, except that from their very nature the implication is, that it is *future*. The prophets, then, in testifying with respect to the sufferings

and glory of Christ, did not necessarily testify or know any thing respecting the *time*, when the events predicted should happen. "The times and seasons the Father keeps in his own power." But how can it be deduced from this, that they did not understand what they did testify, viz. what respected the sufferings and glory themselves? I see not how such a deduction can be made.

But further; even these inquiries of the prophets after the time and the manner of it, were in some degree answered. Let us hear Peter: "Searching at what time, or what manner of time . . . to whom it was revealed, that *not unto themselves*, but *for us* did they act the part of ministers in regard to those things which are now preached to you;" i. e. when the prophets solicitously inquired respecting the time of the Messiah's appearance, sufferings, and glory, it was disclosed to them, that these things could not be exhibited in their day, but at a much later period of the world, viz. the times in which Peter lived and those whom he addressed.

What then is the sum of this whole contested, and (I had almost said) abused passage? Simply this; that the prophets, when prophesying with respect to the sufferings and glory of Christ, were so wrought upon by the subject, that they inquired, with deep interest, when the things they predicted would happen; and that, in answer to these inquiries, it was revealed to them, that these things would not take place until a remote period, and of course not in their day.

But how this can prove, that the prophets did not understand what they had already predicted respecting the sufferings and glory of Christ, I do not see. Indeed, why should their holy curiosity have been so highly excited, if they did not understand it? How could they inquire about the time when *these things* should happen, if they knew not what the *things themselves* were? These are questions which the advocates of Philonic inspiration are fairly bound to answer; but which do not, of course, lie in the way that I have chosen.

Then again; when the time and manner of it were revealed to the prophets, did they not understand what was revealed? If they did not, how was it *revealed*? If they did, how could it be, unless they attached definite ideas to the words in which it was revealed?

We find nothing here then, to shew that the prophets have uttered what they did not themselves understand. But we are

reminded, that Daniel did not understand the matter of his prophecy; for he says, "I heard, but understood not; then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed and sealed up, till the time of the end;" Dan. 12: 8, 9. From this the conclusion is drawn, that Daniel was the instrument of uttering declarations which he did not comprehend.

But how this can be inferred from the words in question, I do not see. Whose are the words which Daniel understood not; his *own*, or those of the *angel*? Surely of the latter. Now that Daniel might not understand all which the angel said to him, may be just as well supposed, as that we do not understand all which he has said to us. But would this latter fact prove, that Daniel did not himself understand what he conceived in his own mind? Admitting then, that the words of the angel addressed to Daniel, which were to be "closed up and sealed until the time of the end," are to be construed as meaning that they are to remain *unexplained* until the time of the end, (which exegesis is itself a doubtful matter, comp. Is. 8: 16), yet this proves merely, that certain words were addressed to him by an angel, which he heard and recorded, but did not understand their import. And what were these words? They were, that the final accomplishment of the predictions which Daniel had been uttering, should take place only after "a time, and times, and half a time." This designation of time the prophet did not understand; and many of his commentators have not succeeded any better, in doing what he found himself unable to do. This is the very thing, too, which Peter says was at first left undisclosed to the ancient prophets. But when the *time of the end* shall come, i. e. when the events which Daniel had himself predicted, shall have come to pass, then of course the *time* will be fully disclosed. The angel declined making a definite disclosure of this, in order to gratify the curiosity of the prophet.

Thus we find as little here as in Peter, to justify the idea that the prophets have uttered what they did not understand. All of this nature that exists in the Bible, of which I have any knowledge, is the solitary declaration of the angel which has just been considered.

But it is said, once more, that in Paul's time, the gift of tongues was common; and that persons often spoke in a foreign language, by the miraculous aid of the Holy Spirit.

This is true; but how this can prove that the Spirit did not enable them to *understand* a foreign language, as well as to *speak* it, I am not aware. Is there any thing in the gift of tongues, which implies that this gift was a perfectly mechanical one, and that those who had it understood nothing which they uttered? I trust no one will venture on such a hazardous and utterly improbable assertion. It would be indeed a singular gift of tongues, to be exercised in this way—exactly like that of a man who learns to pronounce Latin words, but does not know the meaning of a single one which he utters. In such a case, how could the apostles converse and hold intercourse with those, who spoke in a foreign language? If they had no power of attaching ideas to the words that were uttered in it, they could not do this. If they had this power, then the reasoning is utterly destitute of force.

These, if I mistake not, are the principal and most specious arguments of those who advocate the Philonic theory of inspiration. We have seen that they will not abide the test of critical scrutiny. We must not quit the subject, however, without suggesting some things, which make directly against the theory in question. I should not do this, did I not believe that the subject under discussion is one, which has a very important bearing on the principles of interpretation.

1. My first argument to shew that the prophets, while inspired, were *voluntary, conscious, rational agents*, shall be taken from Paul himself, who must have known their condition while under divine influence. He is treating of the same miraculous gift that has been mentioned, viz. that of speaking with tongues, i. e. of speaking in a foreign language. He ascribes the power to do this directly to the Spirit of God; but throughout a whole chapter (1 Cor. xiv.) he labours to persuade the Corinthians that they should not *abuse* the power in question; he cautions them strongly against such abuse; he rebukes them sharply for it. And why? If they are the mere unconscious instruments of an influence which supersedes all their own voluntary powers, what concern has exhortation, or praise, or blame, with them? None at all; no more than it has with the growth of a vegetable, or the functions of a magnet. But not so the apostle. Why? Because, as he says, *the spirits of the prophets, are subject to the prophets*, 1 Cor. 14: 32. Indeed! Then they are not mere involuntary, unconscious instruments. They still remain, while under the influence of the Spirit, rational,

moral, accountable beings, and free voluntary agents. The very fact, that the apostle severely chides them for the abuse of their miraculous gifts, necessarily implies all this. But if this be true, then the Philonic theory of inspiration is not true.

2. Men inspired are so far from being divested of rationality, and understanding, and free agency, that, I may truly say, they possess all these in a higher degree than ever. Inspiration does not *supersede* the use of men's rational powers; it *exalts* their reason, it purifies their understandings; it scatters the darkness that rested upon them, and brings them into regions of pure light. For the truth of this, I appeal to the apprehensions of every reflecting man concerning the nature of the subject; and to the development which inspired writers every where make of their own sentiments and actions. Why should the Scriptures be the better, for being derived from men deprived of their rational and intellectual powers, and made mere involuntary instruments in the hands of an all controlling power? Is not light let in from heaven upon the understanding and reason, and the persuasion and clear conception which ensue, of as much value as words uttered mechanically, and without any knowledge of their meaning?

3. If the prophets did not understand themselves, who can understand them? A question difficult indeed to be answered. The prophets did not understand their own words! Then surely, if those inspired by heaven did not understand what they themselves uttered, and this too with all their aid of divine teaching, it could not be expected, that others who are uninspired and unenlightened, would understand their words. And yet we are told, that the Scripture is all a *revelation*! A revelation to whom? Not to the prophet who utters it, for he understood not what he said; of course not to others, who are still less able to understand it. Here is then no revelation; for a revelation must be understood, or at least it must be intelligible.

"But it is to be understood in after ages." Indeed? But how? Not by the interpretation of language, surely; for if the prophet could not interpret his own vernacular tongue, not even when under the influence of inspiration; nor the men whom he addressed interpret their own vernacular tongue, with all the advantages which they possessed; then how can after ages, strangers and foreigners, interpret it by rules of language? It is plainly out of question.

How then is the Scripture to be understood? "The event,"

it is replied, "will shew how obscure prophecy is to be explained." But here is a *ὑστέρων πρότερον* in reasoning; or rather, there is a mere arguing in a circle. The event is to explain a prophecy that was before unintelligible! But how can we know that the event is a fulfilment of the prophecy? To know whether any event corresponds with a prophecy, we must of course first know what the prophecy is, i. e. what it means or signifies; for if the words of it are unintelligible, then it means nothing to us, and we have of course no prediction with which we can compare the event. It follows, that it is impossible for us to know whether the event is a fulfilment or not.

It must therefore be true, that we do commit the *ὑστέρων πρότερον* of transferring the language of an event to the prophecy itself; that is, from the event itself we make out a meaning; then we apply that meaning to the prediction, and thus make out a sense for it, when to us it had none before; and then we say, that the prophecy had such or such a meaning, because the event shews it to be so. But after all, we reason in a mere circle. The prophecy is fulfilled by the event, because the event has created a meaning for the prophecy; and the event corresponds to the prophecy, because the prophecy means what the event shews it to mean, i. e. the event corresponds to itself; a notable species of logic indeed! How much the Scripture has been exposed to the significant shrugs of sceptical men, by such interpretation, need not be said. Give me such a liberty of interpretation as this, and I can take a wider range than the interpreters of Delphos, or Cumae. I can never be wanting in an *ex tempore* power of explaining any prophecy of the Scriptures, however apparently dark or mysterious; for it is perfectly easy *quodlibet deducere ex quolibet*.

On the other hand, nothing can be more certain, than that true exegesis is obliged first to make out the meaning of a prophecy from the usual laws of language; and then to compare an event or events with the meaning thus made out, and see if there be a harmony between them. In other words, a prophecy must have a meaning *per se*, like any other writing, and must be explained in the like manner.

Why not? Of what possible use could a prediction be, which neither the prophet himself nor any one else understood, or could understand? It would answer no purpose of warning, reproof, encouragement, consolation, or instruction. Paul says, that "all Scripture is profitable for doctrine, correction, reproof, or in-

struction in righteousness ;” but on the ground of those whose opinion I am opposing, here is Scripture which subserves neither of these purposes, unless you say, that a mere form of words which conveys no sense intelligible to us, is profitable for them. But this would be idle ; a mere trifling with a serious matter.

Cui bono then ? I ask once more. We have a right to ask this, and to insist on an answer, in a case like the present, when the question between two methods of interpretation is, which is most consonant with the nature, design, and object of the sacred Scriptures ? The Philonists answer this question by saying, that ‘when the event comes to pass which the prophecy foretells, then this event will serve to confirm the predictions of Scripture, and to illustrate the power and providence of almighty God.’ When the *event* comes to pass ! What event ? Surely none that the prophecy in question foretells to us ; because by the very supposition, the prophecy is unintelligible to us, and to all men. No meaning then can be given to the prophecy ; and of course, we can never tell whether it is fulfilled or not. As to putting a meaning upon it, drawn from occurrences that take place in after-times, and then calling this a *fulfilment*—I have already examined this in the paragraphs above.

But further ; are the wisdom, and goodness, and condescension of the Spirit who guided the prophets, more conspicuous in uttering what is plain and intelligible to the people of God, or in dictating what is dark and unintelligible ? When God speaks, I must take it that it is in order to be understood ; when he reveals, he does not cover his revelation with impenetrable darkness. The heathen oracles and religion could boast of their *μύσται*, and *μυστήρια* ; but *thy word, O Lord, is light, it giveth light to the understanding*, was said by David, and ought to be echoed by every disciple of him who is “the Light of the world.”

And when it is asked, with a confidence which seems to feel that overwhelming argument is contained in the question, ‘Whether we do not understand the prophecies of the Old Testament, in respect to the Messiah, better since the fulfilment of them, than the Jews of ancient times did ?’ I answer at once, We do so ; or at least, we ought to do so. But how this confutes the view which I have taken, I am not able to perceive. I have read many a description of Constantinople, and seen many a representation of its edifices and scenery, delineated by excellent engravings. I read the words of a writer on this subject, who has

never been at Constantinople ; he has merely studied his subject as I have. I understand him. The language which he employs, suggests to my mind the very same train of ideas in general, and the same images in particular, which existed in his mind. I can therefore interpret him, i. e. I can convey to others the exact meaning of this writer. But if I pay a visit to Constantinople, see it all with my own eyes, and sojourn in it so as to become well acquainted with all that is passing there, then indeed I have a much more complete and satisfactory view of the city in question, than I could gain from any description. Then, when I read the description of the writer above mentioned, I can have a better view of all its several parts, a more perfect idea of the *things* suggested and described, than the writer himself had. But how this can make his language mean any more, than he himself meant to convey by it, I cannot see. The information which enables me to have a more lively perception of the object described than the author had, I obtained not from him, but from being present in the place described. I stand in a more advantageous position than he did. His words awaken in me trains of thought, the result of my experience, which never existed in his mind. I understand the *objects* described better than the author himself, because of my superior sources of information. But must I attribute all the meaning which I can now give to his words, actually to him, i. e. to his production? I trow not ; clearly not, if Prof. Hahn's definition of right interpretation be true, viz: that it is an exposition of the meaning which an author attached to his own words.

Let me produce another example for illustration. An illiterate man says, 'The sun is rising.' An astronomer hears this declaration ; and in making out an interpretation of it, he connects with the words *sun* and *rising*, all the ideas which astronomy has taught him respecting the one and the other. Is this an interpretation now of the peasant's words? Truly not ; for they mean neither more nor less than what he intended to convey by them.

Such is the case too with the words of the ancient prophets. They mean just what *they designed* to convey by them, and no more. If we now, after all that has taken place, understand better than the Jews of ancient times did, the true nature of gospel subjects, (which surely ought to be the case,) this is due to the full day which the meridian Sun of righteousness has spread around us. But ancient prophets saw only his twilight. Could

they describe more than they saw or knew? "No man," says the Saviour, "hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him;" i. e. neither Moses nor any other prophet has ever given a full view of God and his purposes in the gospel; this was reserved for his Son to do, and this he has accomplished.

Why can we not believe this, and expound the prophets accordingly? And if we do so, then we shall not attribute to them a knowledge which they did not possess; nor shall we find any difficulty in them because they did not disclose all that we now know; for all was not revealed to them. We shall interpret them as they spoke, i. e. we shall assign to their words the meaning which they assigned, and no more; for this is to give a true interpretation.

It is plainly an error, then, to say that a prophecy is interpreted by the event. It is perfectly clear, that events may help us to understand the *subject* of a particular prophecy much better than we otherwise could have done; as the cases of illustration already suggested clearly shew. It is equally plain, that when we do thus understand the subject, we are in a better condition to avoid errors in interpretation, than we should otherwise be. More complete knowledge of any thing, always helps to secure against errors in speaking of it. But our superior knowledge of the Messiah and his work, for example, does not bestow that knowledge on the ancient prophets who foretold him; and of course it cannot make their words mean any more, than they themselves meant by them. Events, by giving us a better knowledge of the subject of a prophecy, may aid us in its interpretation by virtue of that better knowledge which they communicate; but these events can never make the words of ancient prophets mean any more than the prophets themselves meant. Later events may place us in a condition, where the words of an ancient prophet will excite in us whole trains of thought, which perhaps he never had at all; but, as in the case of the astronomer, who hears the words *sun rising* from the peasant, although the train of thought may be exceedingly diverse, and even far superior in some respects, this can never make the original words mean any more than the author of them meant to convey.

What an extended influence this plain principle would have, if duly reduced to practice, over the wide and difficult field of prophetic interpretation, it is easy to perceive. What a multi-

tude of errors have been committed, for want of attention to it, every one must know, who is at all conversant with the history of interpretation. But I must quit this theme, as not falling within my present object, and return to my immediate purpose.

We may now venture to believe that the prophets understood their own words, i. e. that they did assign to them some meaning; and therefore, if this be the case, that meaning is the one which is the true sense of their words. In all this there is nothing which contradicts, or is inconsistent with, the idea that the prophets were inspired, or wrote under the influence of the divine Spirit. Peter and the other apostles often preached under such an influence; but the words which they used were understood by themselves, and were intelligible to others. If not, of what use was their preaching?

Nothing can be farther from what is reasonable, at least so it seems to me, than the idea that men cease to be rational and free agents, when they become the subjects of inspiration. The contrary must be true, viz. that they are more rational, more intelligent, more free, i. e. more truly so, than ever before; in other words, all the faculties of their nature, that are capable of intellectual and moral elevation, become more elevated in consequence of divine influence.

We may consider the proposition then as well grounded, that the sacred writers did attach some meaning to every word which they uttered. God speaks to us through and by them. When God speaks to men, he speaks in language such as men employ in speaking to each other; in language, therefore, which is intelligible. If he does not so, then he does not speak to men at all; for him to speak to them, implies, that he addresses them in such a way as to be understood. The language of his prophets, then, is to be interpreted in accordance with the laws of language, i. e. with those laws which apply to the interpretation of all other communications by the use of language. If you deny this, then you deny to men the power of understanding and interpreting the Scriptures; for this must be done, and can be done, only by virtue of the principles of interpretation which usage has established. At least, there is but one other way in which this can be done, and that is, by a second inspiration, I mean, by the inspiration of the interpreter. Now as we do not lay claim to this favour, nor expect it, so the only method of interpretation that remains, is the one which conforms to the usual laws of language.

But an interpretation of this sort must go on the ground, that the prophets did, in their own minds, attach some meaning to the words which they employed; and if this be true, the duty of the interpreter is fulfilled, whenever he has fully developed that meaning.

If any one is still disposed to say, that 'the Spirit of God who influenced the prophets, intended to convey a meaning, by the words which he suggested to the prophets, different from that which they may have had in their own minds;' he takes for granted two things here, which it would be found exceedingly difficult to prove; viz. (1) That the Spirit of God suggested the *words* which the prophet used, rather than influenced the state of his mind which would give birth to proper words; and (2) That men in a state of inspiration, were left in ignorance of what they themselves uttered, while this was uttered for the very purpose of being understood by others. Now as neither of these are capable of proof, and as both are quite improbable, I do not feel that they throw any obstacle in the way of that principle of exegesis, which I have been endeavouring to illustrate and to defend.

We return, then, after the extensive range that we have taken in canvassing various objections, to the simple and obvious principle, that the sacred writers did, in their own minds, attach some idea to every thing which they uttered. So far as I know, there is but one declaration in the Scriptures, which stands on a different footing; and this is not a declaration of a prophet, but of an angel. The prophet is merely the narrator. I refer to the instance in Dan. 12: 8, 9, where the angel declares, that the final accomplishment of the visions which Daniel had seen, should not fully take place until a time, and times, and half a time were past. This new mode of designating time, Daniel tells us he did not understand: "I heard, but I understood not." The angel declined explaining it to him, and it was left to be definitely marked out by the fulfilment of events which had been predicted in other prophecies. But where there is another instance of the like kind in the Scripture, I know not. I find, indeed, that certain symbols are presented to the eye of a prophet, and he is asked what they mean? He answers that he cannot tell; and then the explanation is immediately subjoined. Thus in Zech. 4: 2—7, the angel shews to the prophet a golden candlestick, with a bowl, seven lamps, and seven pipes, and two olive-trees standing by it. He then inquires of the prophet,

whether he knows what these are ; and on receiving a negative answer, he goes on to explain their symbolic use. But all cases of this nature are entirely irrelevant to the subject in question. The symbolic use of things exhibited to the natural eye, or to the eye of the mind, can never be anticipated, because it is not *language*, and no rules of language therefore can have a bearing upon it. The meaning of a symbol must depend entirely on the explanation of him who constitutes it ; and therefore it is not submitted to the interpretation of another. A symbol is a *thing*, not *words* ; and consequently no instance of this nature can have any bearing on our subject. But if it could have, it would be very far from favouring those principles, which are opposed to what has been above advocated. In all the cases of such symbolic representations as I have described, the explanation of them is made immediately to the prophet ; which does not look like calling him to utter things in prophecy which he does not understand.

It may be thought a needless task, perhaps, to have occupied so much time in establishing a principle, that at first view is so exceedingly plain and reasonable, viz. that the sacred writers attached some meaning to every word which they uttered. But the objections which I have canvassed, shew that while this principle would scarcely ever be directly contradicted by any man in words, yet it has been virtually denied by great numbers of Christians, and some of very high consideration too, in the theory of inspiration which they have maintained.

The importance of having our minds fully enlightened and settled on the points that have been discussed, is much greater than an inexperienced interpreter can well imagine. For if it be true, that there are parts of the Bible which are uttered in language that was unintelligible to the sacred writers themselves, and of course unintelligible to their readers ; then it must be true, that such parts of the Bible are incapable of being interpreted by any aid which exegesis can offer ; and indeed, that they are placed out of the pale of interpretation by any human effort. For all such effort must be regulated by the laws of interpretation, derived from the habitual usages of men in explaining words ; and these can never reach the mystical passages in question, nor can such passages be subjected in any measure to their influence in explanation. Of course, nothing but a second miracle, i. e. an inspiration of the interpreter, can ever be adequate to open the meaning of all such passages of Scripture to

the world. And if it be indeed the case, that there are parts of the Bible in this condition, it behoves us well to know it; and not to attempt an explanation of them by any efforts which we can make, lest, like Uzziah, we be smitten by the hand of God for sacrilegiously intermeddling with holy things. I would that those who advocate the mystic revelations in question, would tell us where we must stop in our investigations, and exactly where the veil is spread, that separates the קֹדֶשׁ קִדְשִׁים, the holy of holies, from our view.

Our blessed Saviour exhorted the Jews to search the Scriptures; and Paul urges Christians to study and search them; and Peter strenuously insists on it that we should 'give heed to them as to a light shining in a dark place;' and no sacred writer intimates that there is any part of the Bible which is unintelligible to the sincere and humble inquirer. How can all this be true, and yet there be many considerable portions of it, to which none of the usual principles of interpretation are applicable?

II. It is time to quit this subject, and advance to the consideration of the second deduction which was made above (p. 141) from Prof. Hahn's definition of the true meaning of interpretation. This is, that in discovering the sense which an author attached to his own words, we must have reference simply to the times in which he lived, and the circumstance in which he acted and spoke. Prof. Hahn himself notices this in a part of his essay, subsequent to that on which I am commenting. But his notice is very brief, and he has not unfolded the reasons for the opinion which he gives, although the opinion itself is altogether correct. I have also brought the subject distinctly into view above; but as I have not there attempted a particular examination of the reasons of it, I shall therefore now only endeavour briefly to state the grounds of the principle under consideration.

Language, I repeat again, is the expression of ideas. Words are the signs of ideas, exhibited to the eye or ear. As we are now considering written language, we may call them signs of ideas exhibited to the eye. Ideas are formed in the minds of men by the natural objects which surround them, and with which they are conversant; by the things to which their attention is called; by the relations which they sustain; by the customs, manners, modes of thinking, and reasoning which are prevalent; by religious rites and doctrines, civil

usages and government intercourse with foreign nations, etc. in a word by all the circumstances, external or internal, in which they live. Every nation has words peculiar to itself, just so far as it has objects peculiar to itself. I do not refer at all now to the different sounds of words which stand as the signs of ideas, such as *ἄνθρωπος* and *homo*, and which designate the same object; but I refer to words that cannot by any possibility be translated out of one language into another, because the other language has no corresponding terms which will answer to them, and this, because the nation which speaks this other language never having been conversant with the same objects as the first nation, of course never had occasion to invent terms adapted to express ideas of them. For example; how can we translate the Athenian *ἀρχών*, or the Latin *tribunus*, or *consul*? We do not, for we cannot; all we can do, is to transfer the words themselves into our own language, and leave them to be explained in the lexicons by much periphrasis or historical description. *Vice versâ*, how will any one translate *cannon*, *mariner's compass*, *electricity*, *galvanism*, *steam-boat*, *man-of-war*, etc. into Latin or Greek? And so of thousands of words in the English language. What is the ground of all the difficulty? One very simple and intelligible thing, viz. that the Romans and Greeks, never having been acquainted with the objects which these words designate, had no ideas of them in their minds; and therefore they never formed any terms to express them. Consequently, we cannot translate such English words into Latin and Greek.

The same thing, and for the same reasons, is true, and must be so, of every nation on earth. Each has something peculiar to itself, which is found no where else; and of course, each has some words which can never be literally translated into any other language. They can only be transferred, and described by periphrasis, or perhaps exhibited to the eye in pictorial delineations.

We must observe, in the next place, that no one man makes a language, or controls the use of it. He may have some influence upon it; he may help to introduce, or to change the meaning of a few words. Every writer intends and expects to be understood, when he writes for others. But to accomplish this, he must of course conform to the *usus loquendi* of his nation. Otherwise he composes in a language foreign to them, and therefore will not be understood.

But what is this *usus loquendi*? It is modes of expression which a nation have adopted, under the influence of all the objects with which they are conversant, both natural and artificial; of all the circumstances and relations in which they are placed, whether social, civil, or religious. Authors take language as they find it; they do not make a new one. They may, indeed, help to introduce now and then a new word, because they want it to express a new idea; but the great body of their words must be conformed to the *usus loquendi*, in order to be intelligible.

Now if when God speaks to any particular men, he uses the language of these men, in order to be understood; it follows, that when he spoke to the ancient Jews, through the prophets, he employed the language of the times and of the nation. But in order to interpret this, one must be acquainted with the circumstances and relations of the Hebrew nation at that time; because the language, as it then was, was entirely conformed to these.

From these very plain and obvious principles it results, that in order to interpret rightly, we must have respect to all these circumstances and relations. It follows with equal certainty, that to carry back our *recent* notions of philosophy, theology, morals, government, or any thing else, and attach them to the words of the ancient Hebrews, would be doing a violence to the laws of interpretation which every one must spontaneously disapprove. The simple question for an interpreter, always and without variation, is, What idea did the writer mean to convey? When this is discovered and developed, the interpreter's work is done; and so far as the simple office of an interpreter is concerned, it is all done. Whether this author agrees or disagrees with our present notions, yea, whether he inculcates truth or error, is nothing to him as interpreter. With this he may be deeply concerned as a man and a theologian; he is so; but as an *interpreter*, his work is done, when the true meaning of his author is unfolded.

One cannot help exclaiming here, when he looks on many of the glosses which have been forced upon the Scriptures by philosophy and sectarianism, by superstition and by ignorance, Would to God that the Bible, at last, might come to be considered as *the sufficient and only rule of faith and practice*! When will men cease to be wiser than God, in their own estimation? And when will the simple meaning of the inspired writers, that

and no more nor less, be the great object of inquiry and investigation among all interpreters of the divine word? May that time speedily come, and the whole earth be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters fill the sea!

Let me add a few considerations by way of caution, to every conscientious interpreter, and I have done. Is it not our only true interest, so far as revelation is concerned, to know just what has been actually revealed, and to attach neither more nor less to the Scriptures than the inspired writers did themselves attach to them? This cannot be denied. How then can we strive for a party explanation of a text, in case we are conscious to ourselves that we have never investigated it by the *usus loquendi*, nor the idioms of the language in which it was written? I speak to interpreters, professed and authorized interpreters of the divine word. What would they say of an ambassador of our government, who, being furnished with his instructions, should go to a foreign country, and give an interpretation to them agreeable to the notions or wishes of the people there? And if we neglect to overlook the obvious means by which we are to investigate the sense of the Scriptures, and in order to save toil and application, put a gloss on them suggested by our own philosophy, or superstition, or ignorance, or party prejudice; then we are accountable for what we do, to the Author of the Scriptures. His word is truth—everlasting truth; what is more or less, may be truth, or error, or a mixture of both: but it is what lays us under no obligation of faith or practice; it is often what may mislead us, and plunge us into danger, if not into perdition. Let the interpreter of the divine word, then, feel that his office is high and holy; that he can never be at liberty to pervert it or to abuse it. Nor can he fulfil its functions, in all respects as he ought to do, without such a knowledge of the Scriptures and the principles of their interpretation, as will enable him to pursue his inquiries independently of human authority, and to cast himself only on the guidance of those who were inspired.

ART. V. ON THE GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY OF THE WRITERS
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By J. A. H. Tittmann, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Translated from
the Latin by the Editor.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

J. A. H. Tittmann, the author of the following article, is the son of C. C. Tittmann, formerly Superintendent of the churches in Dresden, and author of the *Meletemata Sacra* and other works. He was born in 1773 at Langensalza, where his father was then sub-pastor; became professor extraordinary in the faculty of philosophy at Leipsic in 1796; was transferred in the same capacity to the theological faculty in 1799; and was afterwards made an ordinary professor in the same, of which he has since risen by degrees, and particularly since the death of Tzschirner, to be the senior professor. He is accounted a man of profound and various erudition. He has published no large work, but many smaller ones both in exegetical and systematic theology, which are characterized by learning and sound good sense; though they do not always exhibit the warm and evangelical spirit of a living faith. The principal one is his work on the Synonymes of the New Testament, first printed in four Programms, and recently republished with his *opuscula*, Leips. 1829. These *opuscula* consist of several essays relative to the principles on which the New Testament is to be interpreted. The following article is the first of these essays; and the others will probably be given in future numbers of this work. He is also the Editor of the small edition of the New Testament published by Tauchnitz.

ED.

ON THE GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY OF THE WRITERS OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

Among the imperishable merits of Luther in relation to the church of Christ, it must no doubt be reckoned the greatest, that he again laid open the fountains of divine truth, which had been for many ages concealed or corrupted; and vindicated the use of them, not only to teachers and to the learned, but also to *all* Christians. But as in many other things, in which he could only make a beginning, so also here, he left to posterity the duty of becoming more thoroughly acquainted with the sources thus re-

stored to them, and of freeing more and more the doctrines drawn from these fountains from the inventions of human opinions. That this was not done by Luther himself, no one can wonder; although such was his genius, that had he not been deprived, by the multitude of his other severe and pressing labours, of that leisure which the study of ancient literature particularly demands, he would probably have been superior to all his contemporaries in the true interpretation of the New Testament.

But that after three centuries, and after the labours of so many distinguished men, the interpretation of the New Testament should not yet have been regulated by any certain laws; must surely be matter of wonder to all, and would seem hardly credible, unless one were acquainted with the difficulties of the subject, and the causes of the errors under which it still labours. The number and magnitude of these difficulties become more known, the longer and more diligently the sacred writings are studied. The nature of the errors and faults to be avoided is such, that the more experience one seems to have in interpreting the writings of the New Testament, the more difficult does it become to avoid these errors. They grow indeed by practice, and are so impressed by daily habit, that unless the interpreter shall have been prepared in the best manner, he is constantly more or less influenced by them. Those therefore who in youth, have become imbued by severe study with a deep knowledge of the ancient languages; and the labours of whose future lives have left them leisure and strength to fulfil the proper duties of an interpreter of the New Testament, enjoy a rare felicity. The lot of very many, however, is widely different; they have been able formerly to read but few of the Greek authors; and having acquired no insight into the genius of the Greek language, are compelled to acquiesce in the decisions of the lexicons, however unsatisfactory and worthless; and are thus unable, through want of leisure and books, to make good in after life that which they have neglected in youth. On the other hand, those philologists who would seem to be the best qualified for the interpretation of the New Testament, have often such a distaste for the reading of the Scriptures, that they most gladly abandon it to the theologians. But although it may be doubted, with Valckenaer,* whether those who have acquired their knowledge only in the monuments of the profane writers, should

* Valcknerii Orationes, Lugd. Bat. 1784. p. 288 sq.

on that account be prohibited from the emendation and explanation of the sacred books ; still, it is greatly to be wished, that all theologians, who are in a manner regarded as the only legitimate interpreters of the New Testament, should be able to sustain a comparison with those great men, who have been so much distinguished by their zeal for the study of languages, by learning, sagacity, and sound judgment.

A principal reason why the science of interpreting the New Testament, is not yet firmly settled on its proper foundations, seems to lie in the fact, that many regard the interpreter of the New Testament as having nothing to do with the niceties of grammar. Hence it happens, that even those who have best understood the genius of the Greek language, have in explaining the sacred books paid no proper regard to the laws of grammar or to the analogy of language ; and the same thing has therefore happened to them, that has usually deterred mere philologists from treating of the Scriptures. They have taken it for granted, that the sacred writers were far removed from that grammatical accuracy, the laws of which are founded in the nature of language and the use of the best writers ; and therefore in explaining their writings, they have supposed there was little or no use in applying those laws. Indeed it has even been imagined, that in seeking the true sense of the sacred writers, he was exposed to err the most widely, who should endeavour to subject their words and phrases to the ordinary rules of the Greek language. Hence the direction, now to take refuge in Hebraism ; or again, where there is no place for Hebraism, we are referred to the barbarous dialect of Alexandria ; or at last, if there is nothing similar to be found in this dialect, we are told that the words of the sacred writers, so incongruously composed, and construed in a manner so contrary to the laws of language, must be explained from the connexion, and by reference to the object of the writer. Inasmuch now as this mode of proceeding is most pernicious, and not only renders the whole interpretation of the New Testament uncertain, but delivers over the Scriptures to the caprice of every interpreter, it may be worth while to spend a few moments, in endeavouring to form a proper estimate of the grammatical accuracy of the sacred writers.

Our first object will be, to explain in what we suppose this grammatical accuracy to consist. This seems the more necessary, because there is here more than one error to be avoided. It is therefore first of all to be remarked, that we are not to treat

here of that *elegance* of style, which we admire in poets and orators. This quality, which consists partly in the choice of words and phrases, and partly in their proper connexion and arrangement in sentences, it will be easily understood, is not to be sought for in the sacred writers, any more than it is required in the discourse of unlearned men. An elegant selection of words, indeed, demands, in the first place, that there should always be at hand a copiousness of words, sufficient to express all the thoughts : so that we may not only comprehend what the writer thought, but also the very manner in which he thought it, and in which he wished to present it. This however is a thing so difficult, and that too from such a variety of causes, that although it is properly expected from an author who professes to be a master of the art of writing ; yet it cannot be required of an unlearned man, who utters without preparation what suddenly arises in his mind, or who is compelled to write for others who are destitute of all cultivation. That the sacred writers are of this character, no one will deny.

In the next place, it is also requisite for an elegant selection of words, that the words of the language employed, should suffice to express with perspicuity the things in which others are to be instructed ; so that the writer may not be compelled, either to employ improper words in an unusual sense, nor to choose expressions which have only a cognate meaning. That the sacred writers were compelled to do both, needs not here to be demonstrated.

Lastly, that elegance which lies in the choice of words, requires that the mind of the writer should neither be excited by the novelty of his subject, nor agitated by the magnitude of his purpose, but composed, tranquil, and never forgetful of himself ; especially at the moment of committing to writing the thoughts which he has excogitated. But the sacred writers, regardless of applause and unmindful of popular favour, always striving for this end alone, that all things should be *πρός οἰκοδομήν*, neglected so much the more this elegance of words, because their minds were aroused and inflamed by the magnitude of the things either done by others, and especially by their divine Master, or yet to be transacted by themselves.

In regard also to that elegance of style, which consists in the proper construction and arrangement of sentences, there is probably no one who would demand an elegance of this sort in the sacred writers. It is only in authors whose chief object is to

give delight, or who wish to please while they instruct their readers, that this species of elegance must not be wanting. In those writers who desire only to instruct, and to impel to the practice of that which is honest and good, nothing more is required, than that they shall speak with perspicuity and in a manner adapted to persuade; for the power of persuasion lies not in those allurements of words, but in the weight of thought, and in the force of a mind imbued with a sense of important things, and filled as it were with a divine spirit. So Paul has truly judged, 1 Cor. 2: 4.

I do not here fear that any should charge me with doing injustice to the sacred writers. That occasionally the most elegant expressions and forms of speech are found in them, is apparent to all; and these have been sought out with the greatest avidity by those defenders of their style, who have been more sedulous than judicious. These single forms of elegance, however, cannot constitute an elegant style. But as is the case with many who bestrew a bad Latin style with elegant phrases, like flowers, and still are as far as possible from the true elegance of that language; so here, the use of well-turned phrases and elegant forms of expression, can never cause the writer to be regarded as exhibiting that elegance of style, for which poets and orators are celebrated. Indeed, if there be in the writers of the New Testament any elegance of style, it is that which consists not in art, but springs from the simplicity and greatness of the thoughts themselves; and the less it is sought for, the more certainly and deeply does it affect those to whom it is addressed. That this species of elegance exists in the sacred writers in the highest degree, is well known to those who have examined the subject.

From all this it will be easily understood, that while we take a liberal estimate of the grammatical accuracy of the writers of the New Testament, we by no means assent to the opinion of those, who have attempted with more zeal than success to shew, that these writers have employed a pure Greek idiom. But would that all those, who have complained of the impure Greek of the New Testament writers, had either themselves understood, or at least explained more perspicuously than has commonly been done, in what this purity of the Greek language consists! Had this been done, there would have been no ground for many and long disputes. At present, however, we will not enter upon this subject; but rather express our general acqui-

escence in the cautious directions of Ernesti:* *To inquire respecting words and phrases, expressing things about which the Greeks were accustomed to speak; and first, whether such single words are spoken in the same sense in which the Greeks used them; and then, whether such phrases have not only the syntax of the Greek, but also the same sense which Greek usages attributed to them.* As to the mention of syntax here, Ernesti does not seem to have so understood it, as if purity of style were to be principally estimated in reference to the legitimate construction of words and phrases. It is one thing to observe the grammatical laws of syntax; and it is a different thing to follow the practice of approved writers and men of cultivated minds, so as to express the same things in the same words that they have used, or in the same way, or at least in a similar and congruous manner.

Whether this is actually done, is not so easy to be determined as is generally supposed. For a habit of speaking or writing with purity and correctness, although it may appear to be unrestrained, is nevertheless limited by necessary laws; the reason of which is often so obscured by usage, and so changed in the progress of language, that it cannot in every case be entirely ascertained. Hence it happens, that words and phrases used by the most approved writers, appear to many to have been at first received without ground, and as it were by accident; than which opinion, none can be farther from the truth. But syntax, properly so called, consists in the mode of correctly joining together all the parts of style, and depends on other grounds than purity of style; although there are some things common to both. Thus the principal laws of both are deduced from reason, the common source of all languages. We wish it therefore to be distinctly understood, that the question about the purity of style in the writers of the New Testament, is entirely foreign to our present discussion; so that no one may suppose, that we rashly desire to renew this ancient controversy. We are to speak only of the grammatical correctness of the writers of the New Testament, and we can now more easily explain in what this accuracy consists.

It is obvious here at the first view, that the grammatical accuracy of any writer must consist in the observance of the gram-

* *Institutio Interp. N. T. Part. I. Sect. II. c. 3. § 6.* Stuart's Translation, § 117.

grammatical laws of the language which he uses. What these laws are, and on what causes they depend, seems to be less obvious; inasmuch as those who attempt to expound the grammatical laws of a language, often expend all their labour, either in explaining single forms and parts of style, or in shewing how these may properly be joined together in order to make out a whole sentence. But why this should be done in this particular way, and in no other, they leave unexplained, and rest satisfied with having proved by a multitude of examples, that it is often so in classic writers. And although the assiduous perusal of many writers is necessary, in order correctly to observe the laws of syntax in a language; yet the *causes* of those laws are not to be discerned, except by a diligent comparison of the genius of the language in question, with the necessary modes of thinking and speaking common to all languages. He, however, who is ignorant of the causes of these laws, cannot properly understand their use; much less can he teach with clearness the mode in which they are to be applied, nor to what extent they may be changed by usage. Such is the case with many interpreters; they know sufficiently well, how a word or construction usually is, but not *why* it is and ought to be so; and consequently, when they sometimes find it otherwise, they are troubled by the uncommonness of it, and cannot explain why it ought not to be so; or they take refuge in a farrago of exceptions, as they are called. On this account, it is proper here to treat, in a few words, of the causes and sources of all grammatical laws, before we proceed to shew, how far we suppose the writers of the New Testament have observed them.

There are in every language two kinds of laws. The first kind are in their very nature *necessary*, so that they are and must be found of the same or of a similar character in all languages. The other kind consists of those laws which spring from the peculiar genius of any particular language. The former kind are necessary, because they arise out of the very nature of all human language, that is from reason itself, and can therefore never be violated, but must always be observed. So that if any one should speak in a manner different from what these laws require, he would compel his hearers to connect in thought things which cannot be so joined even in thought; as if a father should say, *ἐγέννησα σοῦ*; or if any one should call him who is the son of Philip, *Φίλιππον παῖδα*. Here it is not possible, that he who has begotten another, should at the same time be conceived of as hav-

ing the cause of generation in that other, which is the force of the genitive; or that he who is to be represented as the son of Philip, should really be conceived of as a son, when no relation to a father is indicated. The reason of these laws is particularly conspicuous in the Greek prepositions; where their own peculiar force demonstrates the cause, why they are to be necessarily joined with one, two, or three cases. Thus if we accurately consider the proper signification of each preposition, it will not be difficult to see, why *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, and *πρό* can only be joined with the genitive, and *εἰς* only with the accusative; as also why *διά* and *κατά* not only may be, but also ought to be construed, sometimes with the genitive and sometimes with the accusative.

But there are also other laws, which, as springing from the nature of a particular language, and being in a manner peculiar to it, are not in the same degree necessary; so that it is possible to conceive of a sufficient reason, why a style may be complete and perfect, although these laws are neglected. Hence it arises, that idioms, which are introduced by usage contrary to the general laws of a language,* are not to be regarded as faulty; and that what may appear as solecisms to the unlearned, are sometimes in fact the most elegant figures (*σχηματα*) of style.† The reason of these grammatical laws then, although in itself perhaps obvious, is often greatly obscured by opposite usage; so that it is not wonderful, that the precepts of grammarians respecting this part of syntax, should either not have been understood by those who judge of the nature of language only by number and case; or should not have been sufficient to enable us in all instances certainly to determine, whether one has written correctly or incorrectly. It is obvious, however, that in estimating the grammatical accuracy of any writer, these different species of grammatical laws must be distinguished. If a writer violate those laws, of which reason and the nature of things always require the observance, he cannot be said to use the language of man; but if he neglect the other species of laws, we must first examine, whether there is not some probable cause for this neglect. On this account it will be well to treat of the two species of laws separately.

* See Hermann ad Vigerum, Leips. 1822, p. 865.

† Compare Apollonius Alex. Do Constructione Oratoris, L. III. p. 197. ed. Bekker.

In the first place then, although it may be taken for granted that the sacred writers have observed the *necessary* laws of the Greek language,—otherwise they would hardly seem to have spoken like men endowed with reason,—yet it may be worth while to look more closely at the subject, than has usually been done. There are those who in interpreting the New Testament, care very little for the observance of any laws; and if the words of any writer interpreted grammatically, that is, according to the laws of language, express a sentiment foreign to their system or to their private opinions, they do not hesitate to disregard entirely those laws, and, neglecting the proper force of the words, contend, that the writer has said what no one in his senses ever could have said by means of such words. And we could show by a multitude of examples, how many false interpretations which have sprung up out of a hatred of orthodoxy, rest solely upon the opinions of men, who, because they have taken it for granted, that the sacred writers did not observe even the necessary laws of language, have supposed that their words might be made to signify just what they themselves pleased. Inasmuch, however, as the interpretation of the New Testament would be destitute of all certain rule and method, unless we observe at least those laws of language, the neglect of which implies also incorrectness of thought, we will endeavour to show by some examples, that the sacred writers have observed even those laws in which few require accuracy or can judge of it.

To begin with the prepositions; for there is no signification, however repugnant, which has not been assigned to each of the prepositions in the New Testament; and moreover we shall learn to estimate more correctly the accuracy of the sacred writers in a grammatical view, if we find them paying a strict regard even to those laws, which, although necessary, are yet by few regarded as necessary. The nature of the prepositions, as I have remarked above, is such, that they can either govern only one case, or they admit two or more cases; in such a way, however, that according to the variety of their signification, they require necessarily some one particular case. I do not however fear, in asserting that this nature of the prepositions has been accurately observed by the sacred writers, that any one will consider me as on this account attributing a refinement to the style of unlearned men. It is necessary rather to be on our guard, lest in denying to the sacred writers those things which

are regarded as peculiar to men of more cultivated minds, we should seem to approach them with faults which are scarcely to be excused in persons even of the lowest class.

The force of the prepositions, as Hermann has justly remarked,* does not depend upon the cases which they govern; but it is to be explained from the verbs on which the prepositions themselves depend. It follows from this, that a preposition, even if it retain the same signification as to the general notion of the thing expressed, may yet require a different case, provided the verb on which that preposition depends, changes in any way the mode of conceiving the relation of that thing. For if prepositions serve to indicate the relations of ideas, the cause is apparent, both why they govern cases at all, and why they govern only one case, or why they govern different cases, if the verb on which they depend changes the mode of conceiving that relation. Some govern but a single case, because the idea expressed by the verb on which they depend, necessarily demands that case; for the force of these prepositions is such, that if other cases were joined to them, the very idea of the verb would be contradicted. Others again govern more cases, because the idea contained in them is such, that it may be conceived of in various relations, though in a different manner; and hence they may be joined with verbs of different species, which govern different cases.

By verbs of different species, I mean those which indicate the different modes in which the relation of two things may be conceived. Thus *εἶναι* and *ἔρχεσθαι* are different species of verbs; for when we couple the notion of any two things by means of *εἶναι*, we signify nothing more, than that these two notions are in some way connected; but *ἔρχεσθαι* properly indicates *motion*, by which the relation of place is changed. Now motion may be conceived of in a threefold view, as either *in*, or *from*, or *to* a place; and therefore the verb *ἔρχεσθαι* governs also three cases, and calls to its aid those prepositions, which serve to express those different relations. A person is, therefore, correctly said *ὑπὸ Ἰλίου εἶναι*, and *ὑπὸ Ἰλίῳ*, when he is under (at, near) Ilium; but if he is to be represented as coming to Ilium, so as to be under it, he is said *ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ἔρχεσθαι*. The reason therefore why Homer says: *αἴσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ἦλθε*, is to be sought in the verb *ἦλθε*. Had he said *ὑπὸ Ἰλίῳ*

* *Hermann, De emendanda ratione Graecae Grammat. p. 162.*

ἦλθε, it would have signified that he came to Ilium, but that being under Ilium, he had come to some particular place there. For the same reason we find Luke 7: 6 ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς. In the following passages the reason of the construction is different: Mark 4: 32 ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν, John 1: 49 ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν. 1 Cor. 10: 1 ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν. In these instances the verbs κατασκηνοῦν and εἶναι, seem to require not the accusative, but the genitive or dative; so that at first view one is tempted to suppose, that the writers have erred against the necessary laws of language. But there is either a probable reason why ὑπὸ should be joined with the accusative in a relation of this sort, or else the best writers have erred in like manner. So Xenophon, Anab. III. 4 ὑφ' ἣν ἡ κατάβασις ἦν εἰς τὸ πεδίον. Herodotus II. 137 οὔτε γὰρ ὑπέστι οἰκήματα ὑπὸ γῆν. In Homer also and other writers, ὑπὸ is very often construed with the accusative, when the verb from which it depends seems rather to require the dative. But if we carefully look at all the examples of this sort, it will easily be seen, that the accusative is used in order to make more conspicuous the fact, that a thing or person is so connected with another thing, that the latter is to be conceived of and regarded as an *adjunct* or *accident* of the former. The noun, therefore, which is put in the accusative, is such as denotes either the *place* in which any thing is or happens, or the *time* at which it happens; for time and place are necessary adjuncts in all things. So when it is said (1 Cor. 10: 1) that the fathers were all ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην, we are to bear in mind, that while they were journeying, the cloud was always with them; but had it been ὑπὸ νεφέλης, it would have expressed nothing more, than that they had been once under a cloud; which was not the intention of the writer.

Should any one be disposed to regard this distinction as more subtle than true, let him reflect why all good Greek writers say ὑπὸ νύκτα, ὑφ' ἡμέραν, and not ὑπὸ νυκτός, ὑφ' ἡμέρας, when they wish to express that any thing was done by night or in the day time. Not unfrequently we are able to see why a thing ought to be said in a certain way, when we perceive that the same could not have been said in any other way.

The principle is also the same, in regard to the preposition *διά*. When *διά* governs the genitive, it denotes the cause *by* or *through* which a thing is or exists, or the manner in which a thing is done or becomes such as we would represent it. With

the accusative, on the other hand, *διά* marks the cause *on account of* which a thing is done or conceived to be done. Thus in Heb. 9: 12 it is properly said: *Χριστός διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια*, for it is the mode in which he entered that is here spoken of. So also it is correctly said in Rev. 12: 11 *ἐνίκησαν τὸν κατήγορον διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν*. Here we are to conceive of them as overcoming out of regard to *τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὸν λόγον*, as if these were the cause on account of which they were impelled to conquer; for they did not regard their own lives, as is immediately subjoined: *οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν, ἄχρι θανάτου*. And although the cause which impelled them to conquer, also gave them strength and power for the victory, yet the mode of conceiving of it in this first relation is different. Here therefore we are to think not only of the efficient cause, which enabled them to overcome, but also of the impelling cause, which induced them to undertake the contest. The case is similar in 1 John 2: 12 *ὅτι ἀγέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*. For if John had written *διὰ τοῦ ὀνομάτος*, we must have supposed *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* to be the efficient cause of the remission of sins; which however is not the meaning of the apostle; and we are to regard them as having obtained remission *on account of*, *for the sake of*, his name. And when it is said John 6: 57 *κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, κακείνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμέ*, we cannot doubt that *διά* denotes not so much the efficient cause, (certainly not that alone,) as the end or object in which the reason of living is to be sought; for as the reason why Christ lived on earth was in the Father who sent him, (since it was the object of his life to fulfil the commands of the Father,) so those live *because of* or *on account of* Christ, who yield obedience to his doctrines.

The same holds true also when *διά* seems to denote the *impulsive* cause, as it is called: as *διὰ φθόνου, διὰ σπλάγγνα ἐλέους θεοῦ*; very similar to which is also John 10: 32 *διὰ ποῖον ἔργον λιθάσετε με*. It is obvious, if he had here said *διὰ ποίου ἔργου*, we must have thought, not on the deed *on account of* which, but on the manner *in* which, they wished to stone him; just as if one should say *διὰ λίθων λιθάσειν*. Here also, then, *διά* denotes not *per*, but *propter*; and is correctly joined with the accusative. On the other hand, in Acts 3: 16 *ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ* is not *πίστις εἰς αὐτόν*, but the *πίστις* of which he is the author and cause. In 2 Pet. 1: 3 *καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς*, it is not he who calls us *to δόξαν καὶ ἀρετήν*, that is

meant ; but he who calls us *through* δόξαν καὶ ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ, ἵνα διὰ τούτων τῆς θείας κοινωνοὶ γύσεως γενώμεθα, v. 4. comp. 1 Pet. 2: 9. For the highest δόξα καὶ ἀρετὴ of God are exhibited in this vocation. Had it been the purpose to direct our attention to the object or end to which they are called, it must have been written διὰ τὴν δόξαν καὶ ἀρετὴν. But the meaning of the formula διὰ δόξης in 2 Cor. 3: 11, is the same as is found in many other instances, where διὰ either denotes the mode in which a thing is done, as διὰ ὑπομονῆς Rom. 8: 23. Heb. 12: 1, and διὰ νόμον κριθήσονται Rom. 2: 12 ; or it indicates the cause through or by which a thing is done, as διὰ τῆς σαρκός Rom. 5: 19. 8: 3, and δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχηκαμεν Rom. 5: 2. comp. v. 1, 11. Hence we understand why Peter could say correctly in 2 Pet. 3: 5, γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ. Here ἐξ ὕδατος signifies that the earth arose out of the water, as if water were the material. This was done δι' ὕδατος, through the efficacy of the water itself, in the omnipotent will of God. What is subjoined in v. 6, δι' ἧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπόλετο, has been rightly interpreted by Markland (ad Lysiam p. 329 ed. Reisk.) in the same manner as a thing is said to be done διὰ τινος, i. e. during the existence of something else ; as in the passage itself of Lysias, γνώριμος γενόμενος διὰ τῆς ἐκείνου δυναστείας, i. e. *durante ejus potestate*. So also in Rom. 2: 27 τὸν διὰ γραμματος καὶ περιτομῆς, and 4: 11 τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας. Lastly in the celebrated passage Rom. 3: 25, Paul has correctly said, that God constituted Christ ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως, (for the ἱλασμός comes through faith,) and has thereby manifested τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν παρέσιν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, i. e. *on account of (propter) the pardon of sins* ; plainly as in Rom. 4: 25 ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶς καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἡμῶν, *on account of pardon and salvation*, or that we might obtain pardon and salvation. As the apostle says in 1 Cor. 8: 2, διὰ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, (i. e. *on account of, or in order to avoid, fornication,*) so also in the above passage he has correctly said : ὁ θεὸς προσέθετο αὐτὸν ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως, εἰς, ἐνδείξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν παρέσιν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ; for this is the end of τῆς δικαιοσύνης, that we may obtain pardon.

These examples suffice to shew, that the sacred writers have observed at least the necessary laws of language with more fidelity than is generally supposed. We pass therefore to the

other species of laws, or those peculiar to the Greek tongue. This topic is a very ample one, and covers, so to speak, the whole *usus loquendi* of that language; and it cannot therefore be expected, that we should here explain every thing in which the interpreters of the New Testament have found a departure from Greek usage. The subject of Greek idioms, for instance, has not yet been so clearly explained and settled, that every idiom may be at once referred to a certain rule; nor so that the causes can every where be assigned, in consequence of which usage has correctly introduced forms and modes of speaking, which are contrary to the grammatical laws. In general, the genius of the Greeks was so active and rapid, that their language abounds in forms and figures of this sort, more than any other; and as these do not rest on the authority of law, and seem often to depend on mere taste or caprice, they render this part of Greek grammar exceedingly difficult, and are regarded by the unskilful as faults. Hence, even the ancient grammarians have sometimes named those forms of speaking *solecisms*, which, when occurring in the best writers, they have called *figures*, *σχήματα*, of the Greek language. And since those who have formed their estimate of that language from the jejune precepts of these grammarians, have of course not understood the nature of these *σχήματα*; they have often regarded the sacred penmen as writing incorrectly, when they have only used the same license which is found in the best Greek authors. The sacred writers duly observe the laws of grammar; but not always the laws of the grammarians. And it is truly said by Apollonius Alexandrinus, *De Constructione Orationis*, III. 2, οὐ δὴ γε θαυμάσει τις ἀλόγους τὰς τοιαύτας συντάξεις εἶναι, τῶν ἑλλογισμωτάτων ἀνδρῶν χρησαμένων, καὶ τοῦ λόγου οὐκ ἐμποδίζοντος· δῆλον οὖν ὡς ἡ κατὰ πολὺ γενομένη σύνταξις ἀπηνέγκαστο τὴν ὀνομασίαν ᾧ λόγῳ καὶ ἄλλα κατὰ πλεον ἐπεκρατήσε. "No one indeed will undertake to call such constructions improper, since they are employed by the most approved writers, and are not contrary to reason. It is manifest, therefore, that the predominant construction has borne off the name, just as other things also prevail by numbers."

Thus, for example, when it is said in the Apocalypse (1: 5, 6) ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός,—καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς· τῷ ἀγαπήσαντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λούσαντι ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς· αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα κ. τ. λ. there seems, at first view, to be almost as many solecisms as there are words. *Sed*

salva res est. We grant, indeed, that this form of apposition is somewhat unusual; and if it had stood ὅς μάργυς, no objection could have been made. As to the solecism which is commonly found in the following words, as if the dative τῷ ἀγαπήσαντι were to be referred to ἀπό, this comes not from the apostle, but from the transcribers. The full sentence is completed with γῆς, and the datives are to be referred to the following αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα; for nothing is more common than the insertion of this pronoun, referring back to the article at some distance before it. There remains then nothing to give offence, except the consecution of the indicative after participles; and there are probably those who hold this to be an error of the apostle. But even this is not without some probable grounds. For since the participle partakes of the nature of an adjective, it is easy to see, that he who says ὁ ἀγαπήσας, means nothing more than *he who loved*; which is the same as if he had said ὅς ἠγάπησεν. There is, therefore, no incongruity, in referring an indicative joined with a participle in the same period, to the same subject; because in both, there is the designation of an adjective or predicate. Nor was it necessary that the ὅς which is implied in the participle, should be repeated before ἐποίησε; since it is necessarily understood. The omission of a word does not render the style incomplete or incongruous, provided it be plainly implied in what is said; neither does a change of case produce this effect, unless there should be no word expressed or implied, which may properly govern one or the other of the cases.

But if there be any thing faulty in figures of this kind, then the writings of the prince of poets swarm with errors; for in Homer such constructions are very frequent. So II. VI. 509, 510.

— ὑποῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χεῖται
ᾧμοις αἴσσονται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς,
ῥίμφα ἢ γοῦνα φέρει —.

“He bears his head aloft, his mane floats around his shoulders; but he, trusting in his beauty, his limbs lightly bear him,” etc.

So also 513, 514.

— ἐβεβήκει
καρχαλόων, ταχέες δὲ πόδες φέρον·

“He advanced exulting, and his swift feet bore him.”

But here follows a passage, in which all the constructions occur, that have given so much offence in the Apocalypse; II. VI. 479 ff.

καὶ ποτέ τις εἶπεν· πατὴρ δ' ὄγε πολλὸν ἀμείνων!
 ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα· γέρονι δ' ἕναρα βροτόεντα,
 κτείννας δῆμιον ἄνδρα.

“And then may some one say, He is far braver than his father, him returning from battle; and may he bring back bloody spoils, having slain a foe.”

In truth, it is the very nature of such figures as these, to render the style, which would otherwise be encumbered by too many words, more adapted to express the ideas. The power of language does not consist alone in this, that the same idea should be excited in the mind of the hearer, which existed in that of the speaker; but also that it should be perceived, and, as it were, felt in the same manner and degree by the former, as it presented itself to the mind of the latter. If now any one will reduce those words of Hector to the rules of syntax, he will at once see, that they express indeed the same ideas, but in a manner far different from that in which those images affected the mind of Hector himself.

Should it now be said, that figures of this sort, in orators and poets, are artificial and objects of research, but are in the apostles undesigned and accidental; it may be replied, that the question is, not what is said with art and study, but what is said correctly. The best writers, whether poets, or orators, or historians, are applauded, not because they have studiously sought for single words and forms; but because they have, as it were naturally and instinctively, written or spoken in the manner which the subject required, and not necessarily in that prescribed by the syntax of the grammarians.

It has also been objected to the sacred penmen, that while different classes of authors usually have characteristics peculiar to themselves, the style of the writers of the New Testament is mixed up from every kind of writing; that while the peculiarities of tragic authors, for instance, are foreign to the style of the orator and historian, in the New Testament all is found mingled together. This representation is not without the appearance of truth; but the objection may be easily removed. For first, the nature of the style of the sacred writers is such, as to approach as near as possible to the common *usus loquendi* of ordinary life. But this *usus*, which governs alike the learned and the unlearned, is of such a nature, that it submits with difficulty to the fetters of syntax, so far as the laws of this latter are not necessary and essential; either because the thoughts are uttered in an unpre-

meditated manner and as rapidly as possible ; or because the mutual interchange of thought does not require or bear, either a multitude of words, nor fulness of construction ; or because, when speaking in the presence of one another, men do not need to express every idea fully in words, since tone, and expression, and gesture can then afford their aid for the full understanding of what is uttered. It is therefore not surprising, that this mixed kind of writing should be found in the New Testament ; and of him who best understands the causes of this style, we should not hesitate to say, that he is the best interpreter of the sacred writers. It is also to be borne in mind, that those peculiar modes of speaking, as they are called, are not so exclusively appropriated to particular classes of writers, but that they may be employed by all those whose minds are affected in the same manner. The modes of expression found in poets, are not peculiar to them merely because their language is regulated by numbers ; but because their thoughts are of such a kind as to require, or best to bear, these modes of expression ; and therefore he who should think the same things in the same manner, might properly apply the same species of language. The sacred writers therefore are not to be censured, because they have promiscuously employed every species of expression, provided only their style has sufficient symmetry and congruity. On this point, it is more difficult to form a judgment than many suppose, who declare that the sacred writers paid no regard to grammatical accuracy, because they appear sometimes to have used middle verbs for passives, or to have erred in some other manner. This last question, however, refers not to the observance of grammatical laws, but to purity of language ; as has been remarked above.

Such then being the result of our inquiries, it follows, that in order that the interpretation of the New Testament may not be left in a state of entire uncertainty, every interpreter should prescribe it as a rule to himself, to pay a strict regard to the nature of the grammatical laws ; and never in any case to depart from them, nor have recourse to Hebraisms, until he clearly sees, that a passage interpreted according to those laws alone, must be despaired of.

ART. VI. PRESENT STATE OF THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE AND
EDUCATION IN ITALY.*

By Augustus Tholuck, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. Translated from the German by the Editor.

It is seldom that any theological intelligence, or theological production, comes over to us from Italy; and this is the less to be wondered at, because in that country itself, there is very little heard or known of new theological publications. The theological works which appear, are usually ascetic writings, homilies, prayerbooks, and the like; sometimes a translation in rhyme of single poetic books of the Old Testament, as e. g. Pacchi's Version of Malachi and the Book of Wisdom; the Marquis Nicolo Grillo Cattaneo's *Proverbia de Salomone*, Genoa 1827; or a confutation of heretics; † or a biblical history; ‡ or finally small antiquarian treatises. But whoever would form an estimate of the catholic church generally, from the freshness, freedom, and spirituality, which she exhibits in some of the German states, would be led into great error. The German depth has there penetrated also the catholic religion and the catholic theology; and the latter has here and there received another and nobler form, than it exhibits in other lands. For the ardent and profound catholicism of a Sailer or Stolberg, the Italians appear to have no perception. The Marquis Carlo Antici at Rome has taken the pains to translate into Italian Stolberg's Ecclesiastical History, Sailer's Homilies, and Sailer's Life of Sambuga; but these works have excited little attention. The trans-

* The following article appeared originally in the *Literarische Anzeiger für christliche Theologie*, etc. of which Prof. Tholuck is editor, and contains some of the results of his personal observation in Italy during the year of his residence at Rome. It is, of course, more particularly adapted to the German reader; but the information contained in it, is of general interest. Ed.

† Difesa contro la falsa dottrina che si contiene nella vita di Scipione de Ricci, data in luce dal Signor de Potter, opera del sacerdote Bartolomeo Giudetti, uno dei curati della cattedrale di Livorno, Lucca 1826.

‡ Dell' Istoria del vecchio e nuovo Testamento, libri dieci di Pellegrino Farini, Ravenna 1827.—Rudone Jesu Christi ne' due Testamenti, Lodi 1827.

lation of Stolberg moreover was not brought to a close; although the Italians pride themselves on Stolberg's conversion to the Roman church.

The Italians, and at the same time their judgement respecting the Germans, cannot better be described than in the words of the merry Abbate in Göthe (*Dichtung und Wahrheit*, II. 1. S. 279): "Che pensa! non deve mai pensar l' uomo, pensando s' invecchia.—Non deve mai fermarsi l'uomo in una sola cosa, perche allora divien matto; bisogna aver mille cose, una confusione nella testa." "What, think! a man must never think, he grows old by thinking.—A man must never stand still in any one thing, for this makes him a fool; he must have a thousand things, a confusion, in his head!" The Englishman and the Frenchman have so often heard of the abstract profundity of the Germans, that they take it for granted. The Italian theologians know something of it also by hearsay; and since the papacy does not like to see its followers go too deep or too far in any thing, there exists always a certain sort of distrust in regard to the works of German catholics; e. g. in reference to the works of Hug, whose learning is moreover well known. Even the works of the French *ultra*, de la Mennais, and of his Italian representative and enthusiastic admirer, the Theatin Pater Ventura, who in his book on ecclesiastical law, and in several pamphlets contends most zealously for the cause of Ultra-Romanism, have by no means received the unconditional approbation of the papal court and higher priesthood. One work of the latter was even prohibited. "Mi pare esser una testa calda," "he seems to be a hot head"—was the remark; in short enthusiasm, show itself where it will, excites suspicion.

The most approbation with the heads of the church is found by a standing formal theology, which moves, without speculation and without mysticism, within the ordinary bounds of the human understanding, and whose highest *ideal* is the *catechismus Romanus*, which certainly in many respects is truly excellent. The deeper theology of an Augustine, or of the schoolmen, is little known. Augustine is even dreaded, as the father of Jansenism. Yet this deeper speculative dogmatic theology has still its friends among the members of the Augustin and Dominican orders, who are chiefly out of good families, and are even now distinguished for their morality and learning. When one beholds on Corpus-Christi day the cohorts of the different orders of monks—the true *milites ecclesiae Romanae*—pass along

in procession, he is ready to say, that even the external appearance of the Augustins recalls to mind *that* Augustin, who has broken the way for the gospel in its purity. The Dominicans study Thomas Aquinas, and fight his battles, because he was a brother of their order. Others in the mean time, and even pious men among the Italian clergy, speak of this study of Thomas Aquinas and of the schoolmen generally, as of a useless rummaging after hairsplitting subtleties. A theologian of learning, as it seems, and of deep thought and warm piety, who undertook some years ago to demonstrate in a speculative manner, that the doctrine of the trinity is consonant with reason, fell on that account into the odour of heresy, or, as others said, of a disordered intellect. So little is the peculiar character and object of the scholastic theology now acknowledged in that church, which owes to the schoolmen in particular, the most plausible defence of her errors, as well as of her truths.

But although theological literature excites in general so little interest, the Italians are nevertheless not wanting in theological journals; of which however only a very small part have the character of reviews. In Alexandria in Piedmont there appears the 'Ecclesiastical Journal,' *Giornale ecclesiastico*; in Florence, the 'Journal of the Apologists of the Catholic Religion,' *il Giornale degli Apologisti della religione cattolica*; in Milan, if the writer does not err, 'The Friend of Italy,' *l'Amico d'Italia*, in imitation of the French ultramontanist* journal *l'Ami de la religion et du roi*. This journal, *l'Amico d'Italia*, had the honour in 1827 of a papal *Breve*, conceived in high terms of praise. In Imola a *Societa de' Calobibliofili* publishes since 1825 a journal in numbers, which contains the best written ultramontanist essays out of other works. Further, in the arch-bigoted Modena also,—whose sovereign, as was mentioned in the public papers, was not long since graciously pleased to require of his subjects the Christian exchange, that they should deliver up all books printed out of Modena, and receive in return the same number of prayerbooks printed in Modena—there appears an ultramontanist journal: *Memorie di religione, di morale*

* The terms *ultramontanist* and *altramontanism* refer here to the efforts made by the catholics, to establish the authority of the church and pope above that of temporal sovereigns. The name comes from the circumstance, that Rome is *ultramontane* to the rest of Europe. Ed.

e di letteratura, which is not badly written, and also contains reviews. These *Memorie* had also received a *Breve* from the late pope, in which it was said, he had not indeed been able to read much in them, but from report, he could not doubt the devotion of the editor *in personam suam et in hanc sanctam sedem*.

But how little interest the Italians have in such literary undertakings, is shown by the case of the *Giornale di Roma*, published several years ago by Pater Ventura, which, although it defended ultramontanism not without skill and with the greatest zeal, found very few readers, even in Rome itself, out of the diplomatic corps, and was given up after two years. Of the other journals also above mentioned, almost nothing is known in Rome, except of that in Modena. No bookseller had ever heard of the journal at Imola, and no one would write for it,—‘there was no trade to Imola.’ To the question, how then it could be obtained, it was replied: “Aye, if you have not a friend there who can send it to you — —.” As the writer once expressed his astonishment to an intelligent Italian clergyman, that no more interest was taken in such periodical works, the answer was: “We Italians have no need of defending our religion; with us no man doubts; but the French must write in behalf of the Christian religion, because with them there are unbelievers.” Not even in regard to the great missionary enterprises of the Roman church, is any information to be found in any Italian journal. When surprise was once expressed on this subject to a scholar of the Propaganda, his *naïve* reply was: “Eh Signore, noi cattolici non parliamo mai da’ nostri meriti,” “O, my dear Sir, we catholics never speak of our merits.” There was here a glance at the many reports respecting protestant missions in English publications. But whether humility is the true ground of this silence on the catholic missions, may well be doubted. Although this silence may in part spring from a certain mental sluggishness, yet, on the other hand, the chief cause would seem to lie in the policy of the Roman church, which has never been friendly to publicity, because its means were not always pure.

The life which still exists in the theology of Italy, is a dim reflection of the French school of Count le Maistre and the Abbé de la Mennais. The best essays in the abovementioned journals, are translations and imitations of French works. So e. g. a well written essay of Ventura in the eighth number of the above mentioned *Memorie*: “On the actual situation of the

public mind in Europe in respect to religion, and on the necessity of propagating good principles by means of the press." The author here attempts to show, in entire accordance with those French zealots, that protestantism leads directly in political matters to anarchy, and in matters of religion to absolute infidelity.

There is however a very small number of Italian theologians, who have struck out another and new course. They have begun to study German, and have made themselves acquainted with German theology; and that too, rather more from protestant, than from catholic writers. It is particularly the philologico-theological works which interest them. In this class Gesenius, Bretschneider, and especially Winer, are well known names. A specimen of this theological tendency lies before us in the learned work: *Horae Syriacae, seu commentationes et anecdota res vel litteras Syriacas spectantia. Auctore Nicolao Wiseman S. T. D. T. I. Romae 1828.* This work clearly shews a thorough acquaintance of the author with the writings of Hug, Bertholdt, Kuinoel, Paulus, Eichhorn, etc. which the papal library Minerva willingly offers to all who have received the 'licenza.' It cannot indeed be said, that the learning of the author has been here applied in the most important way, nor that his contributions from unprinted sources are adapted to attract attention in any high degree.* In the mean time, the second part of this work (of which only Part I. is yet published) will contain, it is said, subjects of much greater interest, an astrological document of the Sabians or Christians of St. John, extracts from the Palestine-Syriac version in the Vatican Codex used by Adler, etc. Mr. Wiseman was born in Spain of English parents, and is now rector of the English college at Rome, where from twenty to thirty young Englishmen are preparing for the service of the English catholic church. He is also agent for the whole catholic church in England and North America. He is still a young man, between thirty and forty years of age, distinguished for his modesty,

* The author, among other things, gives himself the thankless trouble of circumstantially refuting Horne, the author of the English Introduction to the New Testament, who probably did not himself understand Syriac, and had asserted that the Redeemer, at the institution of the last supper, said *this is my body* etc. only because it could not be said in Syriac, *this signifies* etc.

civility, and tolerance; and has inspired his pupils with such interest for the study of the German, that the greater part of them learn it. German is also studied in the Scotch and Irish colleges. Even the names of Kant, Herder, Jacobi, Fichte, Herbart, are familiar to some of these young men. One of them once mentioned, in conversation with the writer, the schoolman Occam. As the writer knew how little the schoolmen are studied in Italy, he asked with surprise, if he had read Occam. 'No,' he replied, 'I know him only through Tennemann.' A catholic theologian in Italy, who knows Occam from our good Tennemann, is truly a rare phenomenon!—Some of the native Italians have also followed this example of the Britons. In a theological work belonging to an Italian clergyman, the writer found a written motto out of Göthe's Faust!

The study of scriptural interpretation is that among all other theological studies, which most lies fallow among the catholic theologians of Italy and France. The notes to the Italian version of the Bible by Martini, some translations of earlier French commentaries, and at most Calmet, constitute the usual apparatus. Those theologians who are now acquainted with the German exegesis, especially the English, to whom also English commentaries are accessible, exert themselves likewise to promote the study of interpretation. While formerly in the theological schools of Italy, exegesis occurred only by way of explanation of the *dicta probantia* or proof-texts, to which the dogmatic manuals referred; we now find here and there books of the Holy Scriptures explained in course. Kuinoel and Rosenmüller are the best known and approved among the commentators.

The advancement of the study of theology, is connected with the advancement of the sciences generally; and in regard to these, the late pope Leo XII. unquestionably deserves great praise. He took a great and real interest in the sciences; and proved this in his celebrated *Regolamento degli studj* of Aug. 28, 1824. His merits in the reorganization of the Roman university, are also so generally acknowledged by the Romans, that the proud canopy which arose to his honour in St. Peter's, with the glimmer of thousands of tapers, while it showed him on the one side as he opened the closed door of St. Peter in the year of jubilee, exhibited him on the other as he opened and established the Roman university. Inasmuch as little is known in foreign countries, in regard to the new system of education in the papal states, and especially respecting the Roman univer-

sity, it may be worth while here to describe the arrangements, as they exist since the regulation of 1824. It will thence appear, that if in that country the administration of the universities corresponded fully to their constitution, the state of literature and the sciences would not indeed be equal to that in Germany, but still would not remain so far behind it, as is now the case; when the power of custom and of long established usage, either does not suffer new and better arrangements to be introduced, or else renders them, when introduced, immediately ineffectual.

There exists a *Congregazione degli studj*, by which all matters relative to study are directed. To this congregation belong the Cardinal, Secretary of State, the Camerlengo or Chamberlain of the Roman church, the Vicar of Rome, the Prefetto dell' indice, who makes out the catalogue of prohibited books, and several other cardinals. A legate from this congregation visits now and then the literary establishments. The ecclesiastical states have two principal universities, the archgymnasium at Rome, and the university of Bologna. In each of these there are said to be not less than thirty-eight professorships. Universities of the second rank are at Ferrara, Perugia, Camerino, Macerata, and Fermo;—in each of them at least seventeen professorships. These universities cannot bestow degrees, without a previous visitation on the part of the 'sacra congregazione.' The number of chairs, and the subjects which are to be lectured upon, are printed by each university, and cannot be altered.

The office of archchancellor is held at Rome by the cardinal chamberlain; in Bologna, by the archbishop. These archchancellors have jurisdiction over all offences, which occur within the bounds of the universities. Only crimes of a higher nature, are referred to the ordinary courts. Each university has a rector, whose duty it is to watch over the discipline, religion, and morals of the professors and students. The rector makes out the catalogue of lectures. He remains in the university so long as the lectures continue, and notes every professor who does not fulfil his duty. In each university are four *colleges*, corresponding to the four faculties, which have functions *in examinibus*, in the choice of professors, and in the bestowment of degrees. They are, as it were, the mediators between the universities and the sacred congregation, to which they make report when required. To the theological college (or faculty) in Rome, belong regularly, among others, the commissary of

the Holy Office (Inquisition), the general procurators of the Dominicans, Augustines, Carmelites, etc.

It was formerly the case, that professors received their places regularly through favoritism; and sometimes the professorships were even regarded as an honorable provision for invalids of merit. That in this respect the late pope introduced a new order of things, deserves particular acknowledgement; although the trial of the professors, established by him, is by far too much after the school-boy fashion; and besides, it must be remarked, that according to report, even in spite of this mode of proceeding, notwithstanding it was directed particularly against the system of favoritism, the old and established usage has at length triumphed, and favoritism has again assumed its sway. The new arrangement consists only in this, that henceforth every professorship shall be open to competitors. The candidates shall come together in the chambers of the library, and here, with closed doors and within six hours, write a Latin composition on one of thirty themes laid before them. Then follows an oral examination in Latin; and afterwards the archchancellor, rector, and college proceed to the choice. This competition, however, does not take place for the theological professorships in the university at Rome. And generally speaking, an exception is made from such a trial, when a candidate has distinguished himself in some other way, and particularly by any learned work. But in such cases the pope chooses alone.

Every professor must use a printed synopsis, which he explains during the first half hour; the other half hour is spent in questioning and exercising the students. In reference to religion and morals, he receives prescripts from the sacred congregation, which he may not exceed. In case of sickness he must give the rector notice, and send his deputy in his place. Each faculty, namely, has an extraordinary professor, who in cases of sickness takes the place of the ordinary ones; he has the same privileges as the others, but no salary. Each university has a library, an observatory, a museum, and a botanic garden. Each has also its beadles. The revenues are managed by the rector. The university year is divided into three terms or trimesters. Each professor keeps a book, in which all his pupils inscribe their names. In banishing students from the university, the rector cannot act alone; but others must also give their votes. No student is permitted to loiter up and down in the university building, either before or after the lectures;

nor to attend any other lectures than those which he has regularly commenced. Each university has its church or oratory. Every trimester is begun and closed with public worship. They sing: "Veni creator spiritibus—deus qui corda fidelium—deus omnium fidelium pastor." It would be well, were this custom imitated in protestant universities. Mass is read every day. On Sundays and festival days, the students meet in the oratory, listen first for half an hour to the reading of some pious book, and afterwards to a sermon. During the fast of Lent, the students subject themselves annually to certain exercises,—solitude, fasting, prayer, and corporeal penance. Whoever withdraws himself from these religious exercises, or exhibits an habitual want of a devotional spirit, is cut off.

In respect to the conferring of degrees, the student, after the completion of the first year, and after examination, receives the first or Bachelor's degree; and after a course of three years, and regular examination, that of Licentiate. Whoever will obtain the degree of Doctor in Theology, must for two years at least have heard lectures on the Holy Scriptures and ecclesiastical history. This degree of Doctor of Theology is conferred publicly and with the greatest solemnity; sometimes even the pope himself is present, in order to increase the splendor. This took place in 1827 at the promotion of a young Irishman, Cullen, a member of the Propaganda. The young *doctorandus* had given out no less than 224 theses, of which the following are specimens: Thesis 165. *Religio Christiana, ubi primum praedicari coepit, singulari prorsus celeritate propagata est.* 166. *Hujus autem propagationis adjuncta fuerunt ejusmodi, ut inique et ignorantur faciant, qui Mohammedanismi et Lutheranismi progressus cum ea comparant.* 182. *Gravissime falluntur illi (Basnage, Mosheim, Voltaire) qui negant, Constantinum bellum Maxentio inferentem crucis signum coelitus objectum vidisse.* 183. *Quae vero J. A. Fabricius (Exercitatio crit. de hac re, Hamb. 1704. Biblioth. Graecae Vol. VI. 1, 5.) protulit argumenta, minime probant visionem illam naturalibus causis esse adscribendam.* 224. *Est etiam falsa Villersii sententia, qua statuitur, progressus, quos proxime elapsis saeculis scientiae et literae humaniores in Europa habuerunt, Lutheri, quam vocant, reformatione acceptos referri oportere.*—The first theses defended the genuineness of the Pentateuch, Daniel, the first chapter of Matthew, the Apocalypse, as also the divine

origin and authority of the Apocrypha. Reference was also had to works written in German, as Lessing, Eichhorn, etc.

ART. VII. LITERARY NOTICES.

By the Editor.

It is not the intention of the Editor in the present article, nor in future articles of the same character, to give a *complete* view either of literary intelligence in general, or even of that which relates more particularly to Theology. His plan embraces only notices of the more important works which shall from time to time appear; so as to keep the theological scholar well informed (so far as it lies in the Editor's power) not only as to the actual state of literature and science, but also in regard to works which may hereafter be expected. Of course, works on biblical literature will constitute the first and chief object of attention.

I. Literature of the Old Testament.

1. *Hebrew Bibles.* Among the great variety of Hebrew Bibles, the student is often perplexed which to choose; and while he wishes to obtain one which shall combine excellence with cheapness, he is most commonly obliged to sacrifice one of these points, and either gratify his taste at the expense of his purse, or, if compelled to be economical, he must put up with an edition which he would not otherwise have chosen. The most beautiful edition of the Hebrew Bible yet published, though not the most correct, is that of *Van der Hooght*, Amsterd. 1705. It is now rare, and bears in proportion a very high price. That of *Michaelis*, Halle 1720, is the most correct edition, and at present the cheapest of all, the price having been reduced not many years since. But the type is bad and unpleasant to the eye; and it is moreover encumbered by marginal notes and references to such a degree, as to make it inconvenient for common use. *Jahn's* edition is valuable, because it gives the books of Kings and Chronicles in a sort of Harmony, and exhibits the Psalms divided into *στίχοι* according to the parallelism; but for this very reason it should not be the scholar's *only* Hebrew Bible. It is moreover, now out of print. The reprint of Van der

Hooght in London has no special value, except that of comparative cheapness. The same may be said of the edition of *Simonis*, several times reprinted at Halle, and recently under the superintendence of Rosenmüller. This is now the cheapest Hebrew Bible, with the exception of that of Michaelis; but the type, and especially the points, are bad.

Under these circumstances it may interest Hebrew scholars to know, that Mr. Tauchnitz, the celebrated printer in Leipzig, has a new edition in the press, which he intends to make superior to all others, so far as correctness and beauty are concerned. It is a stereotype edition; and the utmost pains are taken, both by the ordinary proof-readers, and by a Jewish Rabbi employed for this very purpose, to make it perfectly correct. The type is beautiful; being almost entirely of the same character and form as that in Professor Stuart's *Chrestomathy*, though of a larger size. The work is superintended by Prof. Hahn, who gives a revision of the text, with the necessary various readings. Mr. Tauchnitz informed the writer, that the retail price of the work would not exceed $4\frac{1}{2}$ rix dollars in sheets, or about \$3,25. From this price a large discount is usually made. The edition is expected to appear at the great Leipzig fair in April next.—The writer also learned at the Orphan-house in Halle, that a new edition of *Simonis'* Bible would soon be necessary, which would be printed with a new and beautiful type.

2. *Hebrew Lexicons of Gesenius.* The first Hebrew Lexicon of this author appeared in Hebrew and German, in two volumes octavo, in 1810—12. This was intended at the time to be a complete critical dictionary of the Hebrew tongue. An abstract of this work by the author was afterwards published, under the title of a *Manual Hebrew Lexicon*, of which three editions have appeared, the last in 1828. For several years past, as is generally known, Gesenius has been making preparations for a full and complete *Thesaurus* of the Hebrew language, in Hebrew and Latin, to be published in quarto, and intended to go down to posterity as the chief labour and memorial of his life. The first three letters of the alphabet were completed and printed so long ago as in April 1827; since which time various other avocations, and perhaps a modification of some of his views through the labours of Ewald and Winer, have caused a suspension of the work. In the interval, however, he has brought out the third edition of his *Manual Lexicon*,

and is now occupied with a fourth edition of it in Hebrew and Latin, the printing of which is already far advanced. This may be regarded as an abstract of the yet unprinted *Thesaurus*; inasmuch as he collects materials for the latter, from which materials the article for the former are made out. That is to say, the Manual contains the *results* of his investigations, while the larger work will contain sometimes the investigations themselves, at other times the results in a more extended form. The Manual is expected to be ready at the next Leipsic fair. The retail price of the German one is about \$3 bound; that in Latin will probably not cost much more.

The *Thesaurus*, so far as printed, after lying in the printer's loft for three years, was at length published as the first number in January last. In a notice on the cover the following points are specified by the author, as forming the chief characteristics of the work: (1) That being intended for scholars and not for beginners, the work is arranged in the etymological order, while the manuals are in alphabetical order. (2) That all the proper names are included and illustrated. (3) That in quoting the passages in which a word is found, in general *all* such passages are given, unless where the number is great and the citation of them would be unimportant. (4) That where the author differs from the received opinion, or sometimes from himself, the reasons are given at length, in order to avoid the charge of rashness, which is often made, e. g. against J. D. Michaelis. (5) That in the citation of authorities reference is more frequently had to the *older* interpreters, and every where, as much as possible, to the ultimate sources.

The number published comprises, as is said above, the first three letters of the alphabet. There are to be three more numbers. The work is printed on paper of two kinds; the one at *three* rix dollars the number, and the other at *four*. The retail price of the whole work therefore will be about \$8,50 and \$11,50. This work is of so much importance to all lovers of Hebrew literature, that it seems not improper to insert here a specimen of it; and the article *בְּדָה* *to weep* is selected for that purpose on account of its brevity, rather than because of any particular merit. It is here printed line for line, *verbatim et literatim*.

בְּדָה fut. *בְּדָה* convers. *בְּדָה* *flevit*. (Ita in omnibus linguis dialectisque cognatis, ut chald. syr. sam. nator. arab. aethiop. melit.). Usurpatur tam de puero

vagiente Exod. II, 6, quam de viro lacrimas fundente Gen. XLIII, 31. 2 Sam. XIX, 2, saepissime de populo in publicis calamitatibus lamentante Num. XI, 10. XXV, 6. 2 Sam. XV, 23. Jes. XXX, 19, spec. de poenitentibus, supplicanti- bus et publico luctu Esr. X, 1. Zach. VII, 3 (coll. 5). Iudd. XX, 26. Constr. c. acc. et valet *deflevit, luxit* aliquem, maxime mortuum. Gen. XXIII, 2. XXXVII, 35. L, 3. Lev. X, 6. Deut. XXI, 13, it. sepu. זל personae vel rei, quam deploramus, lugemus Thren. I, 16. Iudd. XI, 37 : זל-בְּחַוְלַתִּי זל-בְּבִקְבָה *deplorabo aetatem meam virgineam* sc. tam mature devovendam ; sequ. זל 2 Sam. I, 24. Ezech. XXVII, 31 et זל Jer. XXII, 10. Iob. XXX, 25.— זל sequ. זל praeterea valet : lamentatus est *adversus* aliquem, *lamentando adiit* eum Num. XI, 13. Iudd. XIV, 16 ; et *flevit super* aliquo i. e. in amplexu eius, lacrimis eum rigans. Gen. XLV, 15 : *osculatus est fratres suos* זל זל *et lacrimis eos rigavit.* L, 1.

Pi. deflevit, luxit mortuum Jer. XXXI, 15. Ezech. VIII, 14.

זל m. *fletus* Esr. X, 1.

זל in Pausa זל, c. Suff. זל m. 1) id. (Syr. זל) Gen. XLV, 2. Jes. XV, 3: XXII, 4 cet. Spec. de luctu Deut. XXXIV, 8. זל זל זל *eiulatum magnum edidit* 2 Sam. XIII, 36. Jes. XXXVIII, 3. זל זל זל *fletus acerbissimus* Jer. XXXI, 15. — 2) *stillatio, lacrimatio* aquae in metallifodiis Iob. XXVIII, 11. Ita *flere pro rorare, stillare* ap. Lucret. 1, 350, *δάκρυον lacrima* de guttis, quae ex plantis emanant (cf. זל).

Cf. זל et זל זל זל puteus flens i. e. rorans, tenui aqua praeditus (Schult. ad h. l.).

זל (flentes) n. pr. loci prope Gilgal. Iudd. II, 1. 5.

זל f. *fletus, luctus.* Gen. XXXV, 8 : זל זל זל *quercus luctus.* Cod. Sam. זל, cf. L, 4.

זל f. id. Gen. L, 4.

3. *The Prophet Isaiah, translated by W. Gesenius, Ed. 2.* Leips. 1829. This is a new edition of the translation alone, without the commentary; the sale of the former having been more rapid than that of the latter. The version every where bears marks of the file; and the author has bestowed particular attention upon the rendering of the particles, and of the frequent instances of Paronomasia. A few notes are appended at the end, explaining the reasons of some changes in this edition.

4. *A Translation of the Psalms, with a Commentary, by W. M. L. De Wette, Ed. 3.* Heidelb. 1829. De Wette may be justly regarded as possessing more taste, than any of the German scholars of the day; and his version of the Psalms stands preeminent above all others. The commentary is brief, but valuable for its taste and philology. The third edition has every where received the improvements, which suggested themselves to the author's mind in the progress of his studies.

5. *Rosenmuelleri Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, Pars IX. Scripta Salomonis complectens. Vol. 1. Proverbia.* Leips. 1829. The commentary on the book of Proverbs is at length published, and is to be followed by the books of Ecclesiastes and Canticles. This part is of the same general character as the preceding parts. When Part IX. shall have been completed, the commentaries of this author will cover the whole of the Old Testament, excepting the historical books which follow the Pentateuch, and the book of Daniel.

It is already perhaps generally known that a young scholar, under the supervision of Rosenmüller himself, is making a *Compendium* of his multitudinous volumes. Thus the Scholia on the Pentateuch, which fill three volumes, are here reduced to one; which is all that is yet published. This compendium will of course be much better adapted to American students than the original; since it contains all the results, without the discussions and interminable prolixity of the larger work.

II. Literature of the New Testament.

1. *Novum Testamentum Graece. Textum ad fidem testium criticorum recensuit, lectionum familias subjecit, e Graecis codicibus manuscriptis, qui in Europae et Asiae bibliothecis reperiuntur fere omnibus, e versionibus antiquis, conciliis, sanctis Patribus et Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis quibuscumque vel primo vel iterum collatis copias criticas addidit, atque conditionem horum*

testium criticorum historiamque textus Novi Testamenti in prolegomenis fusiùs exposuit, praeterea Synaxaria codicum KM 262, 274 typis exscribenda curavit Dr J. Mart. Augustinus Scholz. Vol. I. IV Evangelia complectens.

The whole of this long title is here given, because it exhibits the whole of Dr Scholz's plan in regard to his edition of the New Testament. The work is finely printed in quarto, on good paper; and the first volume contains 172 pages of Prolegomena, and 496 pages of text. Dr S. has now been twelve years occupied with this great work. His first object was to obtain materials; and for this purpose he visited in person the libraries of Paris, Vienna, Munich, Landshut, Berlin, Trèves, London, Geneva, Turin, Florence, Venice, Parma, Rome, Naples, of the Greek monasteries at Jerusalem, of St. Saba, and the isle of Patmos; and collated, either wholly or in great part, all the manuscripts of the New Testament which are to be found in all those libraries in Greek, Latin, Arabic, etc. comparing them with the text of Griesbach. He professes also to have gone through most of the ancient versions anew, and to have subjected to a new examination all the passages quoted in the fathers and in the acts of councils. Besides these he has also employed the collations, made public by others, of manuscripts in the libraries of England, Ireland, the Escurial, Copenhagen, Franckfort, Dresden, Leipsic, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Hungary, etc.

The Prolegomena contain a history of the text, and a description and critical estimation of all the various sources of authority. The text is accompanied, in the inner margin, by the *families* of readings, as he calls them, that is, the general readings found in the three great families or classes of manuscripts, the Constantinopolitan, Alexandrine, and Occidental or the *textus receptus*. The outer margin gives the more detailed specifications.

Such is the general plan of this immense work, which, it is easy to see, transcends the powers of any one man, let him be even Griesbach himself, and live to twice the number of his years. It is also obvious that the *collations* mentioned above, must have been exceedingly rapid and cursory; and probably no future critics will be disposed to place much reliance upon them. Indeed, it was the general impression of the protestant critics in Germany, such as Neander and Wegscheider, and all those who lie between these two extremes, that little solid advance in bib-

lical criticism was to be expected from this work. Since the publication of it, however, no notice of it has reached us from that land of critics.

2. *Novum Testamentum Graece, recognovit G. C. Knapp.* Editio IV. Halae 1829. This new edition of Knapp's Greek Testament is probably more correct than the third; as it was revised with very great care, by the same scholar who corrected the sheets of the new edition of Griesbach. The additions at the end are also arranged in a more convenient form.

3. *Commentaries on the New Testament.* The commentary of *Kuinoel* remains still the best on the historical books; although even *Wegscheider* reproaches him for his indecision and hesitancy between orthodoxy and rationalism. The work contains a treasure of philological and historical illustration.—*Fritzsche* of Rostock has published a second volume, comprising the Gospel of Mark. He has adopted the grammatical method, which he urges to an extreme.—A commentary on the whole of the New Testament is in progress by *Olshausen* of Königsberg, who is mentioned by Professor Halin on p. 132 of this work. The friends of religion in Germany are looking forward to it with interest.—A commentary on the Epistles and Apocalypse, intended as a continuation of *Kuinoel*, is announced by *Schott* of Jena and *Winzer* of Leipsic, but no portion of it has yet appeared.—A selection of commentaries on particular books, is more easy. *Kuinoel* is about to publish on Corinthians. Mr *Tauchnitz* informed the writer that he was to print the work, and expected the manuscript shortly. This was in April last. *Heydenreich*, an evangelical man, has also published on these, and on the pastoral Epistles. The latter work, especially, is highly spoken of in Prof. *Tholuck's* Journal. *Winer* on Galatians is popular and valuable for its philology. From evangelical men we have the commentary of *Lücke* on the writings of John, the two last volumes of which are in a different and better style and spirit than the first; *Tholuck* on the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Romans, the last of which was described to the writer by *De Wette* as the best extant, while the former is more adapted to the wants of younger students; *Rheinwald* on Philippians, with a preface by *Neander*; and *Pelt* on Thessalonians; not to mention the various works of *Flatt*, which have been published from his manuscripts, and which are judicious rather than profound. *Boehmer* of Griefswalde has also recently published an Introduction

to the Epistle to the Colossians ; as also *Bleek* of Bonn an Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is to be followed by a Commentary. On this epistle, however, we do not need to look to foreign lands. The Epistle of James has found a commentator in *Gebser* of Königsberg, whose present work is to be followed by a general Introduction.

4. *Hermeneutics of the writers of the New Testament.* "Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller, von Dr. J. C. C. Döpke, 1r Th. Leipz. 1829." Such is the title of a work, in which the author's object is to investigate and present the external form of the quotations from the Old Testament, as well as the mode of applying and interpreting these quotations, in the writings of the New Testament. The present part treats of the point of view from which Christ and the apostles have considered the Old Testament ; of the usual *formulae* of quotation both in the New Testament and in Jewish writers ; of the Jewish mode of interpretation, the nature, origin, and application of allegorical interpretation ; and at last, of the character of the Old Testament quotations in the particular books of the New Testament. The second part is intended to treat of the mode of interpretation adopted by the writers of the New Testament, so far as it regards the Messiah, types, and the practical application of religious truth. The work is distinguished by learning and talent.

III. Systematic Theology.

1. *System of Christian Faith according to the principles of the Evangelical Church.* "Der christliche Glauben nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche, von F. Schleiermacher, Berl. 1830." The first edition of this work had been long out of print, when the piratical press at Rutlingen in Würtemberg sent out a reprint, and thus in a manner compelled the author to set about a new edition. In the 'Theologische Studien' for 1829 are two long letters from him, explanatory of his views in regard to the undertaking. The work itself, in the new edition, has not yet been received in this country.

2. *System of Christian Faith.* "Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, von A. Hahn, Leipz. 1828." This is a plain and simple statement of the general system of doctrines of the evangelical church, with the grounds of them. It is particularly valuable from the fact, that it gives under each topic a full view

of the literature, historical, illustrative, etc. It is needless to say, that it is written in a spirit of candour and piety.

3. *Examination of the Plan projected by the Founder of Christianity for the good of mankind, by F. V. Reinhard; a new edition by Prof. Heubner of Wittenberg, Wittenb. 1830.* "Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christlichen Religion zum Besten der Menschheit entwarf." We rejoice to see a new edition of this work (the fifth) with additions from the pen of Heubner a worthy successor of Luther. The object of the work is to shew that the plan projected by Jesus, surpasses in benevolence and extent every thing else of the kind ever projected; and that it bears the impress of the superiority and dignity of the greatest mind, that ever thought and acted upon earth. It is divided into three parts, the first of which gives a short sketch of the plan of Jesus; the second shows that none of the sages of antiquity had ever before projected a similar plan; and the third draws the conclusion, that Jesus must have been an extraordinary person and a teacher sent from God. To this edition are appended several notes found among the posthumous papers of the author; and Professor Heubner himself has also enriched it with notes of a historical, exegetical, and explanatory character, and added an appendix of nearly two hundred pages; all of which much enhance the value of the work. Reinhard, the author, was court-preacher at Dresden, and is well known as one of the most popular and eloquent divines that Germany has produced. This work has been already translated into several languages, and it affords us pleasure to hear, that it is now in the course of translation in this country, and will be published by Messrs. Carvill of New York.

IV. Oriental Literature.

1. *Oriental Translation Committee.* It is already known to most of the readers of this work, that a fund was established a few years since in London, and a committee appointed, whose special object it is to procure and publish translations of works written in the various oriental languages. The extent of the plan is best stated in the Prospectus, from which we here quote the part which relates particularly to theology.

"The advantages likely to be derived from a more extensive cultivation of Oriental literature in this country, may be considered as applicable to Biblical Criticism, Ecclesiastical and General

History, Biography, Belles-Letters, the Arts and Sciences, and Geography.

“With reference to Biblical Criticism and Ecclesiastical History, we know that the sacred Scriptures, particularly those of the Old Testament, abound in modes of expression, and allusions to customs, in many cases imperfectly understood in Europe, but still prevailing in the East. That light confessedly derived from the Arabic and other sister dialects of the Hebrew, has been thrown on the text of Scripture, by the rabbinical and other commentators, few will deny; yet volumes of Arabic Grammar, Rhetoric and the more ancient productions of the Arabian poets, which approach most nearly in style and sentiments to some parts of the Hebrew Bible, still lie in MS. in our libraries, either entirely neglected, or at best accessible to few.

“In the Syriac language, which approximates still nearer than the Arabic to the Hebrew in its form and modes of expression, there are in our libraries unpublished Grammars and Dictionaries, and even Commentaries on the Scriptures, written by the Bishops and other learned members of the Oriental Churches, together with MS. works of the greatest value to Divines, on Ecclesiastical History and Divinity, composed by the fathers of the Syrian and Arabian Churches. The collection also of the late Mr. Rich, now placed in the British Museum by the liberality of Parliament, contains perhaps the most valuable MSS. of the Syriac Scriptures now in existence; and it is of the greatest importance to Biblical criticism that a collation of them should be made and published.

“Perhaps no people possess more extensive stores of History, Biography, and Polite Literature, than the Arabs and Persians. The accounts which their historical and biographical works contain of their own and the surrounding countries, are necessarily the principal sources from which information can be obtained relative to the history of those regions, and of the extraordinary persons to whom they have given birth. Their histories of the Crusades in particular, which furnish the most authentic details on this interesting subject, will always amuse and instruct the general reader, while they furnish materials of the greatest importance to the historian. In Polite Literature, and especially in works of fiction, they have perhaps never been excelled, and in studying such of their works in Belles-Letters as have been already printed in any European language; regret must be felt that but few of these books, which are so well calculated to afford us pleasure, have been translated.”

The Committee have already caused to be published several works of value. Among these are the following.

Travels of Ibn Batuta, translated by Prof. Lee of Cambridge, which, "though only an abridgement of the travels of the Mohammedan Marco Polo of the fourteenth century, gives an accurate idea of the extent and interest of the complete work, which is not to be found in any library in Europe."

Travels of Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, written by his attendant Archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic, translated by F. C. Belfour, Esq. This work "furnishes many curious details relating to the ceremonies of the Greek Church."

History of the Afghans, translated from the Persian by Dr Dorn, which "not only gives the history of the mountain tribes of Afghanistan, whose conquests have spread far east and west of that region, but also contains very curious traditions connected with Scripture history."

The following works, among many others, are also announced as preparing for publication.

The great Geographical work of Edrisi, translated by the Rev. G. C. Renouard. This Arabic work was written A. D. 1153, to illustrate a large silver globe made for Roger, King of Sicily, and is divided into the seven climates described by the Greek geographers.

A Collation of all the Syriac Manuscripts of the New Testament, both Nestorean and Jacobite, that are accessible in England, by Professor Lee.

The Annals of Elias, Metropolitan of Nisibis; translated by the Rev. Josiah Forshall, A. M. This Syriac work contains chronological tables of the principal dynasties of the world, brief memoirs of the patriarchs of the Nestorian Church, and notices of the most remarkable events of the east, from the birth of our Saviour to the beginning of the eleventh century.

A History of Georgia, translated by J. de Klaproth. This will be preceded by Vakhtang's chronicle of events that occurred in Georgia, prior to the introduction of Christianity into that country.

A Description of Thibet; translated by J. de Klaproth. This will consist of extracts from various Chinese and Mandchu works, forming a complete account of Thibet, and of the Buddha religion, of which it is the principal seat.

Ibn Khaldun's History of the Berbers, translated by Prof. Lee. This is a rare and valuable Arabic work, containing an account of the origin, progress, and decline of the dynasties which governed the northern coast of Africa. The Berbers are

supposed to be the direct descendants of the ancient Numidians.

The *History of Vartan, King of Armenia*, translated by Prof. Neumann. This work contains an account of the religious wars between the Persians and Armenians in the sixth century, and many important documents relating to the religion of Zoroaster. It is written in the purest classical Armenian by Elisaeus, who was an eye-witness of many of the events he relates.

A writer in the *Literatur-Zeitung* of Halle, in giving an account of the labours of this society, urges strongly upon the committee the propriety of publishing also the original text of the works translated; and more particularly the text of original Syriac grammars and lexicons, as also Syriac commentaries on the Bible.

2. *Study of Oriental Literature at St. Petersburg.* The savans of Russia are beginning to awake to the importance of these studies; and the close connexion of the Russian empire with Turkey and Persia gives them facilities which are unknown to other countries. A plan was recently on foot to annex a *Faculty or Section of Oriental languages* to the university of St. Petersburg, to consist of eleven professors, who were to teach twelve different oriental tongues, and be assisted by the requisite number of native teachers. It is not known whether this plan has yet been carried into effect.

During the last campaign against Persia also, the Russians were not unmindful of the treasures of oriental literature which fell in their way. Having got possession of Ardebil, they made no scruple to carry away the celebrated library of the Mausoleum of Sheikh Sefy at that place; and leaving to the mosque only the theological works which it contained, they transferred the rest, as good booty, to the royal library at St. Petersburg. Of these there are 96 different manuscript works, all in Persian, and generally speaking highly valuable. Eighteen of these works are historical; the remainder consist principally of poetry. They are all distinguished for the beauty of the writing, and are most splendidly bound, with borders, vignettes, paintings, etc. The greater part of them are bequests of Shah Abbas the Great, A. D. 1608. Professors Frähn and Charmoy, and Mirza Jafar are preparing a splendid catalogue of the whole collection.

3. *G. W. Freytagii Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, praesertim ex Djeuharii, Firuzabadiique et aliorum Arabum operibus,*

adhibitis Golii quoque et aliorum libris, confectum. Accedit Index Vocum Latinarum locupletissimus. Tomus Primus, —
 ٢

Hal. Sax. MDCCCXXX. A truly welcome present this, to all who interest themselves for Arabic literature! So all will acknowledge, who have themselves experienced the difficulty of obtaining books for the study of this noble language. A Golius was very rarely to be met with even in Europe, and if found could usually not be bought under from \$50 to \$80; Meninsky and Castell cost nearly as much; besides the inconvenience of arrangement which characterizes them, and renders it so laborious to consult them; Willmet and Scheid are both very rare, and cover only a few particular books; and besides these there are only the meagre Glossaries appended to different Chrestomathies, the best of which are those of Oberleitner and Kosegarten. But here we have a work, which places the Arabic language in this respect almost on a level with the Greek and Latin. The author's first plan was to give a new edition of Golius, with corrections and additions; but he soon found reason to make a new work of his own, founded on the celebrated Arabic lexicons of Djeuhari and Firuzabad, the last of which is more commonly known as the *Camoos* or *Ocean*. The work is most beautifully printed in quarto, on good paper; and the retail price of Vol. I. containing 544 pages, is 20 rix-dollars, or between \$14 and \$15. The whole work is expected to be completed in two volumes.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. II.

APRIL, 1831.

ART. I.—THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

By the Editor.

PART II. *Course of Study at the Universities.*

WE have seen in the former part of this article, that teachers in the universities and all those who engage in the practice of the various professions in Germany, are directly or indirectly dependent on the governments of the respective states, not only for actual employment, but also even for the previous license or permission to enter upon any profession or course of life. So far as it regards our present subject, all those who desire to become teachers of theology in the universities, or pastors of churches, have to submit themselves to various examinations required by the government, before they can make any application for employment in either of these capacities. Those who are preparing to become preachers, have also to pay attention to the subject of *Pädagogik*, or the science of school-keeping; inasmuch as every pastor is *ex officio* required to inspect and superintend the school or schools within his jurisdiction. To enable the reader the better to understand the several steps and gradations of this ministerial preparation in Germany, it will be proper here to exhibit a brief outline of the constitution of the German churches, and thus shew the manner in which the civil power directs and controls all the internal as well as external regulations, and all the movements, of the ecclesiastical community. In doing this, we shall chiefly advert to the present system

No. II.

26

of the Prussian government, as the most extensive and complete; premising only that the description will apply *mutatis mutandis* to all the other states of protestant Germany.

In Prussia (as also in France) the whole subject of ecclesiastical affairs, public instruction, and the profession of medicine, is assigned to a particular department of the government, called the *Ministerium der geistlichen, Unterrichts-und Medicinal-Angelegenheiten*, the head of which takes rank with the other ministers of the crown. This ministry, or rather department of the ministry, has the direct and entire charge of all ecclesiastical matters; controls the consistories in the several provinces and appoints all the members of them; and, either immediately or through the consistories and other subordinate branches of the government, appoints or confirms to all vacant ecclesiastical places or parishes. It has also the entire charge and control of all the universities, gymnasia, and other seminaries of learning of every species; appoints all the professors and instructors of every kind; and if it does not itself appoint the village schoolmasters, it fixes at least the necessary qualifications, without which no one can be permitted to become a candidate even for that humble office. The minister, of course, represents the king, and acts only in the king's name; and it is therefore through him and his department, that all rewards are bestowed in these several branches of the body politic; whether consisting in an increase of salary, or in promotion, or what is more frequently the case, in the bestowment of some title or appellation of honour, a strong love for which is a predominating characteristic among all classes of the German community.

For the purposes of its civil administration, Prussia is divided into *ten* provinces. These again are subdivided into districts, varying in number according to the size of the provinces. In each province there is a government, having in some respects jurisdiction over the whole province. In each district there is also a government, in some respects subordinate to that of the province; but in most instances standing in direct communication with the several departments of the royal ministry in Berlin. In each province there is also a *consistory*, which has charge of all ecclesiastical affairs throughout the province. It is intimately connected with the provincial civil government; the president of the latter being always president of the former. To the consistories belongs exclusively the examination of candidates for the ministerial office; except that sometimes, in order

to alleviate the burden which comes upon them from this source, a commission is established at a university, before which the first examination may be held. The consistory has also in many, if not most instances, the disposal of vacant livings within its jurisdiction. The location of the consistory is usually in the capital of the province. In the several districts, a clerical member of the consistory is attached to the local government; and this is then charged with the various questions of local ecclesiastical policy, which occur within its bounds; or, at least, it has concurrent jurisdiction; and it would seem that questions relating to practical points are referred at will, either to the government of the district, or to the consistory of the province. In case of doubt, however, the district government does not refer the subject either to the consistory, or to the government of the province, but goes directly to the ministry of the king.

Between these consistories and governments and the pastors of the churches, there is still another intervening class or office, viz. that of Superintendent. To the office of pastor in a particular church, is associated the duty of *superintending* the neighbouring pastors and churches and the schools contained within a certain district. These districts are usually small, and the number of churches, various. In one sense these Superintendents are therefore *bishops*, in as much as they have an oversight over the churches; but then this oversight seems intended only to enable them to make report to the higher powers; for they have themselves no power of introducing improvements, nor of correcting abuses. In Saxony, indeed, they can examine and license the teachers of common schools; but this is not the case in Prussia. They have nothing to do with the *confirmation* either of adults or children, except in their own church; for this is every where the office of the pastor. They seem indeed, in Prussia at least, to be merely the organs of communication between the government and the lower clergy. The government seems never to communicate directly with a pastor; although the opposite is not true. A pastor may apply directly to the government of his district, or to the consistory; but the answer always comes to him through his Superintendent. The extent to which the power of the lower clergy is limited, will hardly be credited in this country; but it is illustrated by the following circumstance. In 1829 there was in Halle a great musical festival; in which the most distinguished singers and musical performers of northern Germany took part, to the num-

ber of more than five hundred. It was desirable to obtain for their accommodation the use of the largest church in Halle; but this could not be granted, either by the vestry of the church itself, nor by the Superintendent, nor by the magistracy of the city; nor indeed by any authority less than that of the district government at Merseberg. The use of the church on such an occasion for the performance of secular music, was indeed a great departure from the ordinary practice in regard to churches, and impinged so much upon the prejudices of the people, that a complaint was afterwards lodged with the ministry in Berlin against the government at Merseberg, for having thus abandoned the church to an unholy use. This complaint was made by orthodox and conscientious men, although the feeling which prompted it was common to many others along with them; but coming at that particular juncture, when it could not fail to be mixed up with the difficulties which were already in embryo at Halle, it cannot appear to our American feelings in any other light, than as highly injudicious.

In some of the states there is also the title of General Superintendent, or one who has the general oversight throughout a province. His duties, however, are chiefly nominal; or they consist at most in visiting occasionally the jurisdictions of the other Superintendents. Thus in the Grand-Duchy of Saxe-Weimar, there is a General Superintendent at Weimar, (formerly Herder, now Röhr,) and another at Eisenach, who are also the heads of the consistories in those places. In Prussia the title does not exist, except in the instance of a single person, who was appointed to that station a year or two since, with a jurisdiction over several of the Superintendents in the vicinity of Berlin. As a substitute for these officers, it would seem, and in consequence of his known preference for the English episcopal system, the king of Prussia has within a few years nominally appointed three bishops; but he has assigned them no general episcopal duties, and no episcopal jurisdiction. They seem to be merely a species of General Superintendents, with a more dignified title.

This then is the general system of arrangements in Prussia. The king's ministry retains the charge of all the universities in its own hands; it appoints all the professors and instructors, and prescribes the requisitions which shall be made on all those who will enter upon the sacred office, or become theological teachers. It appoints also the consistories, and commits to them the charge

of examining the candidates, and often of nominating them to vacant places. To aid them in their duties it also establishes in the universities, when necessary, standing commissions for holding the first theological examinations. These are the several bodies to which a young man has to look, in order to enter the ministry, after he has completed his university course. The cases of doubt and difficulty which arise in the practice of the ministerial profession, may be referred, either to the consistory of the province, or to the government of the district.

Similar also are the regulations of Prussia in regard to those who will become teachers in the gymnasia, or other public schools. In every province there exists, along with the consistory, a *school commission*, whose duty it is to examine in like manner those who are candidates for places as teachers. For this object also there are similar commissions in the several universities. All these are under the same department of the general government, or ministry; and bear the same relation to it in this branch of education, as the consistories and theological examiners do in the division of ecclesiastical affairs.

So it is in Prussia. In the other German states there is not always a special department of the ministry devoted to this object; but the affairs of the church are sometimes managed by an upper consistory, as in Saxony; or sometimes by two, as in Weimar; and these stand in direct communication with the sovereign and his privy council. In the kingdom of Hanover there are no less than six consistories; which would appear to possess the highest power in ecclesiastical matters, after the king in council. But the system of Superintendents goes through the whole land; and the lower clergy in general, as well as the course of theological education, are every where on the same footing as in the Prussian states.

We have already seen in the former part of this article (p. 15) that students of every kind before coming to the university, must have gone through a course of preparatory study, usually at a gymnasium. It may not be useless, perhaps, nor uninteresting, to add here a few remarks supplementary to what was there said on this subject.

In all the gymnasia there are two semi-annual examinations, for those who are about to leave those institutions and enter the universities. These occur at Easter and Michaelmas, in April and September, at the time when the semesters of the universities are usually brought to a close. These examinations cover

the whole ground of study during the course pursued at the gymnasia, and embrace the Latin and Greek languages, history and geography both ancient and modern, and the mathematics. They consist not only in oral questions and replies; but tasks are assigned in each of these branches, which the scholar is required to work out in writing, in a solitary chamber into which *he is locked up*. In order to judge of his proficiency in Latin, extracts from Horace, Cicero, Livy, Tacitus, or Virgil, are laid before him, upon which he is required to give a regular interpretation and commentary; and he is also obliged to make out a written exercise in Latin, while under lock and key. The same takes place likewise in regard to the Greek; in which, besides the task of the closet, passages from the Iliad or Odyssey, or from the tragedies of Sophocles, or from other writers, are assigned him for interpretation. In all the branches of history and geography the process is the same, viz. oral examination, and exercises written on the spot without the aid of books. In mathematics, equations and problems as far as Spherical Trigonometry are given, which must in like manner be solved without aid. Besides these subjects, on which all are examined alike, those who intend to pursue at the university the study of theology, are examined in Hebrew; for which purpose, passages from Genesis and the Psalms are laid before them to be regularly interpreted.

This system of *closet labour*, or the imposing of exercises to be performed in solitude and without the aid of books, though not a peculiar feature* of German discipline, is yet a favourite one, and is carried through all their examinations, even those appointed by the state. To perform well an exercise of this sort, presupposes, no doubt, if not a much wider range of study, yet at least a much more thorough acquaintance with the subjects of study, than is for the most part to be found in our country. The known necessity of sustaining such an examination, together with the consequences which flow from it, must also unquestionably exert a powerful influence on the mind of the scholar, and render him studious not only to lay up in his mind the outlines of knowledge, but also to fill up these outlines as he goes along; not only to ascertain the various sources from which he may draw, but actually to derive from them and treasure up that information for which he looks to them; not only to fill up

* It is employed also in some instances in the English universities; see Cumberland's Memoirs, p. 73. N. Y. edition.

the store-house of his mind, but also to have his stores always at command, and become a *ready*, as well as a learned man. Indeed it may be said, that the German system of examination aims to exclude partiality and personal favour, and to ascertain the real amount and value of the acquisitions which every scholar has made.

Those who have thus sustained an examination at the gymnasias, receive a certificate of their progress and standing, which, according to their degree of merit, is the testimonial No. 1, or No. 2. There are also instances of those who receive No. 3. These are such as are adjudged, after trial, not yet to be fully qualified to enter upon a university course. With this testimonial, however, they are permitted to go to the university, but are excluded from all participation in the foundations for the assistance of indigent students; and are moreover required, at every future examination, to exhibit evidence that they have made up for all previous deficiencies. It follows of course that No. 3 can be no very desirable species of testimonial, inasmuch as it subjects a student to inconvenience and to an inferiority of standing throughout his whole university course; and the motives are therefore very powerful, which serve to impel a scholar to rise to a good standing, if not to eminence, in his preparatory studies.

Furnished with these credentials, the former scholars of the gymnasias repair to the universities of their respective states, and on presenting their testimonials, are admitted as students of the university, after receiving matriculation. All those who enter at the commencement of each semester, are usually matriculated at once, soon after the opening of the lectures. The ceremony consists merely in meeting the Prorector, who usually makes a short address, and reads to them the form of matriculation, by which they promise to obey the laws and honour the instructors. To this they give their assent, and confirm it by the *Handsclag*, or shaking hands with the Prorector, which constitutes a species of oath.—Those who have not gone through a course of preparation at a gymnasium, or who have left the gymnasium without undergoing an examination, are obliged to present themselves before a commission appointed for that purpose by the government in each university, and there sustain a trial similar to that above described. Students from the other states of Germany, or from foreign countries, are not required

to be examined at all, unless it be their purpose to remain in the state where the university is situated, and enter its service.

This provision in respect to foreign students, is certainly a very liberal one. It admits them to make use of all the privileges of the universities, without laying upon them any restraint whatever. They are subjected to no examination on entering upon their course, and to none on leaving it, and are entirely free as to their choice of lectures and instructors. It is this which renders a German university so desirable a resort for an American student; because it presents to him all the advantages which a nation of the most systematic scholars on earth can afford, without requiring of him any thing in return, either in the shape of antecedent preparation or subsequent examination. If indeed he wishes to take his degree, he must of course receive it in the regular way of examination and disputation; unless, as has been the case with most of our countrymen, it be bestowed as a matter of favour. This however is but a name; while the substance may be obtained without restriction.

It might perhaps, at first view, be supposed, that this system of entire freedom in regard to the students of other states, would enable young men to evade the strict regulations of the different governments in regard to examinations, and obtain a university education and subsequent employment in different states, without subjecting themselves to the usual rigorous trials. It might seem, perhaps, that a native of Saxony, for instance, could pursue his studies at the university of Göttingen in the kingdom of Hanover, and afterwards enter the service of Prussia. This however is by no means the case. He could indeed enter the university of Göttingen and reside there as long as he pleased, without examination, provided he disclaimed any intention of remaining in Hanover as a professional man; but he could not afterwards establish himself in any profession in Prussia, without first undergoing there all the examinations regularly required by the Prussian government, or producing evidence that he had already sustained equivalent ones in another state. He could not even go back to his native Saxony, and enter upon a professional course; because Saxony, like all the other states, requires that, for this purpose, he shall have spent two years at the university of his native state. So that instead of any evasion, instead of deriving any advantage from thus studying at a foreign university, he suffers a positive disadvantage. Of course, cases of this kind never occur. Indeed, the different governments

have their own systems so nicely arranged, and there is such a perfect understanding among them all in regard to the universities, that any erratic course of education is impossible.

We might also suppose, that the practice of receiving scholars into the universities, simply on the testimonials which they bring with them from the gymnasia, would lead to great irregularity and confusion; that the students would come in every stage of preparation; and would therefore be, in a great measure, incapable of proceeding together in a common path of discipline and study. Indeed, as applied to our own country, such a system would be fraught with insurmountable evils. Did our colleges, for example, receive students from the various academies on the simple testimonials of their former instructors, the door would be open for irregularities of every sort; and that for the plain reason, that in our academies there is no uniform system running through the whole; not even through all those of a single state. But in Germany the case is directly the contrary; the governments of the respective states have established a uniform system throughout all their own gymnasia; the course of studies in all is the same, or is every where equivalent; the mode of examination in all is the same; and of course the testimonials from the different gymnasia of any state have all an equal value. As there is in each university a commission or board, established by the government, to examine those for admission who have been prepared by a private course and not at a gymnasium; so the officers of each gymnasium constitute a similar board, appointed in the same manner, to examine for admission to the university those who have been prepared under their care.—Moreover, the parallel in our country would probably lie, not with our colleges, but with our professional seminaries. These might even now, without much danger, admit young men from the different colleges without further examination, on their merely exhibiting evidence of having honourably completed the regular college course. The course and system of instruction in all these institutions of ours, are in most respects so very similar, that an examination by the officers of a college might, so far as intellectual acquirements are concerned, be safely adopted as the ground of admission to a professional seminary; or at least to those which make in this respect no greater requisitions, than are implied in a college examination.

The remarks thus far made are applicable to all the students who enter the universities, without respect to their future distri-

bution among the various faculties. The only point of difference in regard to future theological students is, that they have also to sustain an examination in the Hebrew language. If now we look for a moment at the subjects, or the extent of the ground, on which the previous examinations are thus held, they might seem to a casual observer to be very limited, and to imply nothing of that depth and thoroughness, which are usually assigned as the characteristics of the German schools. It should however be remembered, that this thoroughness depends much more on the *mode* of instruction and study, than on the quantity gone over ; and that, after a certain point, the greater the amount nominally acquired, the less radical and real will be the progress of the pupil. The examinations above referred to, although apparently less extensive and various than those of most of our colleges, are to be viewed in connexion with the fact, that they are mostly held in Latin, in which also the exercises of the higher classes of the gymnasia are usually performed ; that the required interpretation of a Latin or Greek author implies a regular commentary, including both the lower and higher criticism, to be given upon the spot without previous study ; that written exercises, both in Latin and Greek, are also to be given in, the former of which is to serve as a specimen of their Latin style ; and that these are to be made on subjects given out at the moment, and written without the aid of books, while locked up in a solitary apartment. It is circumstances like these, that serve to test the radical and accurate scholarship of the pupil ; far more indeed than to have gone over twice the quantity of ground in the same period of time.

Turn we now more particularly and exclusively to the students of theology, already matriculated, and thus become regular members of the university. They have now chosen their future career ; they are entering upon a course of professional study, which is to give a character and colouring to their whole future lives ; for the instances are in Germany exceedingly rare, where a young man passes from the study of one of the professions to that of another. The chief reason of this is, the long and laborious preparation required to enter upon any professional career ; and the fact, that in changing one's profession, all preparatory study is in a great measure rendered useless, while he has to begin *de novo* a course of three years' labour. But in thus entering upon a course of theological professional study, in order to become the teachers of the Christian religion, there is this ob-

vious and striking deficiency running through the whole system of the German universities and churches, that the students are never questioned in regard to their *motives* in thus devoting themselves to the sacred office, nor in any shape examined as to their personal piety, nor in respect to their belief in a revelation, or even in the existence of a God. It is enough that they have been baptized and confirmed, and that they are free from the imputation of crime or open immorality. That they drink to excess, or gamble, or fight duels, or *renown* in every shape, is never brought up against them, unless such things have become the subject of open and scandalous notoriety. That extreme cases like these are rare, is matter of gratitude; that they can exist at all, or that the great body of theological students may be, and often are, men destitute of any personal religion, and of any regard to the sacred profession which they have assumed, further than as it affords a means of reputation and honourable subsistence, is greatly to be deplored. This state of things, however, is not peculiar to Germany. Indeed, it is almost a necessary consequence of the so called union of church and state; an union which in protestant countries has ever consisted in the entire subserviency of the church to the state; and in its dependence upon worldly-minded rulers for its support, and by consequence for its internal arrangement and constitution. While professing to establish religion and the church of Christ on a sure and permanent basis, the civil power has always taken care to assume the direction and control over the church; and to make that to be the true religion, and that to be the constitution of the church, which should best comport with its own views of expediency, and with its own safety and permanency. This is an obvious and necessary conclusion from the history of every protestant state, which has undertaken to support the church by the arm of civil power. That the Romish church forms any exception to this remark, arises from the fact that it has itself a head, who claims preeminence and sovereignty above all other sovereigns; and even in countries where this claim is not acknowledged, as heretofore in France, the church has yet formed a body separate from the body politic, and by its wealth and influence and power has contrived, when not resisted and overthrown by the interposition of the people, to render the government subservient to its designs. The princes of this world, alas! and its less princely rulers too, are most frequently men without religion themselves, and therefore have respect to it only in re-

ference to its general influence on the welfare of their states, or the security of their own power. Woe to the church that is subject to such a head ; that must receive its constitution and its ordinances and its ministers by the appointment of such an authority ! The churches of Germany are mostly in this predicament, and teachers of religion are trained up for them, of whom it is not even asked, whether they believe in that religion which they profess to teach. The church of England is in this predicament, modified only by the limited authority of the English monarch ; and how many of her clergy are men of a mere worldly spirit and even dissipated character ! Let then American Christians rejoice, that the churches are here thrown back upon their primitive foundation, the hearts and affections of the followers of Christ ; that they neither receive nor claim support from the civil power, any further than it becomes the government of every Christian country to provide against open violations of public order and religion. So much as this is demanded of every government bearing the name of Christian ; not by any church, nor in support of any particular church, but in order that it may correspond with the very elements of Christian society.

In regard to the studies pursued by theological students at the universities,* they not only have the privilege of attending lectures on such other branches as they may choose, but are also expected and required to continue their attention to, and make further progress in, the studies of the philosophical department or faculty of letters. Every student of theology, therefore, is also inscribed in this faculty ; and in addition to his theological studies, is required to attend lectures on logic, metaphysics, ethics or moral philosophy, and the philosophy of religion ; by which last is understood, the philosophical exhibition of the eternal and universal ideas which lie at the foundation of every particular religion, and the examination of the religious tendencies and propensities of our nature. In addition to these, it is not unusual for the students of theology to pursue classical philology and literature to a very considerable extent ; or to attend lectures on history, or on one or more of the natural sciences. Indeed, the means are furnished, and young men are invited, to extend their researches into the whole field of ancient and mod-

* In the remarks which follow, the writer has reference principally to the universities of Prussia. The same may be applied however, in most respects, to all the other protestant universities of Germany.

ern literature, and to wander at will throughout the wide kingdoms of science and nature.

The regular *Brodcollegia*, or courses of lectures necessary to be heard in order to sustain the future examinations, and to be regarded as qualified to enter upon the sacred office, are usually classed under three heads, viz. such as are *propaedeutical* or introductory, such as are theoretical, and such as are practical.

The propaedeutical lectures comprise the so called theological *encyclopaedia*, introductions to the Old and New Testament, and hermeneutics. These, of course, are all preparatory studies. The course on encyclopaedia professes to present to the student, a survey of the *whole circle of theological learning*. It is also called *Hodegetik*, from *ὁδῆγεω* to lead the way, and then includes under it, (1) *Encyclopaedia* in the stricter sense, or an *objective* exhibition of the nature, character, and condition of the science to be taught (in this case theology); of the subdivisions of the science into different departments or *disciplines*, and the character of each of these; and of the relation which each particular discipline bears to the whole. (2) It includes also *Methodik* or the proper method of study, which is the *subjective* part of this introductory course, and presupposes the encyclopaedia or objective part. Its business is, first, to shew what are the necessary qualifications in those who devote themselves to the study of a science, and to point out the hindrances which lie in their path; secondly, to shew in what particular way the different branches or departments of the science may best be studied; and this is shewn from the nature of the science itself. The utility of an introductory course like this, in the study of theology, cannot be called in question. The student thereby obtains a clear idea of the object of his studies; and by knowing definitely the relations which the different departments bear to each other, and to the science considered as a whole, he is enabled to pursue them in a proper order, and thus acquire a knowledge of them with greater ease to himself. How few are the students of theology, who, on first entering upon their career, have any adequate conceptions of the wide field that lies before them! The object of such a course of lectures is, to spread before them a map or plan of this field; to mark out its subdivisions with all their metes and bounds; and to accompany this map with a description of the various roads and paths, by which they are to arrive at the different parts of the field; of the obstacles to be avoided or encountered, and the best means of overcoming

them ; and of the preparations and the implements which the traveller must take along with him. This is a topic to which, no doubt, more attention might profitably be paid in the theological seminaries of our own country. Indeed, this introductory study is in Germany considered so important in theology, that provision is made in every university for such a course in each semester ; and it is always the first object of the student's attention. With this course of lectures is also usually connected a synopsis of the *literature* of theology ; or a list of the best books in the several departments, with a brief account and character of each.

The other propaedeutical courses, viz. introductions to the Old and New Testament, and hermeneutics, are also necessarily preparatory in their nature. In order properly to understand, in their full force and extent, the truths of the Bible, which are the foundation of all theology, we ought to be acquainted with the history and character and condition of the sacred books in which they are contained ; we must know not only the general principles on which they, like all other books, are to be interpreted, but also the peculiar circumstances and characteristics which serve in any way to throw light upon and affect their particular interpretation. These are therefore subjects to which an early attention is always given ; although there is less regularity in this respect, than in regard to the general subject of *encyclopaedia*. One of the most celebrated introductory courses, is that of Gesenius on the Old Testament, which never fails to draw a crowd of hearers sufficient to fill his large *auditorium* almost to suffocation.

The regular courses of *theoretical* lectures are those on the exegesis of the Old and New Testament, and archaeology of the Scriptures ; systematic and symbolic theology, and ethics ; the history of doctrines, ecclesiastical history and antiquities. In some of the universities, as at Halle, there are given regular courses of exegetical lectures on the whole of the New Testament, which extend through two years. Such were formerly the lectures of Knapp, of which the substance is said to have been published in the *Exegetisches Handbuch*, Leips. 1799 ff. The same course is also pursued by Wegscheider and Thilo, who always read at the same hour, but on different parts of the New Testament. Tholuck has likewise recently commenced upon the same plan. The first semester is usually occupied with the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, which

are read according to a harmony ; the second semester is filled out with the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles ; while the Epistles and the Apocalypse are divided between the semesters of the second year. Specimens of the general mode of lecturing on the New Testament may be seen in the *Handbuch* above mentioned ; and also in the Commentaries of Flatt on the Epistles, which were published without alteration from his manuscript lectures. In other universities, as at Berlin, the courses on the New Testament are less regular and general, and include only particular books. Each professor, who chooses to read on the New Testament, selects such books as he prefers, and reads upon them in a regular order, or not, as he pleases. Neander, for instance, lectures upon the Gospels of Matthew and of John, and has at times taken up most or all of the Epistles ; but of late years, he confines himself to these Gospels and to the larger Epistles of Paul.

The same is true in regard to the exegesis of the Old Testament. It would here be obviously impossible to deliver lectures on the whole of this part of the Bible ; and therefore every professor selects the particular ground which he will occupy. Some make for themselves a stated course ; while others vary their lectures at will. Gesenius has adopted the former method, and his course covers two years. It consists of lectures on the books of Genesis, Isaiah, Psalms, and Job. The lectures on Isaiah are mostly nothing but an abstract of his printed commentary, condensed into a much narrower compass, and with little or no illustration from the cognate dialects. It may seem strange that these lectures should be fully attended, when it is so easy to obtain the book, and thus possess a complete commentary ; but the poverty of many of the students, the desire of possessing an epitome including the results of the professor's newest investigations, the preference which is felt for instruction *viva voce*, and perhaps fashion too in some degree, conspire to render the lecture-room not less crowded at these, than at the other lectures of the same professor. His course on the Psalms bears a very general resemblance to the Commentary of De Wette ; exhibiting, however, somewhat less of taste and more of philology. The difficulties of the book of Genesis vanish with him entirely ; inasmuch as he considers this book merely as a collection of *μυθoi*, compiled, as well as the rest of the Pentateuch, at a period not earlier than the time of the Jewish kings, and on a level, as to authority, with the fables of other oriental nations in regard to

the creation and early history of our race. In Halle there is no orthodox evangelical lecturer on any part of the Old Testament. In Berlin, Hengstenberg reads upon the prophecies respecting the Messiah, and some other portions; but his lectures are thinly attended. Indeed the study of Hebrew and oriental literature in general, excites little comparative attention at Berlin. In Halle much more time and attention are devoted to both. Gesenius gives occasionally lectures on the elements of Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic; and there are also private teachers in these and the other oriental tongues.

7 The lectures on systematic theology are exceedingly various in their character, according to the point of view under which the professor chooses to consider his subject. Sometimes it is simply a *scientific* theology, whose principles are deduced from, and founded upon, reason alone. At other times it is only *biblical* theology, or the doctrines of the Bible arranged in a systematic form.— Sometimes again both of these modes are combined, and the religion of reason and nature is extended or modified by the precepts of the Scriptures; or the truths of the Bible are supported and illustrated by the principles of reason. At one time the doctrines are exhibited and discussed only in their present form; at another, the history of them is interwoven with the discussion. The greater part of the works on systematic theology published in Germany, have first been read as lectures in the universities; and afford therefore a fair specimen of the mode of lecturing on these subjects. Such are the works of Twesten, Hahn, Nitzsch, Schleiermacher, De Wette, Marheinecke, Wegscheider, etc. to mention only those of living authors. The excellent work of Knapp, also, which is now in the progress of translation in this country, was published without alteration from his manuscript course. All these lectures properly regard the general system of theological doctrines, without reference to them as held by any particular church. The lectures on *Symbolik*, on the contrary, or on the symbols or confessions of the various churches, are devoted to the exhibition of the doctrines as held by these churches; and as the history of creeds and confessions is of course brought into view, it is obvious that the whole subject is thus thrown open for discussion.

The *Dogmengeschichte* or history of doctrines, as has been before remarked, very commonly also forms a part of the regular lectures on ecclesiastical history. Indeed, both this and the history of creeds and confessions form such an integral part of

this general history, that they cannot be passed over in treating of the latter without some notice; although it depends altogether on the plan of the lecturer, to what extent they shall be rendered prominent. The courses of lectures on ecclesiastical history itself commonly occupy at least two semesters, and are given six times a week. This is usually a very popular subject, and is treated fully, and generally in an interesting manner. In Halle, there are no less than four courses given, viz. by Gesenius, Thilo, Ullmann, and Guericke; and also another course on antiquities by the younger Niemeier. These are so arranged, as that no two professors read at the same time on the same part of the course; and Gesenius and Thilo take the alternate years. In Berlin, Neander has no one to compete with him in a general course; although courses on particular periods or subjects are occasionally given by other instructors. The same is the case with Gieseler at Bonn. The text of the published Manual of the latter professor, is a specimen of his own manner of lecturing, and also of that of Gesenius.* The manner of Neander corresponds to that of his great work now in the course of publication; though his lectures, of course, are much less copious. The system of lecturing which is common to all, is to divide the whole ground of ecclesiastical history into epochs or periods; and then under each to give separately, first, the *external* history of the church, or a general narrative of events, with reference to its external relations; and then the *internal* history, or the events occurring within the church, such as its internal regulations, disputes, councils, the history of doctrine, and ecclesiastical antiquities properly so called, or views of the manners and customs of the early Christians, their modes of worship, literature, etc.—Not unfrequently also, separate courses of lectures are given on some one of these particular subjects.

The lectures on the *practical* part of theology comprise pastoral theology, or the proper mode of exercising the pastoral office; *Katechetik*, or the method of imparting religious instruction to children, as by catechisms; *Homiletik*, or the art of preaching; and *Liturgik*, or the mode of conducting public worship. All these departments are taught scientifically and theoretically; and also practically so far as opportunity is afforded. The first however obviously admits of little or no practical illus-

* Prof. Gieseler was formerly the pupil and *fiscal* of Gesenius; and the text of the earlier part of his Manual, bears a strong resemblance to the lectures of the latter.

tration at a university ; although the professors who teach these branches, are at the same time usually pastors. At any rate, pastoral theology in its proper sense, as consisting in the exercise of the pastoral office *out* of the church, is less understood, or at least far less practised, than in this country. In catechetics and homiletics, both the theory and practice are illustrated, and accompanied by the requisite historical notices. The subject of liturgies is rather historical than otherwise ; and has assumed of late, at least in Prussia, a high degree of interest, in consequence of the introduction of a new liturgy by the government, in doing which the king himself took a very active part.

Such are in general the regular courses of instruction at the German universities, in the several departments of theological study. Besides these there are also the *seminaries* mentioned above (p. 22), in which the professors meet the students on a more familiar footing, and the exercises are conducted more in the manner of conversation. The theological *Seminarium* in the university of Halle, which may be taken as a sample of the rest, consists of five divisions, viz. in the exegesis of the Old Testament under the guidance of Gesenius ; that of the New Testament under Wegscheider ; in church history under Thilo ; in systematic theology under Tholuck ; and in homiletics under Marks ; with which last are connected catechetical exercises under Wagnitz. The exercises in the division under Gesenius consist sometimes in writing Hebrew, which the professor corrects ; at other times in discussions upon Hebrew grammar and kindred topics, in which all may take part ; and again in the interpretation of particular books of the Old Testament, in which the pupils are also called upon. These meetings are held once a week, and are interesting and instructive. You have here the first Hebrew scholar of the day, just as in Paris at the recitations of De Sacy you have the first Arabic scholar of the age, placing himself in a manner at your disposal, and ready to answer your questions and resolve all your difficulties. This is a very pleasing feature in the arrangements for public instruction, both in Germany and France. The same remarks hold true, *mutatis mutandis*, in regard to the other divisions of the *Seminarium*. Besides these, the students often unite among themselves in companies of five or six, to review together the lectures which they have written down ; and individual professors also hold private recitations and exercises, in the several branches to which the students have already attended.

These last are sometimes partly in the nature of private examinations; at others, they are repetitions of preceding lectures; and sometimes also they consist of regular private instruction on the same or kindred topics.*

* The following abstract of the *Lectiionsblatt* or Catalogue of Lectures of the University of Halle for the summer semester from May 3 to Sept. 18, 1830, will shew the nature of the studies pursued. It should however be borne in mind, that as several of the professors read stated courses of two years' continuance, the catalogue of any other semester would present, in many respects, a different list of subjects in all the departments. This abstract includes only the faculty of theology and a part of that of philosophy.

Theology.

Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology, *Niemeyer*.—Encyclopaedia and theological literature, *Guerike*.—Hermeneutics, *Weber* and *Niemeyer*.

Biblical Archaeology of the Old and New Testament, *Gesenius*.—Historical and critical Introduction to the Old Testament, *Guerike*.—Books of the Old Testament to be explained: The first chapters of Genesis by *Stange*.—Job, *Wahl*.—The Psalms grammatically, *Schott*, Priv. Teacher.—Isaiah, *Gesenius*.—Minor Prophets, *Rödiger*.—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, *Rödiger*.—Prophecies respecting the Messiah, *Fritzsche*.—Historical critical Introduction to the New Testament, *Ullmann*.—In the New Testament to be explained: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, *Tholuck*.—The same Gospels, *Wegscheider*.—Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and also those to the Romans and Hebrews, *Thilo*.—Exegetical and homiletical Lectures on the Epistle to the Philippians by *Marks*.—History of Christ's Passion and Resurrection, *Tholuck* and *Wegscheider*.

General History of Doctrines, *Wegscheider* and *Ullmann*.—Systematic Theology, *Weber*.—The same in connexion with the History of particular Doctrines, *Wegscheider*, after his *Institutiones* etc.—The same in connexion with a view of the History of Doctrines, *Tholuck*.—On the symbolical Books of the Evangelical Church, beginning with the Augsburg Confession, *Guerike*.

General History of Religion and the Church to the time of Gregory VII, *Thilo*.—The same from Gregory VII to the present time, *Guerike*.—Lives and Writings of the Apostolical Fathers, *Ullmann*.—History of the Reformation, *Lorentz* P. T.

Practical Theology, *Franke* P. T.—Homiletics and their History, *Marks*.—The Preaching of distinguished Pulpit Orators of our own and other times, *Wagnitz*.—Catechetics, *Wagnitz* and

Such is the general outline of the course of theological studies pursued in the German universities; varying indeed in all ac-

Franke P. T.—Catechetical Exercises by **Weber**.—Popular Dogmatics, **Fritzsche**.

In the royal theological *Seminarium*, the exercises in the Exegesis of the Old Testament to be directed by **Gesenius**, and to consist in the Interpretation of the Proverbs of Solomon; those in the Exegesis of the New Testament, by **Wegscheider**; those in the division of Ecclesiastical History by **Thilo**; in the division of Dogmatics, by **Tholuck**; in that of Homiletics and Liturgics, by **Marks**; **Wagnitz** to direct the catechetical exercises of the latter division.

Examinations on Systematic Theology to be held by **Weber** and **Fritzsche**; and in the History of Religion and the Church, by **Guerike**.—A *Repetitorium* on the Introduction to the Old and New Testament offered by **Rödiger**.—Exercises in the Interpretation of the New Testament offered by **Fritzsche**.

Omitting here the faculties of jurisprudence and medicine, and passing over in that of philosophy the departments of philosophy proper and pedagogics, (in which eleven courses of lectures are announced,) mathematics, the natural sciences, (in which botanical lectures and excursions are announced by the celebrated **Sprengel**,) and political economy, we adduce only the divisions of history and philology.

Historical Sciences.

Universal History, **Leo**.—Ancient Universal History, **Voigtel**.—Geography of the Ancients, and their writings on this subject, **Lange**.—General Mythology, **Rosenkranz P. T.**—The religious and domestic Life of the Greeks, **Meier**.—History of the middle ages, and of modern times, **Pfaff P. T.**—History of the Carolingian race, **Lorentz P. T.**—History of the Crusades, **Pfaff**.—History of the Reformation, **Lorentz**.—History of the Seven years' war, **von Hoyer, P. T.**—Modern History, from 1786 to 1818, **Leo**.—Prussian Statistics, **Voigtel**.

Exercises in the Historical Society to be directed by Prof. **Voigtel**.

Philology.

1. CLASSICAL. History of Eloquence among the Greeks and Romans, **Raabe**.—History of Greek Poetry, **Ritschl P. T.**—Greek writers to be explained: Pindar's Olympic Odes, **Lange**.—Philoctetus of Sophocles, **Förtsch P. T.**—Antigone of Sophocles or He-cuba of Euripides, **Stäger P. T.**—Hymn of Cleanthes, **Lange**.—

ording to the taste and character and convenience of the different professors, but yet coming in all the universities to the

Plato's Symposium and Phaedon, *Bernhardy*.—Aristotle's Poetics, *Schütz*.—Theophrastus' Characteristics, *Meier*.

History of Roman Literature, *Bernhardy*.—Works of Roman writers to be explained: Plautus' *Miles gloriosus* by *Ritschl* P. T.—Odes of Horace, *Raabe* and *Bernhardy*.—Cicero *de Oratore* by *Schütz*.—Cicero's Orations on private rights, with an introduction on the civil process of the Romans in the time of the Republic, *Meier*.—Cicero *de Natura Deorum* by *Förtsch* P. T.—Seneca's Physical Investigations, *Schweigger*.

In the royal philological *Seminarium*, the members to be instructed in Interpretation, Disputation, and the writing of Latin, by Professors *Schütz*, *Meier*, and *Bernhardy*.—Exercises in the speaking and writing of Latin, offered by Prof. *Lange* and by *Förtsch* and *Ritschl*.

2. ORIENTAL. History of Oriental Literature, *Wahl*.—Oriental Palaeography, *Gesenius*.—Hebrew Grammar, *Schott*, P. T.—Arabic Grammar, with interpretation of selections from De Sacy's Chrestomathy, *Schott*.—Lectures on the Shemitish Dialects, or on the Persian, Coptic, and Sanscrit Languages, offered by *Wahl*. (This offer is rarely accepted.)—Sanskrit Grammar, with interpretation of the Episode of the Mahā Bhārata, *Rödiger*.—Elements of the Chinese Language, *Schott*.

Instruction in the modern European languages is also offered.

In Berlin during the same summer (1830) the principal lectures announced by the theological faculty were the following. Theological Encyclopaedia, *Marheinecke*.—Introduction to the Old Testament, *Hengstenberg*.—Sections of Genesis, *Bellermann*.—The Psalms, *Hengstenberg*.—Isaiah, as also Hebrew Grammar and the minor Prophets, *Uhlemann*, P. T.—Job, *Benary*, P. T.—Gospel of Matthew, *Neander*.—Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in De Wette's and Lücke's Harmony, *von Gerlach*, P. T.—Epistle to the Romans, *Hengstenberg*.—Ecclesiastical History till Gregory I, *Rheinwald*.—Later History of the Church, *Neander*.—Life, theological character, and writings of the distinguished teachers of the ancient church, *Neander*.—Systematic Theology, after his work: 'Der christliche Glaube,' *Schleiermacher*.—Theological Moral, *Marheinecke*.—Catechetics and Pastoral Theology, *Strauss*; as also the History of Homiletics, and homiletical exercises.

Under the head of *History* and *Geography*, the following are a few of the lectures announced. Chronology of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Hebrews, Christians, Arabs, and Persians, *Ide-*

grand result of propaedeutical, theoretical, and practical lectures, on all the various departments of theology. The order in which these lectures are to be attended, has hitherto been left entirely to the discretion of the pupil; the necessity of attending them at all lies not in any requisition of the university, but in the circumstance that such an attendance is demanded by the government in order for admission to a future examination. For this end, each student is required to have his *Anmeldungsbogen*, or sheet on which the different courses that he attends are entered and signed by the different professors, with a note also of the degree of attendance. In regard to the order of study too, some arrangements have of late been introduced, especially at the university of Berlin, by which it is in some degree regulated, and the students prevented from commencing, as was sometimes done, with the practical part of theology, before they had paid any attention to the preparatory and theoretical parts. In Halle, there is also something of the same kind; but it exists there only in the shape of a recommendation from the theological faculty. As a general rule, encyclopaedia is every where the first course; as to the other courses there can be no definite arrangement, inasmuch as the times at which they are read are irregular, and depend solely on the convenience of the professor.

Further than the obligations which necessarily spring out of the requisitions hitherto enumerated, the universities have, or appear to have, no direct control over the time of the students, nor over the apportionment of that time, nor over their conduct and

ler.—Ethnography and Geography of Asia, *C. Ritter.*—Geography of ancient Latium, *C. Ritter.*

In *Philology* are the following among many others. History of Greek Literature, *Böckh.*—Elements of Latin and Greek, *Bekker.*—Hebrew and Arabic Grammar, *Benary.*—Elements of Arabic Grammar, *Hengstenberg.*—Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit Greek, Latin, and Gothic Languages, *Bopp.*—Antigone and Oedipus Colon. of Sophocles, *Böckh.*—Isocrates, *Bekker.*—Satires of Horace, *Zumpt.*—Ardshuna's Journey, and Hidimba's Death, Episodes of the Mahâ-Bhârata, *Bopp.*

In Berlin the royal theological *Seminarium* has only the divisions of Exegesis under *Hengstenberg*, and of the History of the Church and of Doctrines under *Neander* and *Marheinecke.*—That the *Seminarium* at Halle is more frequented, arises probably chiefly from the fact, that there are usually twice as many theological students at Halle, as at Berlin.

actions, so long as they commit no gross violations of law or public decorum. This is true in general, in regard to students of every class. The only further requisition made in Prussia on students of theology, as such, has reference to their future employment as teachers and ministers of God's word, and is simply this, that they shall attend public worship, and go to the communion a certain number of times every year. This is a new regulation ; and it may be regarded as an indication of the state of feeling among the great body of theological students, that this requisition was generally viewed by them as an arbitrary infringement on their liberty of action, and as imposing upon them an additional burden 'grievous to be borne.' As a proof of the improving state of morals and discipline among the theological students of Halle, it is mentioned in a recent public report on the state of that university, that the theologians are more regular in their attendance on the public religious services. In this neglect of public worship, however, the students do but follow out the example of most of the professors, as well those of theology as others, who, generally speaking, are rarely seen within the walls of a church. And it is no wonder, when these, the teachers and the future preachers of the word, thus fail in the performance of the public duties of religion, that the practice of frequenting the house of God should have fallen into desuetude among the people at large. But to this topic we shall probably return, at a future opportunity.

These remarks refer, of course, to the great body of theological students ; and more particularly to those of Halle, which after all is the great theological school of Germany. There are however many exceptions, and many persons to whom remarks like the foregoing cannot apply. There are not unfrequently pious and gifted individuals among the students, who pursue the course of theological studies with the purest ardour, in order to become faithful and able and devoted ministers of the word of God. Their object is not, as in most cases, merely to study a profession with a view to future subsistence ; but they take every opportunity to improve themselves in all that may the better qualify them to fill the sacred office. It is this class of students mostly, who make use of the privilege of *preaching*, which is permitted to regular theological students at the university. This however can take place only with the special license of the Superintendent of the place, on each and every occasion ; and the sermon to be delivered must also have been examined and ap-

proved by him. The preaching of the students is usually, of course, confined to the neighbouring villages, or to the less frequented services in the city churches, as in the afternoon of Sunday, or the early service of that day at 6 o'clock in the morning.

In regard to the intercourse between the students of theology and the professors, the same evil exists that was alluded to in p. 47 of the preceding number, in respect to all students. The professors, generally speaking, know nothing of their pupils except in the lecture room; they take no personal interest in their general character, or deportment, or progress in their studies, nor in their mental and moral development. Whether they improve their time or waste it; whether they are pious men, or dissipated; whether they are likely to prove 'burning and shining lights in the church,' or to become 'wolves in sheep's clothing,' and vex and desolate the community of Christians; are all questions of entire indifference in the eyes, or at least in the practice, of most theological professors. A few in Berlin and Halle, and in other universities, have adopted a different course; and the result has hitherto been auspicious. This however is no official duty; and indeed, so far as this is concerned, the moral and religious cultivation of the students is left wholly unprovided for. They unite sometimes, indeed, for this purpose among themselves; but these unions are for the most part regarded with an evil eye by those in authority; and even those professors who draw around them a little cluster of students for the purpose of religious improvement, and especially of private devotion, have not always escaped notice and censure. An allusion has already been made to a case of this sort, in the account formerly given of Göttingen. It is to the honour of the Prussian government, that it rather encourages this course of proceeding in the university of Berlin; though its example has not been sufficient to restrain the magistracy of some other cities, from wishing to adopt an opposite policy.

There remains nothing further to remark in reference to the residence of theological students at the universities, but that in Prussia they have been required for some years past to attend lectures also on *Pädagogik*, or the science of education and instruction; inasmuch as the superintendence of the common schools is connected with the exercise of the pastoral office. For this object there exists also a pedagogical *Seminarium* in

each of the Prussian universities ; in which appropriate exercises are practised by the students.

The required term of residence at a university for ordinary students of theology, is three years. One of these, however, may be spent at the university of any other German state ; the requisite testimonials being produced of regular attendance and of good conduct. But in Prussia it is not uncommon for the students of other universities, whose means will afford it, to prefer spending a year at Berlin. Indeed, other things being equal, this would be matter of preference with students of all classes ; since it seems to be generally understood, that the choice of Berlin is rather viewed with favour by the government, and a residence there gives a young man a greater chance of being noticed by those in authority, and thus affords him a better prospect of future employment.*

Thus far our attention has been occupied with the course

* In Würtemberg there is a certain class of theological students who are required to reside *five* years at the university. This however arises from a peculiar institution in that kingdom, which takes the pupils at the age of about 12 years, and educates them throughout at the expense of the government. The boys of the greatest promise in the gymnasia are selected, and have the offer of being thus supported, if they will adopt the clerical profession. They are then sent to the *primary* theological schools ; of which there are *four* in the kingdom, three protestant and one catholic. Here they remain four years, and go through a regular and fixed course of study. They are then transferred to the university of Tübingen, where they remain five years more ; two of which, however, it is believed, are mostly devoted to a preparatory course, as in the university of Copenhagen. This *seminary*, as it is called, provides for one hundred protestants, and as many catholics: The government furnishes them with board and lodging ; and thus gives them their whole support and instruction for nine years in all ; but in return for this the pupils yield their personal liberty and wishes, and become entirely subservient to the will of the government, and must do all its bidding, whatever their own tastes or circumstances may be. In 1829, out of 222 protestant theological students at Tübingen, 97 were in the seminary and lived in commons, and 125 in the city. Of catholics there were 117 in commons, and 54 in the city ; in all 171. The whole annual expense of these institutions is between 90,000 and 100,000 florins, or more than \$38,000.

of studies pursued by theological students during their residence at a university. It is a course fully and completely professional; as entirely so as the course at any of our theological seminaries; and these therefore, and not our colleges, are the institutions of our own country, between which and the German universities a comparison can in any way be instituted. The object of both is the same, viz. professional study. The subjects of study are more or less the same; the great difference in this respect being only in the mode and extent of instruction. But in another respect the difference is deep and fundamental. *There*, to use the common distinction, the whole system of obligation and discipline regards only the head; *here* it refers also to the heart. There, if a student avoid open immoralities, he may become by mere study a distinguished theologian; here, in order to be regarded as a theologian, he must, as yet, be also regarded as a sincere Christian; as one who considers his profession not as a means of subsistence, but has embraced it from high and holy motives of duty towards God and towards his fellow men. This is an association of ideas so utterly unknown in Germany, that when it was at several times mentioned to pious and distinguished men there, that in this country the term theologian had hitherto always implied the exhibition of personal religion and vital piety, they expressed the utmost surprise and delight at a state of things so congenial to their feelings, and yet so different from any thing in their own country, or, as they had supposed, in any other part of the world. May God preserve our churches and our schools from such a state of things, as shall ever give occasion for a separation of these ideas, either in language or in practice!

ART. II. THE CREED OF ARMINIUS,

WITH A BRIEF SKETCH OF HIS LIFE AND TIMES.*

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. at Andover.

The sentiments of any particular man excite but little curiosity, and create but a slight interest, unless something definite and

* When I began the study of the subjects comprised in the following article, it was my intention and expectation to bring the exhibition of them within the compass of 35 or 40 pages. Subse-

particular is known respecting him. It is true, indeed, that nearly all of our religious public have some general knowledge respecting the subject of the following brief memoir. They know that such a man as Arminius lived in modern times; that he was a Hollander; that he was the founder of a party or sect among the Reformed Churches, which still continues to exist, and to be called by his name; and according to their respective feelings and sentiments with regard to theology, they look upon him with respect and reverence, or with disapprobation and aversion.

In the mean time, what was the manner of life and the fortune of Arminius; what were his talents and labours; or how far the sentiments of those who are *now* called after his name, are to be attributed to him; few among us seem very well to understand. It is desirable, however, that our religious public should become more particularly acquainted with these matters. The weak or erroneous conceits and sentiments of schismatics, in days that are past, which have become obsolete by length of time, and are no longer known except to antiquarians in church matters, may be suffered to sleep on, for endless ages, without disturbing their repose or summoning them to the stage of life, and no harm, but rather advantage, will accrue thereby to religion. Antiquarians and critics may indeed be called upon to trace the history of such errors, for the sake of illustrating something which belongs to the complete history of the church; but Christians in general have little or no interest in matters of this kind.

quent reading and attention shewed the utter impossibility of doing any justice to my theme, in this way, and made it evident to me, that I should only mock the hopes of the reader, if I should attempt such an abridgement. As it is, I have left out a vast number of facts, which have more or less interest; but which, nevertheless, I did not deem essential. When I saw the length to which I must of necessity go, it was then my wish to divide the piece between two numbers of the present work. There is generally something repulsive in long pieces, when they appear in a periodical; for the reader does not usually expect them, and he is apt to be wearied with them. But the public, I would hope, will, in reading this, duly consider the nature of the case; and if so, they will see that, in dividing it, there would be some hazard of making incorrect impressions; since the reader needs to have the *tout ensemble* before him, in order to judge correctly.

Not so, however, in respect to such sects and parties as still exist and divide the church. Men, in order to examine and pass a sound judgement on these, should be enlightened both as to their principles and their history. If they are not, how can they judge with candour and discernment? Or how can their judgement, even in their own eyes, be entitled to much respect?

From my youth up to the present hour, I have heard much said for and against Arminianism and Arminius. It has so happened, that, until recently, I have never had it in my power to make a thorough examination into the merits and demerits of this applauded and reprobated man. But as I have now obtained most of the materials for such an examination which I could desire, I have thought it a matter of interest, to know something more definite on the subject than I have hitherto done. The result of my investigation for this purpose, the reader will find in the following pages. In some respects, I may venture to believe, he will be surprized; in others, gratified; in some, disappointed. This will probably hold true, in regard both to the friends and the opponents of what is *now* called Arminianism. Arminius was a very different man, as to his own theology, from what either of them suspect; unless indeed they have been at the pains of instituting a particular and extended examination.

My reason for publishing the following contribution to the history of doctrine in the Reformed Churches, is, that at the present time there is great sensitiveness and interest in the public mind as to the doctrines of *Arminianism* so called. What now passes under this name, among us, I do not undertake, in this place, particularly to describe. I begin, where we ought in all cases of this nature to commence, with the supposed original author of the system in question, and make it my object to develop who he was, and what he believed and taught. It will then be seen, by all who enlist under the present banners of Arminianism, and by all their opponents, how far the Leyden professor is entitled to their approbation or their disapprobation. It is just that things should be called by their right names; or if not, that it should be known that they are not so called. The dead should have impartial justice distributed to them, as well as the living. But this cannot be done while they are unknown, or misrepresented.

I do not say these things by way of apology for the present article. Apology is not needed for an effort to throw somelight

on a subject imperfectly, and in some respects erroneously, apprehended by the religious community of our country. Those who have not the means of pursuing an investigation like the present, will probably welcome this effort to give them the results of a labour which their circumstances do not permit them to perform; and those who have such means, may, if they please, retrace the whole ground, and see for themselves whether I have made correct delineations and statements.

I. BRIEF SKETCH OF ARMINIUS AND OF HIS TIMES.

James Arminius, (called in Latin, *Jacobus Arminius*, and in Dutch, *Jacob Hermanni* or *Van Harmine*,) was born in 1560, at Oudewater, a small but pleasant and thriving village in South Holland. While an infant his father died. It happened, however, at that time, that there was at Oudewater a priest by the name of Theodore Emilius,* who was distinguished for erudition and piety, and who had forsaken the Romish church, and had emigrated from place to place, in order to avoid its persecution. Moved by compassion for the indigent condition of Arminius, he took him under his care, instructed him in the learned languages, and inculcated on him frequent lessons of practical piety. He became so interested in the distinguished talents and rapid improvement of his young pupil, that he continued his education until he was sufficiently advanced, or nearly so, in his studies, to be sent to a university. It appears, that some time before his death, Emilius had removed to Utrecht with his pupil; and there he died, leaving the young Arminius without any means of support. Soon after this event, however, the bereaved youth obtained a second patron in Rodolph Snell, a native of Holland, who had been obliged to quit Marburg, where he had resided, on account of the incursions of the Spaniards, and had recently come from Hesse. Snell was himself distinguished for a knowledge of the mathematics. He soon returned to Hesse, accompanied by his young pupil; but he had scarcely arrived there, before news came that the Spaniards had taken Oudewater, burnt it, and massacred all its inhabitants. Arminius, being exceedingly distressed at this news, set out immediately for his native place; and arriving there, he found it a heap of entire ruins, every house being burnt, and his mother, sister, brother,

* So Bertius, De Vitâ, etc. Schröckh writes *Petrus Emilius*; I know not on what authority.

near relatives, and nearly all his fellow townsmen, murdered.— He returned immediately to Hesse, performing the whole journey on foot. Here however he did not stay long. News reached him, that the university of Leyden had been founded by the prince of Orange. He soon set out once more for Holland, and betook himself to Rotterdam, which was then the asylum for such of the sufferers at Oudewater as survived, and also for many refugees from Amsterdam. Here Peter Bertius, (the father of P. Bertius who wrote the funeral eulogy of Arminius,) was persuaded to receive him into his own family; and he afterwards sent him, with his son P. Bertius, to the university of Leyden. Here young Bertius was the constant companion of his studies and of his person. He describes Arminius as exceedingly devoted to literary pursuits. He cultivated much the study of poetry, mathematics, and philosophy, and became the ornament and example of the whole class of students to which he belonged. He was greatly beloved and extolled by his instructors. His principal instructor in theology here was Lambert Danaeus, who had taught theology at Geneva, and was distinguished for his knowledge of the Christian fathers and of the scholastic divines.

After remaining at Leyden about six years, the Senate of Amsterdam, being moved by the peculiar reputation for brilliant talents and distinguished application which Arminius had acquired, sent him, in 1582, at their own expense, to Geneva, which was then regarded as the head-quarters of the Reformed Calvinistic churches. Here he enjoyed the instructions of the celebrated Beza, the friend and successor of Calvin, in the famous theological school at Geneva. But here he soon created a prejudice against himself, among the leading men in this school, on account of his enthusiastic attachment to the philosophy of Ramus, which he taught to his fellow students by private lectures, and which he boldly and zealously defended in public. The philosophy of Aristotle was at that time considered as the summit of perfection in this branch of science, not only at Geneva, but in all the schools and universities of Europe. The views of Ramus were opposed to this philosophy; and of course, Arminius, who appeared as a zealous and contentious advocate for the opinions of Ramus, (*magnâ contentione pro illâ contendebat*, says his friend Bertius,) could not expect to meet with the approbation of the instructors at Geneva. Accordingly, he was soon obliged to quit Geneva. He immediately repaired

to Basle, where Jacob Grynaeus was a distinguished teacher. Here he won so much applause and admiration by his attainments and devotedness to study, that he was speedily offered a doctorate in theology by the theological faculty at Basle, he being at that time only 22 years of age. This, however, he declined; justly deeming himself too young to be made the subject of such an honour.

The commotion excited at Geneva, by his opposition to the philosophy of Aristotle, in his absence soon began to subside. In 1583 he returned to Geneva. His own feelings were now greatly moderated on the subject of Ramus' philosophy, and he appears to have lived in quietude, during his second residence at Geneva.

As a characteristic of the times in which Arminius lived and Beza taught, it may be proper to stop the course of our narration for a moment, to make a little inquiry about Ramus and his philosophy, to which Arminius was so strongly attached. Peter Ramus was born in 1515, at Vermandois in Picardy. He was in indigent circumstances; but, from his love of learning, he procured himself a place in the university of Navarre at Paris, first in the capacity of a servant, then of a scholar. When a candidate for his master's degree, he boldly attacked the philosophy of Aristotle, assuming as his *thesis*, that all which Aristotle had written was false. This made great disturbance. He was forbidden to teach; he was accused of sapping the foundations of religion; and his sentence of degradation was posted up in every street of Paris. Gradually all this died away; and in 1531 he was made royal professor of Philosophy and Eloquence in the university. All his difficulties, however, were renewed afresh, when he attempted, as he did, to make an innovation in the pronunciation of a Latin word, and taught the students to sound the *qu* in uttering *quisquis*, instead of saying, as before, *kiskis*. Matters ran so high that the court of justice was obliged to interfere; who decided, that every one might pronounce Latin as he judged best. Ramus soon after deserted the catholic religion, and was expelled from his professorship; but after a while he was restored to favour, then attacked by new injuries; and finally massacred, with a vast multitude of other Protestants, on the horrible St. Bartholemew's day, in 1572. His body was thrown out of a window, his bowels torn out and scattered around the streets, and his corpse dragged by his Aristotelian

adversaries, and thrown into the Seine. Philosophy, it would seem, has her bigots, as well as religion; and the dispute, moreover, about *quisquis*, is highly indicative of the pulse of the times, and worthy of those who believed that nothing remained to be done in philosophy since the days of Aristotle.

When or where Arminius became acquainted with the philosophy of Ramus, does not appear. But a mind so ardent and inquiring as his, could not fail to read every thing which came in his way. That he found difficulty in the philosophy of Aristotle, will not be put to the score of heresy in these times; at least it will not, in this country. That he could find such difficulty, shews an inquiring, curious mind; perhaps some proneness to take pleasure in new things. Beza saw, as he thought, this characteristic of mind in him. He accordingly advertised one of Arminius' friends to warn him against it.—“It is a thing,” said this wise and experienced instructor, “which Satan often makes use of in order to mislead distinguished men. Do not engage in vain subtleties. If certain thoughts which are new, suggest themselves to your mind, do not approve them at once, without having thoroughly investigated them, whatever pleasure they may at first afford you.—Calvin gave me this advice; I have followed it, and always found it exceedingly good.”

Nothing could be more opportune, or more judicious and sound, than this advice. Had Arminius taken it as he should have done, and reduced it to practice, he would have never been the head of a party which is called by his name; and he would have avoided many a scandal and sorrow, and much disturbance to the church of God.

It is to be deeply regretted, that all the ministers of religion have not put in practice such principles as Calvin and Beza have thus recommended. They do not stand in the way of any real improvement whatever, in the manner of representing or teaching religion; they only stand in the way of hasty and crude speculations being thrown out, before they are in any good measure examined or digested.

Grynaeus himself, pleased as he was with Arminius while at Basle, seems to have entertained views of his temperament like those of Beza. Philip Paraeus, in his life of David Paraeus, avers that Grynaeus *Arminium graviter admonuisse*, against his ardour and love of novelty.

I am indebted for these particulars to Bayle; for Bertius, the

partial friend of Arminius, has wholly omitted them in his account of him. I cannot refrain from adding Bayle's own reflections; not only for their distinguished acuteness, but for their usefulness. "The cautions of Beza," says he, "are fitted to furnish reflections profitable to many persons, and quite necessary for some readers. Remember the maxim of St. Paul, *Knowledge puffeth up*; but be on your guard against another talent, which puffs up more still. A man of boundless memory and reading applauds himself for his knowledge, and becomes proud. But one applauds himself still more, and is still more proud, when he thinks himself to have invented a new method of explaining or treating any subject. One is not so apt to consider himself the father of a science which he has learned from books, as he is to regard himself as the parent of some new explanation or doctrine which he has invented. It is for one's own inventions that a man cherishes the strongest partiality and affection; here he finds the most captivating charms; this is what dazzles him, and makes him lose sight of every thing else. It is a quicksand, of which the young, who are possessed of distinguished talents, cannot be too much admonished, nor too cautious to shun."

These sentiments are not the less true nor the less important, because they come from a man who is known to have been somewhat sceptical on the subject of religion. They are worthy of all approbation and good heed on the part of every man, engaged in the solemn and highly responsible office of teaching the principles of the gospel.

Let us return to Arminius at Geneva. How long he remained here, during his second residence, is not well ascertained; but as he came here in 1583, and went into Italy in 1586—7, it seems probable that his stay was three or more years.

He was attracted to Italy, by the philosophic fame of James Zabarella at Padua. Thither he went, attended by a young Hollander, his constant and friendly companion. After attending a course of lectures here, he travelled through Italy, visited Rome, then returned to Geneva for a short time, and soon after to Holland. While on his travels, he and his companion carried with them a Greek Testament and a Hebrew Psalter, which they did not fail daily to read, in their exercises of devotion. In 1587 Arminius returned to Holland; and, on repairing to Amsterdam, he found that reports had been circulated there greatly to his disadvantage, respecting his favourable views of

the Roman Catholic religion. Among other things, it was said that he had kissed the pope's feet; that he was intimate with Jesuits; that he was introduced to Cardinal Bellarmine; and that he had renounced the Protestant religion. "All this was false," says Bertius, "for he never saw the pope, except as one of the crowd who gazed on him as he passed by, nor does the beast admit any except kings and princes to the honour of kissing his feet; of the Jesuits he knew nothing; Bellarmine he never saw; and as to the Protestant religion, he has ever been ready to shed his blood in its defence." "Bertius is wrong," says Bayle, "in averring that the pope admits none to kiss his feet but kings and princes; private individuals are sometimes admitted to this honour!"

The probability is, that Arminius had been a little profuse of compliments and politeness to the Italians, while he travelled in their country; and it is also probable, that he had ventured to express his admiration of some things which he found in the consecrated land of classical study. This, in the view of some of his fellow Protestants, was "paying homage to the beast." They began *spargere voces ambiguas*, at first; these, like Virgil's *Fama*, soon magnified; every day's journey which they took, added new strength; and by the time they reached Amsterdam, they had assumed the definite shape which has been stated above. It is thus that a little more than ordinary civility towards one's opponents, can be transformed by party zeal, and withal a little of jealousy or envy, into downright heresy.

The reflections of Bayle on this subject are so just and striking, that I cannot forbear to transcribe them. "Among the popular diseases of the human mind, I know not whether any are more worthy of blame, or more productive of evil consequences, than the habit of giving a loose rein to suspicion. It is a very slippery road; and one very soon finds himself at a great distance from the point where he set out. He passes easily from one suspicion to another. He begins with *possibility*, but does not stop there. He passes on to *probability*; then to an almost *certainty*. In a short time, what was possible or probable, becomes matter of *incontestable* certainty; and this certainty is spread over a whole town. Large cities are most of all exposed to this evil."

It may be true that large cities are more prolific in such offspring; because the means of multiplying them are so much more facile and convenient. But human nature is every where

substantially the same; and one of the most conspicuous evidences of its degraded and sinful condition, is, its proneness to suspicion and detraction, and the gratification which it experiences in indulging or fostering this spirit.

Arminius found his *Mecænaes*, at Amsterdam, cold and suspicious when he first returned. He succeeded, however, in satisfying them entirely that he had been slandered. He soon received an invitation to a place as minister in one of the churches at Amsterdam, over which he was installed in 1588, being then 28 years of age. On his return from Italy, he had passed through Geneva, where Beza gave him a letter to his patrons, in which he speaks of him as "animo ad faciendum officium optime comparatus, si Domino Deo placeret, ipsius uti ad opus suum in ecclesiâ suâ ministerio."

Arminius soon became exceedingly popular as a preacher at Amsterdam. His slender, but sweet and sonorous voice, his manner, his ardour, his distinguished talents and finished education, all combined to give him extensive popularity and influence. The rumours which had been set afloat concerning his inclination to become a Catholic, gradually died away, and all classes of men united in extolling his talents as a preacher and a pastor.

This season of popularity and peace, however, was soon in a measure interrupted, by an occurrence unforeseen, and altogether without design, on the part of Arminius. There lived, at Amsterdam, a man of distinguished talents and learning, by the name of Theodore Koornhert, who was strongly opposed to the doctrine of predestination as held at Geneva and in Holland, and who had written and spoken much against it. Two of the ministers at Delft, Arnold Cornelius and Renier Dunteklok had undertaken, by conference and by writing, to oppose Koornhert. In order to do this, however, as they thought to the best advantage, they had relinquished the views of Calvin and Beza in respect to the *decretum absolutum*, viz. the doctrine that the decree of election and reprobation preceded all respect to the fall of man, and to his obedience or disobedience. This is what has since been called *Supralapsarianism*. On the other hand, the ministers at Delft maintained, not only that God in his decree regarded man as created, but also that he had respect to his lapsed condition. This is what has since been called *Sublapsarianism*. It was the work which the Delft ministers published at this time, entitled *Answer to some Arguments of Calvin*

and Beza on the subject of Predestination, which first gave rise to these denominations in the church of Christ.

Whether the ministers of Delft did not misunderstand the views of Calvin and Beza, it may be of some importance here briefly to shew. Calvin says: "Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he hath determined, in himself, what he would have to become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or other of these ends, we say, he is predestinated either to life or to death." Institutt. Lib. III. c. 21. § 5.*—"In conformity with the clear doctrine of Scripture, we assert, that by an eternal and immutable counsel, God hath once for all determined, both whom he would once for all admit to salvation, and whom again he would condemn to destruction." Ib. § 7.†—"Now with respect to the reprobate . . . Esau, while yet unpolluted with any crime, is accounted an object of hatred. If we turn our attention to works, we insult the apostle, as though he saw not what is clear to us. Now that he saw none [i. e. no works], is evident, because he expressly asserts the one [Jacob] to have been elected, and the other [Esau] rejected, while they had not yet distinguished any good or evil, to prove the foundation of divine predestination not to be in works. . . . The reprobate are raised up for this purpose, that the glory of God may be displayed by their means. . . . When God is said to harden, or shew mercy to whom he pleases, men are taught by this declaration, to seek no cause beside his will." Lib. III. c. 22. § 11.‡

* Praedestinationem vocamus aeternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes; sed aliis vita aeterna, aliis damnatio aeterna praeordinatur. Itaque prout in alterutrum finem quisque conditus est, ita vel ad vitam vel ad mortem praedestinatum dicimus.

† Quod ergo Scriptura clare ostendit, dicimus, aeterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse, quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursus exitio devovere.

‡ Nunc de reprobis . . . Esau, nullo adhuc scelere inquinatus, odio habetur. Si ad opera convertimus oculos, injuriam irrogamus apostolo, quasi id ipsum quod nobis perspicuum est non viderit. Porro non vidisse convincitur, quando hoc nominatim

—“Let them [the wicked] not accuse God of injustice, if his eternal decree has destined them to death, to which they feel themselves, whatever be their desire or aversion (*velint nolint*), spontaneously led forward by their own nature.” L. III. c. 23. § 3.—“But though I should an hundred times admit God to be the author of it [the perverseness of the wicked], which is perfectly correct (*verissimum*), yet this does not abolish the guilt impressed on their consciences, and from time to time recurring to their view.” *Ibid.* †—“All things being at God’s disposal . . . he orders all things by his counsel and decree in such a manner, that some men are born, devoted from the womb to certain death, that his name may be glorified in their destruction.” *Ib.* § 6. ‡

As a more thorough-going passage still, in some respects, I quote once more from Lib. III. c. 24. § 13. Calvin is commenting on the passage in Is. 6: 9, 10, *Hear ye, indeed, but understand not*, etc. “Observe,” says he, “that he [Jehovah] directs his voice to them [the Jews]; but it is that they may become more deaf; he kindles a light, but it is that they may become more blind; he publishes his doctrine, but it is that they may be more besotted; he applies a remedy, but it is that they may not be healed. . . . Nor can it be disputed, that to such persons as God determines not to enlighten, he [God] delivers

urget, quum nihildum boni aut mali designassent, alterum electum, alterum rejectum; ut probet divinae praedestinationis fundamentum in operibus non esse . . . quod in hunc finem excitentur reprobi, ut Dei gloria per illos illustretur. . . . Quum enim Deus dicitur vel indurare, vel misericordia prosequi quem voluerit, eo admonentur homines nihil causae quaerere extra ejus voluntatem.

* Ne ergo Deum iniquitatis insimulent, si aeterno ejus judicio morti destinati sint, ad quam a sua ipsorum natura sponte se perducere, velint nolint, ipsi sentiunt.

† Atqui ut centies Deum auctorem confitear, quod verissimum est, non protinus tamen crimen eluunt, quod eorum conscientiis insculptum subinde eorum oculis recurrit.

‡ Ecce, quum rerum omnium dispositio in manu Dei sit, quum penes ipsum resideat salutis ac mortis arbitrium, consilio nutuque suo ita ordinat, ut inter homines nascantur, ab utero certae morti devoti, qui suo exitio ipsius nomen glorificent.

his doctrine in enigmatical obscurity, that its only effect may be, to increase their stupidity.”*

These passages, all taken from the *Institutiones* of Calvin, a work that was published while he was yet a youth, could hardly be assumed as the certain index of his riper opinions, were it not that we find them confirmed in his Commentary, a work accomplished in his mature years. Let us then hear the same author, when commenting on Rom. 9: 18, *Therefore he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth.* “We must insist,” says he, “on the words *whom he will*; beyond which we cannot go. As to the word *harden*, when this is used concerning God in the Scriptures, it means not only *permission*, (as some drivelling moderates would say,) but it also means the *action of divine indignation*; for all external means which conduce to the blinding of the reprobate, are instruments of the divine indignation. Yea, Satan himself, *who acts with efficiency internally*, is in such a sense his minister, that *he acts only under his control* (nonnisi ejus imperio agat). That pitiful subterfuge of the schoolmen, then, about foreknowledge, falls to the ground. Paul does not teach here that the ruin of the impious was *foreseen* by God, but that it was *ordained* by his will and counsel; in the same manner as Solomon teaches, not only that God foreknew the destruction of the impious, but that the impious were, by his decree, created in order that they might perish, Prov. 16: 4.”†

* Ecce, vocem ad eos, dirigit, sed ut magis obsurdescant; lucem accendit, sed ut reddentur caeciores; doctrinam profert, sed qua magis obstupescant; remedium adhibet; sed ne sanetur. . . . Neque hoc quoque controverti potest, quos Deus illuminatos non vult, illis doctrinam suam aenigmatibus involutam tradere, ne quid inde proficiunt, nisi ut in majorem hebetudinem tradantur.

† Insistere enim debemus in istas particulas, *Cujus vult et quem vult*; ultra quas procedere nobis non permittit. Caeterum *indurandi* verbum, quum Deo in Scripturis tribuitur, non solum *permissionem*, (ut volunt diluti quidam moderatores,) sed divinae quoque irae actionem significat. Nam res omnes externae quae ad excaecationem reprobatorum faciunt, illius irae sunt instrumenta. Satan autem ipse, *qui intus efficaciter agit*, ita ejus est minister, *ut nonnisi ejus imperio agat*. Corruit ergo frivolum illud effugium, quod de praescientiâ Scholastici habent. Neque enim praevideri ruinam impiorum a Domino Paulus tradit, sed ejus consilio et voluntate ordinari. Quemadmodum et Salomo docet, non modo

Again, in commenting on Rom. 9: 10—13, he says: “Although Esau might have been justly rejected, on account of his *vitiosity* [original sin] . . . yet that no occasion of doubt may remain here, as if Esau’s condition may have been any the worse on account of any fault or sin of his own, it was proper that both sins and virtues should be excluded. [He means virtues with respect to Jacob, and sins with respect to Esau] . . . God has, in his own will, just cause of election and reprobation.”*

On Rom. 9: 17, *For this same purpose have I raised thee up*, viz. Pharaoh, Calvin says: “God declares that Pharaoh proceeds from him; that he has assigned him this part to act; and to this sentiment the words *ἐξέγειρά σε* well correspond. Moreover, lest any one should imagine that Pharaoh was impelled by a kind of general and indistinct impetus on the part of God, so that he might rush into that madness, the special cause or ground is here designated; as if it had been said, that God knew what Pharaoh was about to do, but of set purpose he had destined him to this very end.”†

That Calvin, then, was a Supralapsarian, in the sense in which the Delft ministers understood him to be, seems, from these passages and many more to the same purpose which might easily be adduced, to admit of no historical doubt. The right or wrong of his opinions, is no part of my present business. I am now merely acting the part of a historian. By and by I shall make a few remarks, on the use and abuse of such passa-

praecognitum fuisse interitum, sed impios ipsos fuisse destinato creatos ut perirent, Prov. xvi. 4.

* Etsi sola vitiositas, quae diffusa est . . . ad damnationem sufficit, unde sequitur merito rejectum fuisse Esau . . . ne quis tamen maneat scrupulus, ac si ullius culpa aut vitii respectu deterior ejus conditio fuisset, non minus peccata quam virtutes excludi utile fuit. . . . Deum in suo arbitrio satis justam eligendi et reprobandi habere causam.

† Deus Pharaonem a se profectum dicit, eique hanc impositam esse personam. Cui sententiae optime respondet *excitandi* verbum. Porro, ne quis imaginetur quodam universali et confuso motu divinitus actum fuisse Pharaonem, ut in illum furorem rueret, notatur specialis causa vel finis; ac si dictum essent, scivisse Deum quid facturus esset Pharao, sed datâ operâ in hunc usum destinasse.

ges as these, in Calvin and other Reformers. But for the present, I pass on to a brief notice of the allegation in respect to the *supralapsarian* sentiments of Beza.

This excellent scholar and able commentator, in his note on Rom. 9: 11, says: "Those who maintain that God has predestinated reprobates to eternal destruction, because he was influenced by any unbelief or sinful works which he foresaw in them, *magnopere profecto falluntur*. On this ground, one must draw the conclusion that the counsels of God have their ground in created things and in secondary causes, *quod non modo falsissimum, verum impium fuerit cogitare*." He then goes on to argue, that just the contrary of all this is true, viz. that things are as they are, because God, for reasons wholly within himself, determined they should be so; he neither had respect to any faith or good works in the elect, nor to any unbelief or wicked works in the reprobate.

Again, Rom. 9: 17 Beza thus paraphrases: "Respondet de reprobis, sive quos Deus in odio habet nondum natos, et nullo indignitatis praeceunte respectu, exitio destinavit; i. e. The apostle treats of the reprobate, whom God hates before they are born, and without any preceding respect to their unworthiness, has destined to destruction."

These extracts will serve to shew that the ministers of Delft did not misunderstand Calvin and Beza, in regard to their views concerning the decrees of God; and that I have not misinterpreted their meaning in the explanation which I have given above. I have quoted from Calvin and Beza, neither for the sake of attack or defence; but merely that the reader may have a fair chance to know the ground on which he stands, while entering upon the history of the times of Arminius.

I return to my narration. The book of the Delft ministers, containing strictures on the *Supralapsarianism* of Calvin and Beza, was sent by its authors to Martin Lydius, then professor of Theology at Franeker. He was dissatisfied with it; but instead of undertaking to answer it himself, he solicited Arminius to do it, in order that he might defend his teacher Beza. This Arminius at first inclined to do; but after a thorough perusal of the *Ansuer*, he suspended his purpose, as his mind had been filled, by the perusal of the book, with doubts or difficulties in regard to some positions of Beza and Calvin respecting the point in question.

These doubts were soon whispered abroad in Amsterdam,

although Arminius did not himself proclaim them in public. Suspicions of defection from orthodoxy began to break out more openly against him, when, in 1591, he explained publicly the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and represented the latter part of it as describing the sinner under legal conviction; in the same manner as Martin Bucer had before explained it, and all the fathers of the church before the days of Augustine; and in like manner, I may add, as nearly all commentators, whether evangelical or neological, have of late done. He was now accused of *Pelagianism*; and the accusation became the more bitter, because Faustus Socinus had just published, under a fictitious name, the same view of the sentiments contained in this passage of sacred writ. He was cited before the synod on account of the exegesis in question, and had long disputes with many of his brethren. His lectures on Rom. vii. are published in his works. They exhibit much acuteness; but it is nearly all employed in the way of the school logic, not in the way of philology.

These difficulties were augmented still more, when, in 1593, Arminius published his lectures on Rom. ix. in which he called in question the interpretation given by Calvin and Beza of this chapter, and laboured to shew that it was susceptible of another and more probable meaning. In his view, the object of the chapter is to shew, that God in rejecting the Jews, who sought for salvation on the ground of their own merit and refused to accept of the terms of the gospel, and in receiving the Gentiles into their place as the spiritual children of Abraham, not only did the Jews no wrong, but that his proceeding in this case was entirely analogous with many instances of the like nature, which are recounted in the Old Testament and mentioned in Rom. ix. Whether Arminius supposed this reception of the Gentiles into the place of the excluded Jews, to be one of merely an *external* nature, or whether it was truly *spiritual* and *effectual*, is not very explicitly stated by him; at least I have not met with very explicit declarations. If the former only, then one might well ask, whether the great question in debate by the apostle, has any concern with the *mere externals* of religion? If the latter, then all the difficulties are in reality involved in his own opinion, which belong to that of his antagonists; although the manner in which they have sometimes expressed themselves may be liable to serious objection.

At any rate, however, the exegesis of Arminius was much

more specious and tolerable, than that of his successor Episcopus, who, at an almost immeasurable length, has laboured to shew, that the predestination which Paul mentions in Rom. 8: 28, and on which he descants through chap. ix. is a predestination to *sufferings and sorrows*, which the Jewish converts were to expect, and not a predestination to *salvation*. Neither the strong commendations of this opinion by Schröckh (Kirchengesch. seit der Reform. V. 285 seq.) nor the more respectable opinion of J. A. Turretin (Comm. on Rom. viii.) that this is one of the objects which Paul had in view, can support any just claim to its reception.

It is very natural to suppose, considering what the views of Calvin and Beza were respecting Rom. ix. and how extensively these were received among the reformed churches, that such an interpretation by Arminius would occasion not a little commotion. This was the case. Disputes arose out of this, which greatly disturbed the peace and harmony of the churches at Amsterdam and in its neighbourhood, and were productive of no small evil.

In 1597 Arminius repaired to Leyden, for the sake of conferring with the celebrated F. Junius, who was then professor of theology there. The result of this was a long and amicable correspondence between them, on the subject of decrees, necessity, liberty, etc. which is published in the works of Arminius. Junius treated these subjects with mildness and great ability; but he did not satisfy the scruples of his friend respecting them, who became, as it usually happens in such cases, still more confirmed in his own opinion.

There lived, at this time, a very popular and able minister of the gospel at the Hague, by the name of Uytenbogart, who sympathized in sentiment and feelings with Arminius. To him Arminius wrote, beseeching him to assist in the examination of the difficult questions in which he was engaged. Uytenbogart, as appears by the sequel, entered warmly into his views.

In 1598, Arminius wrote his *Examen modestum Libelli Perkinsii*, i. e. of the treatise in defence of predestination, which the Englishman Perkins had published under the title of *Armilla Aurea*. In 1699, he and his friend Uytenbogart endeavoured to move the States of Holland, to cause a new translation of the Bible to be made by that excellent scholar, Drusus. In this they failed, because suspicion was already strong among many

of the clergy, that they were aiming at the overthrow of the sentiments then prevailing in the churches of Holland.

In 1600, Arminius set himself against those of his brethren, who were urging an *annual* subscription of all the ministers to the creed and catechism of the churches in Holland. In 1602, the plague made dreadful ravages in this country, and particularly at Amsterdam. Arminius is said to have distinguished himself greatly, during the continuance of it, by his attention and kindness to the sick and to the bereaved.

During this plague, F. Junius and L. Trelcatius, professors of divinity at Leyden, both died. The curators of that university elected Arminius to the place of Junius, in 1603. It was only by the interposition of the curators at Leyden, and of the leading men in the government of the States, that the synod at Amsterdam were persuaded to give him a dismissal from the church at Amsterdam; so great was the attachment of his people to their minister.

It is said that F. Gomar, a distinguished professor of theology in Leyden at this time, was opposed to the election of Arminius. Soon after the latter was inaugurated into his office, he and his colleague Gomar were brought to a friendly conference, in which Arminius explained himself so plainly and fully against the doctrines of Pelagius, that Gomar professed to be satisfied. But during the next year, Arminius delivered a lecture on predestination, in which he maintained that God had eternally decreed to save believers, and to punish the impenitent; the one to the praise of his glorious grace, the other in order to display his power and his indignation against sin. Arminius doubtless meant, that God had respect in his decree, to the belief of the one, and the unbelief of the other. Gomar openly attacked this lecture; Arminius replied; and thus commenced a dispute which has not yet subsided. Gomar carried it on actively, during the rest of his life. The students of the university soon became engaged in it, and were divided; a part held with Gomar, but a majority with Arminius, whose lecture-room was always crowded.

This state of things very naturally took hold of the public sympathies. The ministers of the gospel became divided, as well as the students of the university; but the majority appear to have taken the side of Gomar, and blamed Arminius. As the contest went on, the teachers of religion began first to dis-

pute with each other, then to preach and write against each other, until all Holland was in a state of religious war.

In 1604, some *theses* of Arminius on the divinity of Christ, occasioned him new trouble. The reader will see his views on this subject, in the extracts which by and by will be made from his works.

In 1607, the ministers of Gouda published a catechism, which for the most part was expressed in the language of Scripture, and was intended to be simple and brief. Arminius was accused of favouring this catechism, which, it was averred, would open the floodgates for all manner of error. All these occurrences served to increase the excitement in Holland. This finally rose so high, that the States General were called upon by Arminius and Uytenbogart, to convoke a general synod, before which Arminius might defend himself. The Supreme Council admitted Arminius and Gomar to a conference before them. The result was, that the Council informed the States General, that the disputes between the parties were on points of difficulty, and of little or no importance; and with respect to them, one might believe in this manner or in that, *salvâ fide et salvâ ecclesiâ*. The States General enjoined on the parties to cease contention, and to teach nothing against the creed or catechism; and here they dismissed the matter, intimating only, that at some future day, the subjects in dispute might be decided either by a provincial or national synod.

This attempt of the government to put a stop to the disputes concerning religion, although well meant, was entirely unsuccessful. Neither Arminius nor Gomar ceased to defend themselves, nor to attack their opponents. The students of the university of course followed suit; and ministers through the country, and finally private individuals, became deeply engaged on one side or the other, in this contest.

The friends of Arminius urged upon their more numerous and powerful antagonists, the command of the government to desist from disputation on the subject of the divine decrees. Gomar and his friends, excited by remonstrances of this nature, finally disclaimed the authority of the States General in matters of religion. In accordance with these views, the *classis* of Alcmarr proceeded, in 1608, to depose five of their number from the ministry, because they refused subscription to a declaration enjoined by them; which amounted to this, viz. that the Heidelberg catechism and the creed of the Hollandic churches, were entirely

accordant throughout with the word of God, and that one was bound to teach all which they contained. They were commanded by the Supreme Council to restore the ejected ministers to their office ; but their answer was, that this was an *ecclesiastical* matter, entrusted to the church and not to civil rulers. In the sequel, they partly yielded, but not entirely, as to the point in question.

About this time, fresh rumours broke out against Arminius, viz. that he and Uytenbogart had been treated with by the pope, in order to engage them in the defence of the Roman catholic religion. The ground of these rumours was, that Arminius had averred, that God was ready and willing to impart strength to men to do the duty which he required of them ; and also, that he had said, that a pope, who like Adrian VI. should honestly aim at a reformation, was to be judged with moderation. To put these accusations to silence, Arminius published his *Theses de Idololatriâ*, in which he maintained that the pope is an *idol*, and that all who pay homage to him, are idolaters. He published other theses also, in which he defended the churches of the Reformation against the imputation of schism ; and in a public *disputatio*, about this time, he declared the pope to be “*adulterum et lenonem ecclesiae, pseudo-prophetam, et caudam draconis, Dei et Christi adversarium, Anti-christum ; servum malum qui conservos suos verberat, episcopi nomine indignum, ecclesiae destructorem et vastatorem.*”

One would think, that if calling hard names could ever develope one man's views respecting another, Arminius had sufficiently done this with respect to the pope, on the present occasion. But all this did not seem to satisfy his opponents. Hints were still circulated, that he had a secret favourable opinion of the Romish church. One of the ministers at Amsterdam accused him of maintaining many capital errors ; and among the rest, of holding the pope to be a true member of the church of Jesus Christ : “*a doctrine,*” said he, “*so odious to God, that many persons have remarked, that since it began to be maintained, the affairs of our republic have taken a very unfortunate turn.*” In addition to all this it was reported, that Arminius had persuaded a number of persons to return to the bosom of the catholic church, and influenced magistrates to become less rigid in refusing to papists the liberty of worshipping in their own way without molestation.

In reply to these accusations, Arminius wrote a letter to Se-

bastian Egbert, in which he explicitly declared that "he did not regard the pope as a member of the body of Christ, but as an obstinate enemy of the same, a sacrilegious man, a blasphemer, a tyrant, a most violent usurper of unjust dominion over the church, the man of sin, the son of perdition, etc."

As Luther and Calvin had scarcely ever succeeded in bringing more hard names together against the pope, than Arminius collected on this occasion, he seemed, at last, to have made the kind of propitiatory offering which the spirit of the day demanded. For a man to argue coolly and dispassionately, whatever skill or weight his arguments might exhibit or contain, was not enough to satisfy the excited feelings of men. If one did not blacken his adversary, it was but half doing his work. Above all, if he found in him any good thing, one trait of candour, generosity, ability, learning even, then he was no true son of his party. He was regarded as being in secret more than half on his opponent's side; and the only way in which he could throw off this load of suspicion, was, to fill his pages with epithets chosen from the vocabulary which the excitement of the times had rendered too common, to exhibit passionate antipathy, and as it were to clench his fist, and bring it not very softly against the face of his adversary.

One of the most derogatory things that I know of respecting Arminius, is, that he was overcome by the pressure of calumny, so as to yield to such a spirit as that which I have now described. He ought to have resisted it, with calmness as to manner, but still with sacred indignation; because it was truly of an unchristian character. He should have trusted in God, for his ultimate defence and deliverance from calumny. He should have bid defiance to the storm that raged, not in the spirit of pride, but in the strength of conscious innocence; and he was entitled to look with pity on those, who insisted upon it, on penalty of defaming his reputation, that he should defend the truth of God in an ungodly manner. Passion is not piety; the calling of hard names is not argument; the loading of an opponent with curses or with detraction, is not the most probable way of convincing him; nor is the exhibition of the *odium theologicum* a very happy exemplification of obedience to those precepts, which require us, when we are reviled, not to revile again, and demand that 'the servant of the Lord should not strive, but be gentle toward all men, meekly instructing those who oppose

themselves to the truth, if peradventure God will give them repentance.'

Arminius, however, is not the first nor the last, who has been driven, by the cry of heresy, from the ground which Christian integrity and courtesy should ever maintain. But he would have appeared far more dignified, in my view, had he never moved an inch because of the empty accusations about his inclination toward the Romish church. I am constrained indeed to believe, that all the accusations are true, which he made against the head of that church, as he then was, and has been for most of the time since. But I could wish he had never uttered them in the manner that he did; much less to appease the unjust demands made on him by detraction. It was an unholy sacrifice. A man who makes such an one, must expect that the very persons who demand it, will shortly turn round, and look at him with contempt for doing what they demanded. And no doubt, sooner or later, he did receive ample retribution in this way.

Thus much for the spirit of the day, and the homage which even the more independent minds paid to it. We return to the events of Arminius' life.

In this same year (1608) Arminius was summoned by the States General to appear before them at the Hague, and give them an account of his sentiments. This he did in his famous *Declaratio*, published in his works. From this, most of the extracts in the sequel are made, which are exhibited in order to develope the sentiments of Arminius.

The States General, as a body, were at this time beyond all doubt inclined to favour Arminius. But the disputes continuing with increased violence, in the next year (1609) they summoned Arminius and Gomar before them once more, each accompanied by four ministers of his own party, in order that they might hold another conference in their presence. This was interrupted, in a short time, by the sickness of Arminius. Gomar and his friends insisted, before the magistrates, on a general synod, knowing that they had a majority of the clergy on their side. Uytenbogart, the special friend of Arminius, who was present as one of his assistants, warned the States against being prejudiced by the violence and the number of the opponents of Arminius. He expressed an entire willingness to have a general synod; only he averred that, as Beza once said, *he did not wish Satan to be the president of it.*

In the mean time, Arminius died, on the 19th Oct. 1609. His last sickness was exceedingly severe. Exhausted by the fatigues of body and mind which he had undergone, during the many years of his warfare; deeply wounded by the ill reports which the heat of dispute had engendered, and zeal against him had extensively circulated; he fell under a complication of diseases, viz. fever, cough, dyspnoea, atrophy, and arthritis. It is said, that amidst all his sufferings, he died with great calmness and resignation, lamenting the evils to which the church had been exposed, and earnestly praying for her peace and prosperity. In his last will, made on his death bed, he solemnly testifies that he had, with simplicity and sincerity of heart, endeavoured to discover the truth by searching the Scriptures; and that he had never preached or taught any thing, which he did not believe to be contained in them.

Some of his opponents, as Bertius tells us, did not fail to take advantage of the circumstances of his death, in order to make an impression that heaven had interposed, by special judgments, to remove him from the earth. A partial paralysis of the left side, was one of the evils which he suffered in his last sickness; and with this, came on an obscuration of vision in the left eye, the optic nerve of which became insensible. His opponents, as Bertius and Brandt aver, quoted and applied to him, because of this, the passage in Zech. 14: 12, where it is said of the enemies of Jerusalem, that *their eyes shall consume away in their sockets*; also Zech. 11: 17, where it is said of a false shepherd, that *the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye*. If they did so, they were at least unlucky in the choice of this last text, as it was the *left* eye of Arminius which was affected.

On a par with this exegesis and application of the Scripture, we may place the epigrams which are said to have been made, on the occasion of his death; among the rest, one made out of his name, by transposition of the letters, *Vani Orbis Amicus*. Among the blessings which the ravages of time bring along with them, one is, that they exterminate a mass of poisonous or of worthless matter, which would otherwise mar the safety and peace of the world by its influence. Such epigrams, I would hope for the honour of Christianity, have been swept away by time, and that they lie buried deep, along with the accusations that Arminius was inclined to favour the Romish church.

On the other hand, Baudius and Grotius each composed Latin elegies on the occasion of Arminius' death, which were filled

with eulogy of his learning and his virtues. It is said that the celebrated Daniel Heinsius, private secretary of the deputation of the States General at the Synod of Dort, did the same; but the copy of his verses was suppressed in the later edition of his works.

That the friends of Arminius should be deeply wounded by the bitter antipathy against him which was manifested by his opponents, is not strange; and the probability is, that their eulogy of him has been greatly heightened by this circumstance. Such is plainly the case in respect to the funeral oration of Bertius his friend. Speaking of the detraction which Arminius suffered, and which contributed to hasten his end, he says: "Oppressio, inquit Sirachides, insanum facit sapientem. Eadem huic dolorem, ex dolore morbum conciliavit, ex morbo mortem." On which he exclaims, "O tetrum, et viperium, exque imo Tartaro excitatum malum!" Speaking, further on, of the application to Arminius of the passage in the prophet Zechariah 11: 17, to which I have referred above, he says: "Is locus in sanctum Christi servum, corpore quidem afflictum, sed animo nunquam non felicem, nunc vero etiam felicissimum, contortus est. Horresco tam enormis et detestandi et impii facti memoriâ. Quis tu es, O homo, qui fratrem tuum condemnas, propter quem Christus sanguinem suum fudit?"

Near the close of his eulogy, he thus eloquently describes the death of Arminius: "Tandem vero XIX. Octobris, circa meridiem, fidelis iste servus Dei, defunctus strenue omnibus militiae suae stipendiis, consummato cursu, decertato bono illo certamine, servatâ fide, animam suam jam pertaesam curarum, jam saturam aerumnarum hujus mundi, jam liberationem exoptantem, jam sanctorum gaudia praegustantem, jam Christum Deum suum ac redemptorem cernentem, oculis in coelum sublatis, placide inter sanctas eorum qui aderant preces, Deo Patri creatori suo, Filio redemptori suo, Spiritui Sancto sanctificatori suo, reddidit, acclamantibus omnibus, *Morietur anima mea morte justorum!*"

"Ita occidit (continues the orator) nobis etiam iste sol; ita mortuus est justus, quo mundus iste non dignus fuit; ita sublatus est pater tot prophetarum; ita curru Israelis et equitibus ejus in altum a nobis subvectus est JACOBUS ARMINIUS; et nunc immunis, liber, atque expeditus aerumnis, habet coronam tot laboribus, tantâ perseverantiâ fidei, tantâ sanctimoniâ expetitam, fruiturque coelesti Jerusalem, inter frequentiam multorum mil-

lium angelorum, et ecclesiam primogenitorum qui conscripti sunt in coelis."

After a few more sentences of the like tenor, he finishes all by saying : " Fuisse in Bataviâ virum [Arminium], quem qui norant, non potuerant satis aestimare ; qui non aestimarunt, non satis cognoverunt."

The whole strain of this shews, that when men of eminent talents are assailed, who have made a deep impression on the hearts of their friends, opposition or detraction by their opponents, only serves to heighten the esteem and eulogy of their adherents.

In estimating the character and virtues of Arminius, a cautious inquirer will follow implicitly neither the praises of his friends, nor the condemnation of his enemies. Both were exaggerated by the disputes and animosities of the day. But these are past by, and buried in oblivion. The consequences of them, indeed, remain, but the *personalities* of them are buried in the graves of those who had a personal interest in them. We can now look back, examine the whole ground, and pass a more impartial judgement than could be expected from the times in which Arminius lived, or those which immediately followed.

Before we assay, however, to do this, it will be proper to pass in review before us the real doctrines which Arminius held and taught. We wish to look at him as a *Christian teacher*, as well as a man, a scholar, and a professor at Leyden. Nor can we properly make up our minds respecting him, until we have examined thoroughly what his real views were.

But before I proceed to develop fully his sentiments, it will be proper, in order to gratify the curiosity of the reader, to present a brief outline of the immediate consequences which flowed from the disputes in which Arminius was engaged. This I shall endeavour to do, confining myself to important circumstances only, and narrating these as briefly as perspicuity will admit.

It does not appear, that the conference in which Arminius was engaged, at the time of his death, was productive of any good effect upon the state of party feeling in Holland. The government, however, were evidently leaning towards his side ; for in the following year (1610), on sending an embassy to France, Uytenbogart was appointed chaplain. At Paris he enjoyed frequent conferences with the celebrated J. Casaubon, then overseer of the royal library at Paris, although a protestant. These conferences served much to strengthen Uytenbo-

gart in the sentiments which he had espoused, inasmuch as Casaubon, for the most part, agreed with them.

In the mean time, during the absence of Uytenbogart in 1610, the disputes went on in Holland, and the violence of them continued more and more to augment. They had now become so extensive, that nearly all the country were engaged in them, clergymen and laymen, the learned and the unlearned.—A large majority of the clergy and leading religious men, adopted the sentiments of Gomar, and espoused his cause. The Arminian party, fearing lest matters might come to extremities, and themselves be crushed, drew up a representation of their sentiments, which was presented to the States General, and was named by its authors *Remonstrantie*, i. e. remonstrance. This gave rise to the name of *remonstrants*, by which the party has been usually called, from that time down to the present, on the continent of Europe. The *remonstrance* was arranged in five articles, the sum of which was ; that ‘God has from eternity determined to save those who believe in Christ and persevere in faith and good works, and to cast off those who are unbelieving and impenitent, and remain so ; that Christ, the Saviour of the world, died for all men ; that by his death he made atonement for sin, and procured the forgiveness of it ; yet in such a way, that believers only can enjoy the benefits of this ; that man cannot of himself acquire a saving faith, nor by the strength of his own free-will, but that he needs the grace of God through Christ, in order to accomplish this ; that this grace is the original cause of the beginning, continuance, and completion of the salvation of men, and in such a way that none can believe without co-operating grace, nor continue in belief without the same ; consequently, that all good works must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ ; but this grace is not irresistible. Believers, moreover, have sufficient strength, through the grace of God, to overcome sin, Satan, the world, and their own carnal appetites.’

On the question, whether saints can fall from grace, they merely said, that it deserved further consideration ; but afterwards they decidedly embraced the affirmative of the question.

The consequence of this remonstrance was, that the States General enjoined the clergy not to exact a subscription of belief relative to the five points in question, but to go on in harmony together. But some of the *classes* made answer, that they could not obey such an injunction.

In 1611, the States General made another attempt at concili-

ation. They summoned six preachers of each party to a conference before them at the Hague. As the preachers could not agree, the States recommended to them mutual forbearance.— But already had the party of Gomar made out a *contra-remonstrance*, in which the doctrine of predestination was placed on high ground, and many positions of their opponents contradicted. On account of this, the party opposed to Arminius have very frequently been called *contra-remonstrants*.

At this time, the celebrated Simon Episcopius, the second father of the Arminian party, came upon the stage of action.— He was born at Amsterdam in 1583, educated at Leyden under Arminius and Gomar, and settled as a minister of the gospel at Blaeswick, a village near Rotterdam, in 1610. In 1611, Gomar relinquished his professorship at Leyden, and retired to Middleburg in Zeeland, where he taught Hebrew and theology. Episcopius was immediately elected in his place, young as he was ; while Conrad Vorstius, more than suspected afterwards of favouring Unitarianism, already occupied the chair of Arminius. These events shew, that the curators of Leyden were, at this time, altogether on the side of Arminius.

The dispute thus excited, did not confine itself to the bounds of Holland. The friends of Gomar had influenced the mind of James I. king of England, to take part in it, as he sympathized much with their views. Vorstius published a book about this time, entitled *Tractatus de Deo*, etc. which contained many things on predestination and other doctrines, very obnoxious to the friends of Gomar. James I. ordered this book of Vorstius to be burned in England, published himself an attack upon it, and wrote to the States General to suppress it, and to expel Vorstius from his office on penalty of his displeasure. Vorstius defended himself; but political considerations led the States General to dismiss him in 1612; on which he retired to Tergow.

J. Polyander, a *contra-remonstrant*, was now introduced into the chair of theology at Leyden; but being a man of pacific feelings, he and Episcopius lived together on amicable terms.

The States General were not yet satisfied with conferences of religious teachers. Another was held, by their appointment, at Delft, in 1613; but without any good consequences. They again enjoined the clergy to abstain from disputes concerning predestination, to preach the doctrines of grace, and to live in

harmony. But many preachers refused to listen to these injunctions.

Political parties now arose in Holland, who took under their wing the respective theological parties, and thus greatly aggravated the evil. John Van Oldenbarneveld, advocate of Holland, celebrated by the republican party as the great champion of civil freedom and of the rights of man, and Grotius, a distinguished scholar and civilian as well as theologian, favoured the Arminian party. On the other hand, Prince Maurice of Orange, Stadtholder, Captain-General, and Admiral-General of the republic, enlisted strongly on the side of the contra-remonstrants. The latter, who were now a decided majority in the States, began to press hard for a national synod. The States General, urged on by Maurice and his friends, finally determined on this measure, and in the year 1617, *Dort* was fixed upon as the place where it should be held.

In 1618, the reformed churches abroad were most of them invited to send deputies to this synod. During the same year, prince Maurice caused Oldenbarneveld, Grotius, and Hogerbeets, the three most distinguished advocates of the republican party in Holland, to be arrested and imprisoned. They were accused, on account of the part which they took in befriending the Arminians, of fomenting religious discord, and of putting in jeopardy the union of the provinces. In the sequel, Oldenbarneveld was beheaded at the age of 72 years; and the two others were condemned to perpetual imprisonment.

In the same year (1618) the synod assembled at *Dort*, consisting of 5 professors, 36 preachers, and 28 elders from Holland, and 28 theologians from England, Scotland, Hesse, Switzerland, Nassau, the Palatinate, East Friesland, and Bremen. No Arminians appear to have been elected to the synod, except three in the province of Utrecht; and of these only one was admitted as a member of the same. The Arminians, however, were invited to appear before the synod, and to make such explanation and defence of their sentiments as they thought proper.

At the twenty-second session of the synod, Episcopius and his twelve colleagues, summoned for this purpose, appeared in order to enter upon their explanation and defence; but declined submitting to the jurisdiction of the synod, on the conditions which it prescribed. The letter of summons, which, by direction of the deputies of the States General

who were present at the council, in order to watch and regulate its movements, had gone forth in the name of the synod, citing Episcopius and his twelve colleagues to appear before that body, was couched in the following terms, viz. "Synodus nationalis aequum et necessarium judicavit . . . Remonstrantes ad hanc synodum vocare et citare, ut in eadem dictos articulos [the five points as they are called] *libere proponant, explicent, et defendant, quantum possunt et necessarium judicabunt.*" Under the authority of this citation, the remonstrants claimed the liberty of defending themselves in their own way, unitedly or otherwise, in writing or *vivâ voce*, and in what order they judged best. At the twenty-fifth session of the synod, Episcopius read an address of more than two hours in length, the object of which was to disclaim the jurisdiction of the synod over the remonstrants, because it consisted of a party selection of members. In this paper, he examined and detailed at great length the essential qualities of an impartial tribunal; and in order to shew that the synod then convened could not be such an one, he made charges against the members of it of being schismatics and innovators in the churches. The moderator replied to these charges in terms that corresponded with them; and the whole synod were greatly offended at the liberty which Episcopius had taken.

A great part of the time, from the twenty-fifth session of the synod, on the 10th of December, 1618, until the fifty-seventh session on the 14th Jan. 1619, was occupied by discussion and dispute with the remonstrants, concerning the method and order in which they should discuss the subjects in controversy. The remonstrants insisted that they should have the liberty of choosing their own manner and order of discussion, whether by writing or *vivâ voce*, or partly by both, or whether they chose to discuss the doctrine of reprobation before they came to that of election, and to declare what they *did not* believe, as well as what they *did* believe. The synod, on the other hand, insisted that they should exhibit all their defence in writing; that they should discuss the subject of election previously to that of reprobation; and that they should confine themselves to declaring what they *did* believe, and not indulge in the exhibition of what they *did not* believe.

In the course of this controversy, both parties became heated and exasperated; the remonstrants, because they thought that the plainest principles of right given them by the letter missive

which cited them to the council, were violated, this letter declaring that the object of citing them was, *ut libere proponant, explicent, et defendent quantum possunt et necessarium judicabunt*, their sentiments on the five contested points; the synod because the remonstrants judged them to be party men, schismatics, oppressive, prejudiced, who sought not to overcome by right but by might, and who therefore were incompetent and improper judges of the cause in dispute. The freedom of the remonstrants in uttering their opinion respecting all these matters of charge against the synod, almost of necessity produced exasperation; and this will account for all the imprudent speeches and resolutions, which one meets with in the history of this famous council.

It is painful to dwell on the faults of worthy and excellent men. That the Synod of Dort contained a great number of such men, I do not well see how an impartial man, who fully examines its history, can doubt. But that in the course of this dispute, exasperation carried a part of the council, in particular the moderator Bogermann, and also Gomar, Scultet, and several others; indeed one may say, the Hollandic divines in general, and those of Geneva; much beyond the bounds of Christian moderation, propriety, and decorum, in their deportment and words with respect to the remonstrants, can never be doubted by any one who now peruses even their own records, viz. the celebrated *Acta Synodi nationalis Dordrechtanae*, or the history of their proceedings by John Hales, the secret deputy of the English court or embassy to that council. I need not say, that the accounts of the remonstrant party are still more unfavourable.

As one example only, for the sake of exhibiting what I mean, and of doing the duty of a historian impartially, I must beg leave to introduce a brief account of the manner in which the remonstrants were debarred from all attendance upon the Synod, by the president Bogermann, on the 14th of January, 1619, at the fifty-seventh session of the council.

The remonstrants had given their final answer, that they could not submit to the terms enjoined by the synod, as to the manner and order in which they should conduct their defence.— They were summoned before the council, and addressed by Bogermann, who said to them, among other things: “Indignos esse vos, quibuscum res diutius agatur. . . . Exhibuistis . . . propositiones, quibus tantum inest perturbationis, tantumque alienarum rerum, ut nulli nobis usui possint esse. Decreta concii-

lii aperte sprevisistis. . . . Vos vero sinceritati, lenitati, mansuetudini synodi, *fraudes, artes, et mendacia* opposuistis. . . . Ut primum ingressi estis concilium, *mendacium* dixistis; idem in egressu crimen committitis. . . . Quod [affirmastis,] universum concilium *falsum* esse novit. . . . Certi estote, concilium universo Christiano orbi *pertinaciam* vestram patefacturum esse; neque *armis spiritualibus* Belgicas ecclesias instructos esse dubitate; quibus opportuno tempore vestram *improbiter* *ulciscuntur*. Quamobrem vos, delegatorum et synodi nomine, dimitto. *Exite.*" Halesii *Epistolae*, p. 392 seq.

This sentence Bogermann pronounced, without having called at all upon the Hollandic part of the council to give their judgement in the case, and without any consultation with the synod beforehand, as to the manner or matter of it. It is a relief to find it recorded, that the imprudence of the manner and matter of the sentence gave great offence to all the moderate men of the synod; and that in particular nearly all the members from abroad expressed in strong terms, and some of them openly before the council, their entire disapprobation. They foresaw, as they said, that the remonstrants would take advantage of it, in their appeal to public feeling; which indeed they did not fail to do.

The remonstrants thus ejected from the council, were ordered by the delegates of the States General, who were present, not to quit the town of Dort. But the synod itself, as they came together almost solely for the purpose of deciding respecting the Arminian controversy, proceeded to gather the propositions maintained by this party, from the books which they had already published. The result of the whole they afterwards published to the world in the famous *Acta Synodi nationalis* mentioned above, and printed the same year.

On some of the points which were disputed, the synod were not harmonious at first. This may well be supposed, inasmuch as it was made up of Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians. If we are to judge by the *Expositio Fidei* made by the synod, we must suppose that the latter class had a predominating influence. At any rate, the doctrine of predestination is so expressed, as not to give any direct aid to the cause of the Supralapsarians, or at least, so as not to exclude Sublapsarians from signing the creed.

After one hundred and fifty-four sessions, on the 6th of May, 1619, the synod came to such an agreement on the doctrines

which had been discussed, that they published their result in the great church at Dort, in presence of an immense assembly. It would be aside from my present object, to give a particular account of this result, as it lies before the world in so many forms, and is the well known *Declaratio* or *Expositio Fidei* of not a few of the churches in this country. It is certainly drawn up with great ability and caution in many respects. Even its enemies, who are candid, must admit this. It is plain that able men were concerned with it; and even those who do not agree to the sentiments which it contains, cannot refuse to pay it the tribute of their respect.

So far, however, as it concerns the remonstrants, the consequences of this synod were serious indeed. In the judgement of this council, the Arminians were 'renewing ancient and mischievous errors; they were forging and propagating new ones; they were slandering and casting contempt upon the doctrine of the Hollandic churches, and filling the land with embittered feeling and discord.' The synod, moreover, 'conscious of their authority from the word of God, and treading in the footsteps of all regular ecclesiastical councils, and supported by the authority of the States General, decided that the remonstrants were introducing errors into religion, making divisions among the churches, and giving cause of offence. To all this impropriety of demeanour, they had added that of most unyielding obstinacy in maintaining their errors before the synod.'

Those remonstrants, who had appeared before the synod, were, as has already been mentioned, suspended from their office, until they should make satisfaction. Their brethren in sentiment, among the churches at large, were left to the provincial synods, the classes, and the presbyteries, to be dealt with until they should exhibit a becoming submission; but none were to be allowed the exercise of their *official* functions, who would not subscribe to the doctrines which the synod had set forth.

The States General soon confirmed this decree of the synod. This being done, every preacher was called upon for subscription to the creed which the synod had prescribed; and such as refused were at once deposed from office. Episcopius and his colleagues, who had been present at the synod of Dort, were detained by order of the government at Dort, until the meeting of the commissaries of the States General. They were then called upon to know whether they would suspend their ministerial functions, cease writing or publishing their opinions, etc. This

they declined to do. On the 27th of June, 1619, they were summoned to the Hague by the States General, and called upon to know whether they were ready to subscribe an agreement to abide by the terms which the commissioners had prescribed. This all but one (H. Leo) refused to do. Sentence of banishment was then pronounced upon them. They asked leave to return under escort to their homes, so as put in order their family affairs, collect their dues, and discharge their debts. This was refused; and they were sent the next day, under the charge of an armed guard, to their respective places of banishment.

In regard to the remonstrant preachers generally of Holland, they were not only forbidden to perform the duties of their office, but their flocks were forbidden to assemble for the purposes of worship. Violent contests of course ensued, all over the land. In some places blood was spilled, and life sacrificed. About two hundred remonstrant preachers were deposed; among the rest, John Gerard Vossius, regent of the theological college at Leyden, lost his place. Caspar Barlaeus, a famous Latin poet of those times, and Peter Bertius, a celebrated geographer, both of Leyden, also lost their places. The storm swept away even civilians also, who manifested any favouritism for the party of the remonstrants.

That the synod of Dort should have been highly celebrated, by those contemporaries who sympathized with it in feeling and in doctrine, was natural. Hence we find, that on the one hand, it has been eulogized as the most perfect of ecclesiastical councils, that have ever been held; but, as one might also expect, on the other hand, its opponents have been more loud if possible in their complaints, than its friends in their praises. A deep sense of injury and persecution of course remained infix'd in the minds of the remonstrants, and of all who sympathized with them; and this feeling was greatly aggravated by the appeal made to the civil power, to carry into execution the decrees of the synod, by banishment, by imprisonment, and by fines.

Both parties undoubtedly went too far in their praise and their blame. The *Expositio* of the synod in question is an able paper; yet I cannot see that, compared with other declarations of the like nature, it calls for any very extravagant eulogy. Certainly the Westminster Confession is superior, as a whole. Men of great talent, much learning, warm piety, and well-meaning intentions, belonged, no doubt, to the council of Dort; and perhaps an unusual number of such men. But no one of them

has ever been so distinguished as a theologian and a writer, as many other men who can be easily named, among the reformed churches.

That the measures of force, which the spirit of dispute and of the day urged them to take, were misjudged, of hurtful tendency, and against the true spirit of prudence and of protestantism, I suppose no one in our times and our country, will venture to call in question. But at the same time, their opponents were more concerned in the blame of these measures, than they were willing to allow. They were violent, heated, sarcastic, contemptuous. They felt a deep sense of injury, and they gave vent to it in no very measured terms. They had reason to complain, that the principles of religious liberty were violated in respect to them; but their opponents might, well complain also, that the principles of Christian moderation, and lenity of manner, and respect for differing sentiments, had not unfrequently been violated on the part of the remonstrants. Nor can there be any room to doubt, that if the latter had been the dominant party, they would have taken as effectual measures to carry their points, as the Gomarists did; although perhaps not in the same way.

The celebrated Daniel Heinsius, who was, as has already been stated, scribe of the lay deputies sent by the States General to the synod of Dort, in a preface of about 40 quarto pages, to the *Acta Synodi Nationalis*, has drawn a very vivid picture of the zeal and turbulence of the Arminian party. That it is, like those of the opposite side, highly coloured, no one who reads it with attention can well doubt. Still, as Heinsius must have had an intimate acquaintance with facts, and withal was a man of great learning and talents and of very high respectability, we cannot well overlook his testimony. He avers that Arminius was of an ardent temperament, "verum cui nihil arrideret, nisi quod aliquâ novitatis specie se commendaret;" that he looked with contempt on the received doctrines of the church, because they were received; that he cherished opinions bordering upon Pelagianism; (this last opinion is of course built on his own construction of Arminius' sentiments;) that he was accustomed to speak to his pupils with contempt of the writings of Calvin, Beza, and other reformers; that his pupils, when examined before the *Classes*, used ambiguous phraseology; that they were disputatious, and gloried in being freed from the prejudices and darkness of the orthodox; that Arminius himself equivocated when

questioned upon certain points; and that he shielded himself rather by saying what he *did not* believe, than by avowing what he *did* believe. He also avers, that the remonstrants calumniated before the government the doctrines of their opponents, and grievously misrepresented them; “non sine apertis atrocibusque calumniis proponerent.” He charges the remonstrants with labouring, by these calumnies, to excite the government against the orthodox, in such a way that the consequence would be a loss of their place and ejection from the pastoral office; also with obtruding upon churches, deprived of orthodox pastors by their persecutions, pastors of their own party, and thus causing the orthodox to secede from their communion and places of worship. In consequence of such measures, he represents all Holland as almost in a state of civil war; in fact as actually so, in many places.

With all the abatements, now, which we are to make on account of the strong feelings of Heinsius, we must still say, that although the contra-remonstrants were heated and violent, yet the remonstrants at least kept pace with them.

As a further justification of the remark made above, I appeal to the fact, that Arminius did often urge the States General to convene a general synod, before which he might appear, explain his doctrines, and defend himself; and which also might reconsider some of the positions in the Heidelberg catechism and in the creed. This the opposite party strongly opposed, as long as they thought the chance might be in favour of Arminius.— Before his doctrines had become matters of general knowledge and dispute, they feared that by his talents and persuasive address, he might win over a majority of a national synod to favour him. But when the discussion had been going on long enough to be generally known, and the clergy throughout Holland had taken sides in it, then the contra-remonstrants began to urge vehemently for a council, and Arminius and his associates to prefer that none should be summoned.

If, on the other hand, Oldenbarneveld and Grotius had prevailed, and Maurice and his party had gone down, is it clear that there might not have been a synod of Dort, or some other one, consisting of the remonstrant party, and enforcing their *liberality* on others, in a manner like to that in which extreme orthodoxy was forced on them? Reasoning from analogy and from human nature, we must concede that this is probable.

I do not assert, indeed, that it would have been so; but, I

may add, the spirit of the day, and the frequent appeals of Arminius and his friends to the government of Holland to interpose, while he believed them to be in his favour, concur with the reasons already given, to render such a thing by no means improbable.

The simple truth, confirmed by the history of all ages, is, that when men become engaged in violent dispute, on theology or any other topic; when their passions become enlisted, and they are determined to carry their point; they do not usually wait to examine the justice, or the consequences, of all the measures to which they resort. Appeals to the government were agreeable to the political constitution of the Hollandic churches. But in making them, did Arminius, or Gomar and his friends, "do as they would be done by?" This question forever settles the whole matter; and settles it triumphantly against the intermingling of church and state.

The contra-remonstrants were gratified with carrying their point. But it filled Holland with scenes of distress. The triumph, moreover, lasted only for a short time. On the death of prince Maurice, the Arminian ministers began gradually to resume their offices; and in 1630, only eleven years after the sitting of the synod which excommunicated them, the States General connived at their return to their offices; since which they have never been disturbed. It was not long, before the principles of the remonstrants began to acquire a kind of predominance in Holland; and finally they became triumphant; although there have been men of the opposite party also, who have stood up, and borne testimony against this general disobedience to the synod of Dort.

Heaven has decreed, that reason and argument, not contumely or force, should maintain an empire over the minds of Christians. All appeal to any other weapons, is worse than in vain. It may triumph for a moment; but the next generation will take the liberty to think and inquire for themselves. So it should be. If men are not to be convinced by Scripture and argument, then human power has no ability to convince them. They must be commended to God, and left with him. All else is unchristian, yea, antichristian. It is, indeed, perfectly clear, that the contra-remonstrants had a right to withdraw their *fellowship* from their opponents, if they believed them to be essentially in the wrong. If so much was not true, then they themselves were not entitled to Christian liberty. But all beyond this; all hard names, con-

tumely, violence, appeal to civil power, shutting up their churches, and every thing of this nature, be it what it may, was utterly inconsistent with that religion for which they professed and cherished so much zeal. In the end, all this reacted upon the very cause which they meant to defend. It is thus that Heaven teaches men, that the armour of the gospel is Scripture and reason and argument, and not passion and prejudice and force. **WHERE THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IS, THERE IS LIBERTY.**

But I am forgetting my main business, in pursuing these reflections; which is, to give the creed of Arminius. The *Declaratio* which Arminius made at the Hague, in 1608, (see p. 247 above,) before the States General, and at their request, is the principal source from which I shall draw; as this was a public and solemn declaration, and was made only one year before the close of his life. This and all the other sources from which I draw his creed, may be found in *Arminii Opera*, 4to 1629. L.B. I have noted the pages, so that every curious reader may consult for himself, and see whether I have rightly translated the author.

On the subject of translating him, I have only a word to say. His Latin is not very pure. It is grammatical, but not classical; and it is exceedingly unlike to that of Beza and Calvin, and greatly inferior to that of Limborch, Le Clerc, and Grotius. Moreover it is full of the scholastic terminology of the day. I am not certain, that I have in every instance hit upon the exact idea of the author. I am sure only that I have designed and wished to do so, and have spared no pains to accomplish my wishes. It is for those who are more conversant with the technicalities of the times of Arminius than myself, to correct me if I have gone wrong; and to their correction I will cheerfully submit.

I have rendered freely, yet closely to the sense. I have sometimes exchanged technical expressions for those which will now be better understood; for which I may probably count upon the thanks, rather than the blame of the reader. For the rest, it has been my aim to select all those points, of any great importance, on which Arminius was said to differ from his opponents, or accused of heterodoxy. Other points need no illustration; at least the object of the present essay would not embrace them, nor are they a matter of special interest to the reader.

Having premised thus much, I now proceed to the most important part of my work, beginning first with extracts from the

Declaratio above described. The reader will remember that Arminius read this before the States General, and will consider him throughout as addressing them.

II. THE CREED OF ARMINIUS.

In an introduction of some length and much address, Arminius states various efforts which had been made, to draw upon him the imputation of heresy. In the year 1605, he says, three deputies from the synod of South Holland, and two from North Holland, waited on him and requested a conference with him respecting his religious sentiments. The ground of this request was, that some of his students, who had been examined by their respective synods, had given answers not consistent with the catechism and the creed, and had appealed to him as sustaining them. Arminius declined a conference on such grounds; inasmuch as this would subject him to a kind of ecclesiastical trial, as often as any of his students misunderstood and misreported his sentiments; which by experience he had found to be not unfrequent. The proper way, he alleges, was, for the synod to confront those students with him, and thus to ascertain whether they had made a right report of his sentiments; and not to take it for granted that they had.

In this, Arminius was clearly in the right; for nothing is more frequent, than for students without experience in theology, and without sufficient attention and inquiry, to misunderstand and give a wrong account of a teacher's sentiments; although it may be with no ill design, but yet to the serious injury of such teacher. But for graver and more experienced persons to take these accounts as being of course correct, even where they are at variance with the published opinions of such teachers, is indeed a species of injustice of which it must be right loudly to complain, as Arminius did.

Various other colloquies had been undertaken with Arminius; some of which, as he states, he declined, and into others he entered, according to the circumstances of each, and the evident intentions of those who were engaged in them. After endeavouring, with great skill, to justify to the States General the course he had taken, in regard to declining various colloquies, on account of which suspicions against him had been much augmented, he proceeds to the declaration of his sentiments as follows.

“ The first and most important article of religion, on which I

have some thoughts to suggest, and which has been a subject of reflection with me for many years, has respect to *divine predestination*, that is, *the election of men to salvation, and their reprobation to destruction.*

“I begin with this article, and I shall, first, shew what is taught respecting it, both orally and in writing, in our churches, and in the university of Leyden; secondly, I shall propose my own thoughts respecting it, and at the same time exhibit my own opinion concerning it.

“The opinions of the learned respecting this article of faith are not one and the same, but diverse and in several respects discrepant. Those who are most rigid in their views, hold for substance to the following sentiments; as appears in all parts of their writings.

“That God, by an eternal and immutable decree, has predestinated some to eternal life, and some to everlasting perdition, without respect to them as having been created, much less as having sinned, and without any regard to their righteousness or unrighteousness, obedience or disobedience, but of his *mere good pleasure*; and this, that he might display the glory of his justice and compassion, or (as some say) of his saving grace, wisdom, and sovereign power.” pp. 99, 100.

This first proposition contains the essential part of the opinion in question. Arminius then proceeds to detail, under eight heads more, various subordinate propositions connected by the high predestinarians with their main position. The substance of these is, that ‘the *means* of carrying the great and original decree into execution, were also predestinated, and will necessarily and certainly bring about the end intended; that of these means, some are common both to election and reprobation, and some peculiar to each; that those means common to both were, the creation of man in a state of original righteousness and holiness, the permission of Adam’s fall, (or rather, the arrangement made by God that man should sin, and become corrupt,) the loss of the image of God or original righteousness, and the consequent conclusion of all under sin and condemnation;—and all this, because in order to save there must be some to save, in order to condemn there must be sinners, and in order to be sinners without making God the author of sin, men must be created in a state of righteousness. Of the means predestinated to carry into effect the decree of election, are (1) The gift of the Saviour; (2) The effectual calling of the elect; (3) The pre-

servation of them in a state of grace ; (4) As to elect children, they may, by special promise and grace, be saved without actual *faith* or perseverance in it. Of the means destined to execute the decree of reprobation, are, (1) The desertion of the non-elect in their state of sin, and the withholding of saving grace from them. This is done in two ways ; first, Christ did not make any atonement for the non-elect ; and secondly, God does not communicate his spirit to them so that they may believe on Christ. (2) Adult reprobates are *hardened*, first, by the law of God operating on the conscience, and enlightening and convincing it ; secondly, by the preaching of the gospel, which makes an external call to repentance and obedience, and furnishes internal excitement to the same ; but which never can produce any better faith than that of the devils, who believe and tremble but remain impenitent.'

' From all this it follows, that all the elect must necessarily and infallibly be saved, and all the reprobate as surely perish ; because all things and events, all causes and effects, proceed from, and depend entirely upon, the absolute and eternal purpose of God.' pp. 100—102.

Against these views, thus stated by him, Arminius proceeds to array twenty one reasons, at very considerable length, (pp. 102—115,) which I shall not here repeat, inasmuch as he has made a separate declaration of his own sentiments in a subsequent part of his *declaration*, and my object is history, not discussion. Thus much, however, should be said respecting them, viz. that they bear ample testimony to the learning, acuteness, dexterity, and logical subtlety of the author ; nor can any one read them without feeling that they deserve serious consideration.

It ought not to escape notice, moreover, that under his twenty-first head, he avers, that not only the churches of ancient times rejected the doctrine of predestination, but that the Lutheran, the Anabaptist, and the Romish churches did the same. He admits that Luther and Melancthon favoured the doctrine at the beginning of the Reformation, but declares that they afterwards renounced it. For proof of this, he appeals to an epistle of Melancthon, addressed to Caspar Peucer, in which he compares the doctrine under consideration to the stoical fatality of *Zeno*. To the church in Denmark also he appeals, as rejecting the doctrine ; and he declares, very fully and explicitly,

that many in the churches of Holland agreed with himself. p. 115.

It is very natural to ask, whether Arminius, in the spirit which is too common among disputants, has not charged upon his opponents, the predestinarians, consequences which he himself deduced from their principles, and which they would not admit as either necessary, or as being a part of their creed. He anticipates such an objection himself, and solemnly declares, at the close of his twenty one reasons, that he has taken all the principles which he has charged upon them, from their own authors, and this "*optimâ fide, with the most conscientious fidelity*, in order that he might put nothing to their account, which he could not clearly establish from their writings." p. 116.

How far these declarations are correct, the reader may judge in some measure, by reverting for a moment to p. 236 seq. above, where he will find the views of Calvin and Beza; with which those of Supralapsarians generally accorded. But Arminius, no doubt, had special reference in all his declarations concerning predestination, to the views and assertions of Gomar, his rival colleague and antagonist, a man of strong feelings, of an irritable temperament, and one who, when pushed in dispute, uttered rash and extravagant things. For example; when, in the synod of Dort, Episcopius had been declaiming against the doctrine of reprobation, and charging it with making God the author of sin, Gomar replied with strong feeling, that "Episcopius had falsified the tenet of reprobation; that no man thought that God had absolutely decreed to cast away man without sin; but as he did decree the end, so he did decree the means; that is, as he predestinated man to death, so he predestinated him to sin, the only way to death." Golden Remains of J. Hales [Halesius] as quoted by Mosheim, p. 435. On this, Hales himself, a high Calvinist when he was at Dort and when he wrote his letters on that synod, remarks, that Gomar "so mended the question, as tinkers mend kettles, and made it worse than it was before." Again, when Martinius of Bremen, a member of the synod of Dort, had with great modesty and gentleness maintained the doctrine, that Christ is not only the patron and vindicator of the election of the faithful, but also the author and special cause of it, Gomar, who felt that this would be assigning a ground for election different from the *mere* good pleasure (*decretum absolutum*) of God, rose with great emotion, pulled off his glove, and threw it down in presence of all the synod, chal-

lenging Martinius to a public contest on that point. To this Martinius made no reply ; but the president of the council and the members of it interfered. The council was soon dismissed by prayers as usual ; but all this, says Hales, had no effect in composing the mind of Gomar. As soon as prayers were ended, he immediately renewed his challenge to Martinius ; which however he declined to accept, not through want of ability, for he was a distinguished scholar and theologian, but from his pacific temper and modest feelings. Halesii Epistolae, p. 419. Brandt also relates the same anecdotes.

Balcanqual, the deputy from the Scotch churches to the synod of Dort, a staunch Calvinist himself, says nevertheless of Gomar, that "he suffered expressions to escape him, respecting the theologians of Bremen, which could proceed only from the mouth of a fool." The same Balcanqual also relates, that the English deputies to the synod of Dort laboured much, that when the synod expressed their disapprobation of asserting that God was the author of sin, they should also express their abhorrence of the expressions, "Deum movere hominum linguas ad blasphemandum ;" and "Hominem non posse plus boni facere, quam facit." But in this the deputies failed ; not because the council as a body approved of these and the like expressions, (which clearly they did not,) but because they knew that some of the members of it had employed such declarations in controversy, and to condemn them would savour too much of personality. See Halesii Hist. p. 60 seq. edit. Mosheim.

From such facts the reader can judge, whether the charges of Arminius have not some foundation, in regard to the mode in which the *decretum absolutum* was represented by some of the Supralapsarians. To charge these modes of representation on them all, would be an evident act of injustice ; but still, it is one which, for the purposes of *argumentum ad invidiam*, is frequently committed.

After all, however, that Arminius was excited by his feelings and the circumstances in which he was placed, to make out as strong a case against his antagonists as could well be made out, every intelligent reader will easily concede. For the colouring, therefore, and for the intensity of the whole picture, the reader must consider himself, in some good measure, indebted to the zeal of Arminius.

Having thus given the views of the *high* predestinarian party, Arminius admits that there is a second and a third party who

hold to the doctrine of decrees, and whose views he proceeds to state.

“The second class hold, that God, by an eternal and immutable decree, did, of his own good pleasure, ordain that a small part only of men should be saved ; and also that he would pass by the rest, leave them to their own sinfulness, and withhold his saving grace from them ; and finally, that being sinners, and unreclaimed, he would, in order to display his justice, subject them to eternal death. The *elect* he predestinated to eternal life ; and to accomplish this end, he foreordained a Saviour, their effectual calling, and their final perseverance. As to the *reprobate*, the means used to secure their reprobation, were, (1) The passing by them, i. e. withholding his grace from them, and the dereliction of them by the Spirit ; (2) The pre-condemnation of them ; which, however, had respect to them as *sinners*, and specially as being sinners in Adam. In order to ensure this pre-condemnation, the reprobate are deserted by the Spirit, and the consequence is, the hardening of them, and fitting them for destruction.” p. 117.

The main point of difference between this and the preceding scheme of predestination, is, that in the second, the decree of reprobation is stated as having respect to men as sinners, specially as sinners in Adam ; whereas according to the other scheme, God did not even respect men as creatures, much less as sinners, in his decree of election and reprobation.

The third class, hold “that God, in making his eternal decree of election and reprobation, did have respect to men as lapsed and condemned ; that in choosing some to life, he did it for the display of his own compassion ; and that in giving over others to eternal ruin in their sinful and condemned state, he did this in order to display his justice ; and that he was not at all moved in the one case, by repentance and faith, nor in the other, by impenitence and unbelief. The means of executing this decree of election and reprobation, are essentially the same as those already stated.” The difference between this last scheme and the others, is, that it is *sublapsarian*, i. e. it commences the election and reprobation of men at a point which was posterior to the lapse of Adam. p. 118.

After a short argument against the second and third scheme of predestination (p. 118) Arminius proceeds, at last, to declare his own views, which he thinks are “*quam maxime*” conform-

ed to the word of God. To do him justice, I must quote him here, without abridgement.

I. "The first and absolute decree of God, respecting the salvation of sinful man, is, that by which he decreed to constitute his Son Jesus Christ, a mediator, saviour, high priest, and king; who by his death should take away sin, and by his obedience should procure the salvation that had been lost, and by his power confer it."

II. "The second precise and absolute decree of God is, that by which he decreed to receive the penitent and believing to his favour, and to save all those in Christ who should persevere unto the end, and this by Christ and through Christ; but the impenitent and unbelieving, he left in sin and under wrath, and condemned them as alienated from Christ.

III. "The third decree of God is, that by which he decreed that the means necessary to faith and repentance should be sufficiently and efficaciously afforded. This however is conducted in a manner agreeable to the wisdom of God, by which he knows what becomes his compassion or his severity, and also in a manner accordant with his justice, by which he is prepared to follow the prescription of his wisdom and to carry it into execution.

IV. "Hence follows a fourth decree, by which he has ordained, that particular individuals and certain persons should be saved and should be damned. But this decree depends on the foreknowledge of God, by which he knew from eternity who, in accordance with his administration of the means fitted to produce conversion and faith, his grace coming in aid of them, would believe, and, in consequence of grace afterwards obtained, would persevere; and also who would not believe, and would not persevere." p. 119.

Having thus given the essence of his creed on the subject of predestination, Arminius proceeds to fortify it, by averring, 'that such a predestination is the foundation of Christianity and of the certainty of salvation; that it is the very gospel itself, necessary to salvation; that it is so palpably supported by the Scriptures, it has no need of councils for its support; that no orthodox teacher ever contradicted it; that it agrees with all the confessions of the reformed churches, and especially with the Belgic confession and catechism; that it accords with the nature of God and the nature of man; that it agrees with the design of our creation, and with the nature of eternal life and death; that it harmonizes with the fall of man, with the nature of grace, with the nature and liberty of

the human will, with the glory of God, the honour of Christ, and the salvation of men, and also with the order of the prescribed graces of the gospel, such as repentance, faith, etc. It also confirms the administration of the gospel, and is the very basis of the Christian religion. Finally he avers, that the great body of Christians in all ages have approved the doctrine, as he has stated it.' pp. 119, 120.

This is not the place to *theologize*, nor is it my intention to do so; but if it were, it would seem not very difficult to ask questions respecting the creed of Arminius thus avowed, which would be attended with difficulties not less than those which he has thrown in the way of his opponents. For example, in regard to No. I. Did the plan of God's decrees and purposes commence at the point which succeeded the fall and ruin of man? And when he decreed that Christ should be a redeemer of lost man, had he before determined, that there should be any need of a redeemer? Or was the necessity for one an unlooked for, unexpected mishap, which took place in spite of infinite wisdom and power, and which the Supreme Being finally provided for, by making decrees after the mischief was done? etc.

These and a multitude of other like questions force themselves spontaneously upon the thinking and reasoning mind, and compel it to feel, that in shunning Scylla it is very easy to plunge into Charybdis. In shunning the doctrine of *fate*, and avoiding the making of man a mere machine consigned to inevitable and necessary destruction, why should we in reality, although not in words, divest the divine Being of omniscience, or deny that he has a specific purpose and object in all his works? Why should we hold him up as by *after-thought* providing for exigencies upon which he could not before calculate, and which (one would be tempted to suppose) he could not even foreknow? Must it be proved again to the world, that God knows all things "from the beginning to the end," and that all are under his control?

Having thus given and defended his own creed on the subject of *predestination*, Arminius proceeds to disclose his views on other topics connected with it, or dependent in some measure upon it. Such are the following.

1. *The providence of God.* "The providence of God I define to be, the careful, continual, and ever present inspection of God, by virtue of which he extends his care to the whole world in general, and to all creatures without exception in particular; in so far as that he preserves them in their own proper essence,

qualities, actions, and affections, and governs them in such a manner as is becoming and congruous, to the praise of his own name, and to the salvation of believers.

“I do not, therefore, in any measure detract from the providence of God any of those things which belong to it; but I affirm that it preserves, governs, controls, and directs *all* things, and that nothing can take place fortuitously or by chance. Nay, I view the free will and the actions themselves of rational beings, as subject to the providence of God; so that nothing can happen without his will, not even of those things which are forbidden by him, *quæ contra voluntatem ejus fiunt*. But I make this discrimination between good and bad acts, viz. that God wills and causes the good ones, and freely permits the bad ones. Nay, I very willingly concede, that in respect to evil, every kind of acts may be ascribed to the providence of God which can even be imagined, saving only this, that God be not regarded as the cause of sin. This I have sufficiently shown, in my dispute respecting justice, and the efficiency of divine providence in the production of evil, twice repeated by me at Leyden; in which I have endeavoured to ascribe to God whatever acts in respect to sin the scriptures represent as belonging to him; and in which I have gone so far, that some have taken occasion from it to accuse me of making God the author of sin.”

2. *The free will of man.* “My opinion in respect to this is, that man, in the original state in which he was created, was endowed with knowledge, holiness, and ability of such a nature, that he was competent to understand, estimate, consider, will, and perform that which was truly good, as he was commanded to do; but still, not without the aid of divine grace. I hold also, that after his fall and sin, he could, in and of himself, neither think, will, or do, what is truly good, but that he must be renewed and regenerated of God in Christ, by his Holy Spirit, in his understanding, affections, or will, and all his faculties (*viribus*), in order that he may rightly understand, estimate, consider, will, and do that which is truly good. When made a partaker of this regeneration or renovation, I hold; that being freed from the power of sin, he can think, will, and do good, but still, always and only by the grace of God.”

The most thorough advocate of total depravity will scarcely venture to go farther in regard to man in his unregenerate state, than this statement of Arminius goes. Indeed, as he extends renovation to all the faculties of man, even to his

understanding, I believe that on this point Arminius would find few among the orthodox of the present day that would keep pace with him. Surely he cannot be accused of laxity in this matter.

3. *The grace of God.* "First, I believe it is a gratuitous affection of God towards miserable sinners; on account of which he first gives his Son, that he who believes in him may have eternal life; and next, in Jesus Christ, and for his sake, he justifies the sinner, and adopts him as one of his children in order to his salvation. Secondly, grace is an infusion of all those gifts of the Holy Spirit, both in respect to the understanding as well as the will and affections of men, which pertain to their regeneration and renovation; of which kind are faith, hope, charity, etc. Without these gifts of grace, man is capable (*idoneum*) neither of thinking, willing, or doing any good thing. Thirdly, there is a continual assistance and constant aid of the Holy Spirit, by virtue of which the Holy Spirit moves and excites the regenerate man to good, by infusing salutary thoughts, by inspiring with good desires, so that he may actually will that which is good; and further also, by virtue of this, he wills and operates together with man, so that man does that which he desires to do. And in this way, I ascribe the beginning, continuation, and consummation of all good, to grace; and this even to such an extent, that man in his regenerate state, without grace coming before and exciting, following on and cooperating, would neither think, will, nor do any good thing, nor ever resist any temptation or evil."

"From all this it plainly appears, that I am not chargeable with derogating from *grace*, and that I do not (as I have been accused of doing) attribute too much to the free will of man; but all the controversy which I have on this subject, is, whether the grace of God is an influence which is irresistible. That is, the controversy is not concerning the actions or operations of grace, (of which I believe there are as many as any one else does,) but only concerning the mode of the operation, viz. whether it be irresistible or not. In respect to this, I do believe in accordance with the Scriptures, that many resist the Holy Spirit, and reject offered grace."

4. *The perseverance of the saints.* "My opinion in respect to this is, that those who are engrafted into Christ by true faith, and thus become partakers of his life-giving spirit, have strength adequate to contend with Satan, sin, the world, and their own

flesh, and to obtain the victory ; yet still, only by the assistance of the same Spirit of grace ; yea further, that Jesus Christ by his Spirit will assist them in every trial, and be their helper ; and that, provided they prepare themselves for the conflict, and implore his aid, and are not wanting with respect to themselves, he will preserve them from falling, so that by no fraud or force of Satan they can be taken out of the hands of Christ. But whether the same persons by negligence cannot lose the beginning of their union to Christ, again return to the world, make defection from the sound doctrine once delivered to them, lose a good conscience, and make grace ineffectual ; this I think should be diligently investigated by the Scriptures, and the subject should be discussed in our leading convention. I declare, however, very frankly, that *I have never taught that a true believer will finally and totally fall away and perish* ; although I do not deny that there are texts of Scripture which seem to favour this sentiment, and which I have not seen answered in any way to my entire satisfaction ; while, on the other hand, there are some of an opposite character, which deserve attentive consideration." pp. 121—123.

5. Arminius next proceeds to state his views of the doctrine of *assurance of salvation*. He says that he entertains no doubt of the possibility of it ; but that he should deem it less in degree than the certainty that there is a God, or that Christ is the Saviour of the world ; because God is greater than our hearts, and we are more exposed to err in the estimate of ourselves, than we are as to the certainty of those truths which have been mentioned. p. 123.

6. He says, moreover, that he had been accused of asserting that the regenerate can, in this present life, keep all the commandments of God, and therefore he had been ranked with Pelagius in this respect. But Pelagius, he says, as understood by Augustine, asserted that man was able, by his own strength, to obey all the law of God ; which he (Arminius) is so far from saying, that he deems this sentiment heretical, and diametrically opposite to the words of Christ, "Without me ye can do nothing." He also deems this sentiment hurtful, and injurious to the glory of the Saviour. p. 124.

It would seem from this, that in theory Arminius held to the *ability* of a regenerate man to keep the law of God perfectly, when assisted by divine grace ; but as a matter of *fact*, he did not maintain that any man ever did thus keep it.

Having made these explicit avowals respecting his tenets in regard to the several points which have now been noticed, Arminius proceeds to say, that he does not know why he should be continually traduced, as he had been, for maintaining heretical opinions. He avows that he can see no ground whatever for this, unless it be, that he is suspected in regard to his views concerning the divinity of the Son of God, and with respect to the doctrine of justification; and as he understands that such is the fact, he will proceed to declare his sentiments, in a manner equally explicit, on these respective points.

I. *The divinity of Christ.* "As to this, and the word *αὐτόθεος*, concerning which disputes exist in our university, I cannot sufficiently wonder why they should endeavour to render me suspected, or regard me as such. More especially do I wonder, because there is no probability whatever on which this suspicion can be grounded, and it is so far from all reason and truth, that it may be called notoriously slanderous, whatever may have been said to my injury respecting it.

"It happened, indeed, in a dispute on a certain afternoon, at our university, when the subject of the divinity of Christ was discussed, that one of the students maintained that the Son of God is *αὐτόθεος*, and therefore is *self-existent, and derives not his essence from the Father.* On this I observed, that the word *αὐτόθεος* may be understood in two different ways, viz. either of him *who is truly God*, or of him *who is self-existent God.* According to the former sense, the Son of God is really and truly *αὐτόθεος*; but not according to the latter. The disputant, however, warmly pursued his argument, and contended strongly that the second sense of *αὐτόθεος* might be applied to Christ, and that the essence of the Father could not with propriety be said to be *communicated* to the Son and the Holy Spirit, but was properly and truly common to Father, Son, and Spirit. He declared that he was the more confident in this position, because Trelcatius,* of pious memory, had espoused it, as appeared from his *Loci Communes.*

"To this I replied, that this sentiment was at variance with the word of God, and with the whole Greek and Latin church, which always taught that *the Son derived his deity from the*

* This was Trelcatius the younger. L. Trelcatius, the father, had been professor at Leyden, and died of the plague in 1602, at the same time with F. Junius, the predecessor of Arminius.

Father by eternal generation. I added, moreover, that such a sentiment as he espoused, would involve us in two contradictory errors, viz. Tritheism and Sabellianism; for it would necessarily follow from it that there are three Gods who at the same time collaterally possess divine essence, instead of the fact that one, only hypostatically distinct from another, derived it from another; and yet, for maintaining a unity of essence in a trinity of persons, this alone was always rested on as a basis, viz. the *progressus** of the origin of one person from another, i. e. of the Son from the Father. On the other hand, it would follow that the Son is Father, and differs from him only in name; which was the sentiment of Sabellius. Now as it is peculiar to the Father to have self-existent deity, or (to speak more correctly) to have his divinity from no one; if in that sense the Son be called *αὐτόθεος* and God of himself, it follows that he is the Father."

Arminius then proceeds to state, that he related this dispute with the student to a pious minister of Amsterdam, and requested him to inform Trelcatius what use was made of his *Loci Communes*, and to desire him to correct them; which he promised to do. Yet, he says, the report continued to gain ground that he was opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity, although Gomar, his colleague and opponent, had come out in his lectures, expressly against these positions of Trelcatius. The latter, he says, was excused and tacitly justified by many, while he (Arminius) was condemned. "Tantum (he exclaims) possum favor et zelus." p. 124 seq.

Arminius then proceeds to shew how the friends of Trelcatius contributed to soften down the expressions which he had used, and to defend him. As this affords a notable specimen of the argumentation of the times, and of the *Spitzfindigkeiten* (or hair-splitting propensities) of theological schools, as well as of the extravagancies of metaphysical speculation on a subject beyond the reach of human knowledge, I will proceed in my translation from Arminius.

"The milder interpretation [of Trelcatius' assertions] was

* The expression, like the subject, is sufficiently obscure. The reader has it as the author has given it. I suppose he means by *progressus originis*, the derivation first of the Son from the Father, and then of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Here is an *oecomenical progression*, or one in the order of nature, though not of time. If I have not rightly understood his meaning, the reader is at liberty to supply a better one.

this, viz. that the Son of God could be called *αὐτόθεος*, or that he had his deity of himself, in so far as he is *God*; although as *Son* he has it from the Father. For the sake of explaining this more fully it is said, that God or the divine essence may be considered *absolutely* and *relatively*; that absolutely, the Son has his essence of himself; while relatively, he has it of the Father.

“But these new modes of speaking and new opinions are by no means consistent; for the Son as Son, and as God, has his deity from the Father, although when he is called God, this idea is not expressed, but only when he is called Son. Indeed, the essence of God can in no way be considered, without affirming that it is communicated to the Son by the Father; nor can it, in a different respect, be said to be communicated to him, and not to be communicated to him; for these things are contradictory, and cannot in any different respect be harmonized. If he [the Son] has it of himself, considering it in an *absolute* point of view, it cannot be communicated to him; if it is communicated to him, considered *relatively*, he cannot have it of himself as absolutely considered.”

“I shall be asked, perhaps, whether I do not consider these two things as distinct, viz. *to be the Son of God*, and *to be God*. Certainly I do. But when they go further and say, that as to be the Son of God means, to have his essence of the Father, so to be God, can mean nothing less than to have his essence of himself, i. e. to derive it from no one; this I deny altogether, and declare at the same time, that this is not only a great error in sacred theology, but also in natural philosophy. For to be Son and to be God accord well together; but to have his essence of the Father, and yet to derive it from no one, is contradictory, because the one destroys the other.

“But that this mistake may be made more apparent, I will arrange my views in a triplet of propositions: viz.

1. God is eternal; having divine essence from eternity.
2. The Father is underived; having divine essence of none.
3. The Son is of the Father; having divine essence of the Father.

“Now the word *God*, signifies a Being who has real divine essence; the word *Son*, that he has such essence from the Father; and hence he may properly be called *God*, and *Son of God*. But since he cannot be styled Father, it cannot be said that he has his essence of himself, or that it is underived.

“Yet there are efforts made to apologize for such assertions, by saying, that when the Son, as God, is said to have his essence of himself, this is no more than to say, that divine essence is underived. But if we may indulge in such apologies, there is nothing however badly spoken, which may not find some excuse. For although God and divine essence do not differ substantially (*οὐσιαστικῶς*); still, it does by no means follow, that whatever may be predicated of divine essence, can be predicated of God; because, according to our modes of conception, these things are distinguished, and all our modes of expression ought to be adapted to this, since we are expected so to speak as to be rightly understood. Hence it appears that we may correctly say *quod Deum mortuum esse*, that God died; also that the essence of God was communicated; but not at all that God was communicated. He who understands the difference between *abstract* and *concrete*, (about which we have so frequent disputes with the Lutherans,) will easily understand what absurd consequences would follow, if such explications were once admitted in the church of God.

“It cannot, therefore, in any way be defended as well spoken, when it is said that the Son of God is *αὐτόθεος*; nor is it at all correct to say, that the essence of God is common to the three divine persons; it is incorrect, because we say, that it is communicated to one by another.

“I wish these things may be particularly noted; so that it may be seen, how much we can tolerate in one whom we do not suspect of heresy, and how greedily we catch at every thing which may be converted into matter of accusation, in cases where we have a suspicion of any one.” pp. 124—126.

The reader will see by all this, that Arminius was versed in the subtleties of the day, and could measure weapons with his adversaries, on the arena of school dialectics. Nor must he think the doctrine thus proposed and defended to be new or strange; for it is truly, as Arminius asserts, the doctrine of the Greek and Latin fathers as a body. So acknowledges Bishop Bull, near the close of a very long chapter (in his folio entitled *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*) on the question whether the Son of God was considered by the fathers as *αὐτόθεος*. “All with one voice,” says he, “deny that the Son is *αὐτόθεος*.” Arminius has stated the subject somewhat explicitly, although dressed in the logical technicalities of the day. But the Nicene creed

expresses the very same sentiment in another form : " God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God." As a body, the early fathers believed in the *derivation* of the Son as God, their philosophy not at all revolting at this. The *unity* itself of the Godhead they made out, as Arminius does, from this very derivation. It was derivation without separation, a kind of *πλατυνισμός* or *expansion* of the divine substance, so as to exhibit itself in new relations. The common image made use of to convey their meaning, was, the radiance which proceeds from the sun, compared with the source of light in the sun itself. They did not, indeed, speculate upon all this, in the metaphysical way of Arminius, nor use language in all respects such as he employs ; but that he has truly and *bonâ fide* stated their views of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, needs not to be proved, after what Martini has done in his *Geschichte des Dogma der Gottheit Christi*, and Keil's essay entitled *De Doctoribus vet. Ecclesiae* etc. reprinted in his *Opuscula*.

No wonder that the doctrine of the Trinity, thus avowed and stated, has found difficulties in its reception among those, who regard self-existence and independence as essential to true divinity. A *derived* being must necessarily be a *dependent* one ; and reasoning as we now do, we are constrained to ask, How can a dependent being be God over all? No wonder that Arminius found his more strenuously orthodox neighbours discontented with these relics of ancient times, and ready to embrace the first suggestion from a respectable quarter, that the Logos, being truly God, must as true God be self-existent and underived. The human mind, as now trained for the most part, can scarcely deem it possible that men should have ever believed and taught otherwise, if it were not so amply attested by history. Such have been the unhappy fruits of the *emanation* philosophy of the East, which mingled itself with the religious views and reasonings of early Christians, in respect to deep and difficult subjects in philosophy.

But to return ; it was after all, very unfair to accuse Arminius of *Arian* views, because he speculated with the Nicene fathers. Most clearly he would have sided with the Council of Nice ; and his opponents should not have aimed *spargere voces ambiguas* concerning him, in respect to this point, while they themselves admitted the high authority of that Council. I proceed with the remaining point.

II. *Justification*. " On this point," says Arminius, " I am not

conscious of having thought or taught any thing different from what the reformed and protestant churches believe. . . . For the present I say briefly, that I believe sinners to be justified solely by the obedience of Christ ; and that the righteousness of Christ is the sole meritorious cause, on account of which God pardons believers, and accounts them as just, not otherwise than if they had obeyed the whole law. But since God imputes the righteousness of Christ to none except to believers, I think that in this sense, faith may well and truly be said to be gratuitously imputed to a believer for righteousness, viz. inasmuch as God has set forth his Son Jesus Christ as the mercy seat (*ἱλαστήριον*) or propitiatory sacrifice, by faith in his blood. But however this may be, my sentiments on this subject do not so differ from those of Calvin, whom all admit to be correct here, but that I am ready to subscribe with my own hand, to those things which he has said in the third book of his *Institutions*." p. 127.

Arminius then adds : "These, most noble and supreme *Ordines*, are the particular articles, respecting which I deemed it necessary to speak my sentiments, agreeably to the order of your *Consensus*." (p. 127.) He then concludes his declaration, by urging a new and general synod of the Belgic churches, to take into consideration several particulars of their confession and catechism. p. 128 seq.

We may well suppose, that the points which have now been brought under review, were the principal ones which were the object of attack upon him ; for it would have been very ill-judged in him to leave unnoticed any important particular of accusation, before an assembly of the States General, to whom an ultimate appeal must be made in all matters of church as well as of state. Whatever other allegations his opponents have made, or can make against him, I presume that of being wanting in shrewdness and foresight never has been, and never will be one. He plainly *outgenerated* all his competitors, and enlisted a large majority of the civil power on his side.

It appears, however, that Arminius was not assailed in synods only. There was put in circulation, in a kind of private way, a paper or papers, containing thirty one charges of error, i. e. error with respect to thirty one points in theology. To these he at length made a public reply, denying many of them wholly ; explaining others ; and avowing his sentiments in regard to most of them. From these avowals, I beg the liberty of making a few extracts, which will explain more fully the opinions of this

writer, on some points which the preceding extracts leave untouched.

Among other accusations was the following; viz. "that he held, that to those, unto whom the gospel is preached, sufficient grace of the Holy Spirit is given, so that if they will, they are able to believe; otherwise God does but mock men, in proffering them salvation."

That he ever taught this, in the same words, or the like ones, he totally denies. He afterwards proceeds to shew what he does hold. "What is meant by *giving sufficient grace*? It is known that there is *habitual* grace (*gratiam habitualem*), and the grace of *assistance* (*assistentie*). Now the phrase *sufficient* grace may be construed as meaning, that all to whom the gospel is preached, have *habitual* grace infused into them, which renders them qualified (*aptos*) to yield faith to the gospel; which sense I disapprove. For whatever is said of their *sufficiency*, I think should be ascribed to the assistance of the Holy Spirit, by which he aids the preaching of the gospel, as the instrument by which he is wont to operate on the minds of men. But this assistance of the Holy Spirit may easily be explained, and sufficiency ascribed to it; so that Pelagianism may be shunned, at a great distance.

"As to the expression, 'They can believe, through that sufficient grace, if they will;' these words, in this crude form, may be made to convey the very worst sense, and one which by no means accords with the Scriptures; just as if, when ability is once given, the Holy Spirit and divine grace remain inactive, waiting to see whether man will rightly use this ability and believe in the gospel. Whereas he who would think and speak correctly respecting this matter, must necessarily assign to grace its own part, and this the principal one, in persuading the will so that it shall assent to those things which are preached.

"This explanation will easily free me from the suspicion of heresy on this point." p. 145.

The amount of these views seems to be, that Arminius never meant to assert, that *habitual* grace rendered men able or disposed to accept the offers of the gospel. In other words, what is sometimes called *common* grace, i. e. such influences of the Spirit, whatever they may be, as are bestowed habitually on all men who hear the gospel, these Arminius denies to be sufficient to engender faith, or to enable the sinner savingly to believe. He affirms that the *gratia assistentie*, grace specially

aiding, or (as we call it) *special grace*, is necessary in order to persuade the will to assent unto the gospel. He avows explicitly, that we must assign to this grace its own part, and this a principal one, in the matter of saving belief. And if there can be any doubt here as to his meaning, we have to look to his declaration respecting the free will of the sinner (p. 271 above), where he openly avows, that ‘man, in his fallen and sinful state, is able neither to think, will, nor do any thing truly good, but he must be regenerated and renewed of God, in Christ, by the Holy Spirit, in his understanding, affections, or will, and all his faculties, in order rightly to understand, regard, consider, will, and do that which is truly good.’

I do not see how it can be justly denied, that Arminius held the doctrine of total depravity, (as this expression is understood by all considerate and intelligent theologians of the present day,) and the doctrine of *special grace*, in the highest sense that words are capable of expressing, unless man is represented as a mere passive machine. It is doing manifest injustice to his memory, to tax him with a denial of these doctrines; and equal injustice, to appeal to him as a patron and supporter of sentiments directly opposed to these doctrines. The envy or fear of a name, and the heat of party spirit, can never be an adequate apology for doing injustice to the dead, in order to gain interest among the living. Nor can a Christian sense of justice admit that it is pardonable, either to denounce a man for errors which he did not hold, or to appeal to him as the patron of sentiments which he rejected, (and this in order to render them more popular and grateful,) when the means of correction are at hand, and nothing is wanting but a little diligence to use them. Whatever were the faults or virtues of Arminius, neither the one nor the other consisted in his rejecting the doctrine of the entire depravity of the unregenerate man, or of the special influences of the Spirit of God; for it is clear as the light, that he did fully recognize the truth of both these doctrines.

I am apprehensive that neither his opposers nor his friends will be satisfied with this representation; for both, in some respects which may easily be conjectured, will be disappointed. The pen of historic justice, however, must not be guided by the wishes of those who may read, but by the evidence which lies before it. This evidence I have produced; and every man of candour may now judge for himself.

Clearly as the opinion of Arminius is expressed in the above

extracts, so clearly that we are not at liberty to doubt what his opinion was, unless we can shew that he has made a false statement, yet he had such views of the state of the sinner, when labouring under that conviction of mind which usually precedes the regeneration of the heart, as do not agree with the speculative opinions of many excellent men at the present day. The point is both a delicate and an interesting one; and therefore it is expedient to give his own words.

The anonymous paper that had been put in circulation, and contained the thirty one articles of accusation mentioned above, charged him, among other things, with holding that "the works of the unregenerate may be pleasing to God, and may be an impulsive cause or occasion, on account of which God is moved to confer saving grace upon them."

In respect to this allegation he says: "The word *unregenerate* may be understood in a two-fold sense. (1) It denotes those who have not experienced any influence of the Spirit, either regenerating them, or tending to or preparing for regeneration. (2) It signifies those who are in the state of being born again, and experience the influence of the Holy Spirit, pertaining either to that which is preparatory to regeneration, or to regeneration itself; although the final act itself of regeneration is not yet completed. I have reference to such persons, as are led to acknowledge their sins, to grieve for them, to desire deliverance from them, and to seek after the Deliverer who has been revealed; although they are not yet the actual subjects of that influence of the Spirit, by which the flesh or the old man is mortified, and the new man, formed for a new life, is able to do good works.

"In the next place I remark, that a thing may be pleasing to God, either as an initial action pertaining to the commencement of conversion; or as a work complete as to its very essence, and performed by one truly converted and born again. Thus confession of sin is pleasing to God, in which one acknowledges that he is stupid, blind, and poor, and therefore would betake himself to Christ that he may procure ointment for his eyes and garments for himself. So also, works which proceed from warm affection, are pleasing to God. Calvin himself appears to distinguish between the *initial* and *filial* fear of God; and so does Beza, who holds that grief and sorrow for sin belong not to the essential part of regeneration, but to the preparatory one; while

he places the essence of regeneration itself in the mortification [of sin,] and in the vivification [of holiness].

“In the third place I remark, that the occasion or impulsive cause by which God is moved, may be variously understood. It will be sufficient for my purpose, if I appeal to two passages of Scripture, from a comparison of which a distinction may be made out which is agreeable to, and sufficient for, my present purpose. In Matt. 18: 32 the king says, “I have forgiven thee the whole debt, because thou didst ask me.” In Gen. 22: 16, 17, God says to Abraham, “Since thou hast done this thing, and hast not spared thy son, thine only son, I will greatly bless thee.” If any one does not see in these, first an *impulsive* cause, and secondly one of *complacency*, it must be because he is blind as to the Scriptures.

“In the fourth place, saving grace is conferred in different measures or ways; it may be the first grace, or the second; it may be antecedent, or subsequent; it may be operating, or co-operating; it may be knocking and opening, or actually entering. Now unless one properly distinguishes all these things, and uses his language accordingly, he must necessarily infringe upon others, whose sentiments he does not well understand, or he must make them offenders. If any one will duly consider these things, he will find that the accusation or allegation in question, when understood in one sense, is agreeable to the Scriptures; but in another sense, it is widely diverse from them.

“Let the word *unregenerate* be understood as designating one in whom the work of regeneration is begun but not completed; let that which is pleasing when completed, be considered as agreeable when it is commenced; let *impulsive* be defined as that which tends to the final obtaining of a thing; and finally, let saving grace be considered as secondary, subsequent, co-operative, and actually entering [the sinners heart]; then, evidently we may say with propriety, that earnest sorrow for sin is pleasing to God in such a sense, that, from his abounding compassion, he is moved by it to bestow grace on sinful man.” pp. 158, 159.

It would seem, from this representation, that the sinner who is awakened to a sense of his lost condition, may, as Arminius viewed it, be the subject of real sorrow for sin, and have a deep, or at least a true sense of his spiritual wants, and of the necessity of betaking himself to Christ in order that they may be supplied; and all this, short of actual regeneration. This seems

at first view to be repugnant to his opinions about the natural, unregenerate man, which have been stated above, and also to the statement of Arminius with regard to special grace. But the contradiction is merely in appearance. Arminius does not deny that the sinner's conviction and sorrow for sin, are the work of the Spirit; he recognizes it as the initial work of the Spirit, but not as the essential and completing one. Of course, he does not contradict his views of the natural man, as he is in himself. The mistake, if there be any, lies in his definition of regeneration. He appeals to Beza in order to confirm this, and avers that Beza held grief and sorrow for sin not to be regeneration, but only a preparation for it. The mortification of the sinful principle, and the vivification of the holy one, Beza makes to be regeneration. And as Arminius had himself been a pupil and an ardent admirer of Beza, we can hardly distrust the correctness of this statement.

Now, at the present day, we are accustomed (rightly as I must believe) to think, that real grief and sorrow for sin come only from a heart truly penitent, and therefore truly regenerate. There may be much terror on account of sin, much *legal* fear, much "sorrow of the world which worketh death," without any real evangelical contrition. The error of Arminius, then, if it be one, lies merely in mistaking the definition of regeneration, or in a want of right views as to the place of its commencement, if I may be permitted so to speak. He makes a gradual work, partly legal and partly evangelical, all of which together makes up an initial and final work of the Spirit, or the whole compass of the operation by divine grace. After all, the essential act of regeneration itself, the final one, the *gratia finalis, efficiens, ingrediens*, he does not state to be gradual. It is the preparatory, not the final part, which in his view is gradual.

We may differ from him, then, and from Beza, (if Arminius has correctly stated his opinion,) as to the point where the actual renovation itself of the heart begins. But we need not, on this account, accuse either of them as being heterodox on this point, so long as they ascribe *both the initial and final process to divine grace*, and maintain that the sinner of himself is "dead in trespasses and sins."

In regard, moreover, to what Arminius calls the initial or preparatory part of the work of regeneration, he certainly does not stand alone here. If this be heretical, then others, whose reputation for high orthodoxy has never been called in question, are

also heretical on the same point. Thus in confirmation of the statement of Arminius respecting Beza, I find that this author in commenting on John 3: 6, *That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*, says, when explaining the nature of the spiritual birth, in distinction from our natural one, ‘that the Spirit of God does not impart himself to the regenerate substantially, i. e. by infusing into them a part of his own essence, or by an abscission of himself in part, and communicating this part to those who are created anew; nor does he create a new substance in the place of the old one which belonged to the natural man; he only renews the image of God in them, removing by his power their former state of pollution, and bestowing on them a disposition to purity; which is a work so great and distinguished, that those who are transformed in such a manner as to their moral qualities, may with propriety be called regenerate, that is, born again, yea, they seem as it were to be created anew, by existing in a new state.’

But this great work is not begun and completed at once, according to the views of Beza. So he explains himself: “*Hoc autem SENSIM quidem [Spiritus] efficit; et primum in animâ, cujus intellectum verâ luce illustrare, et voluntatem et caeteros affectus ad bonum volendum et præstandum præparare incipit;*” that is, ‘the Holy Spirit GRADUALLY accomplishes the work of regeneration; he begins by imparting light to the understanding; and thus he prepares the way for the will and other affections to be inclined to that which is good.’

How this differs, in any material circumstance, from the statement and views of Arminius, I am not able to perceive. Neither of them maintains, that the *essential* act itself of regenerating, is gradual. Both aver that there is a preparatory work which is gradual, (*hoc sensim efficit*), so that one may affirm that Beza and Arminius both held the work of regeneration to be gradual, when considered as a whole, i. e. as embracing the initial or preparatory work; but neither avers this, as to the act itself of creating the soul anew, or of regenerating it in the highest and truly efficient sense.

Nor do these writers stand alone. Dr Owen, the *coryphaeus* of the English Calvinists, in his great work on the Spirit, says, that “Ordinarily there are certain *previous and preparatory workings* in and upon the souls of men, that are antecedent and *dispositive* unto regeneration.” Vol. I. p. 362.—“This,” he goes on to say, “is, for the substance of it, the po-

sition of the divines of the church of England at the Synod of Dort. . . . I mention this, that those by whom these things are despised, may a little consider whose ashes they trample on and scorn." He then goes on to aver, that what he says respecting this preparatory work, has respect only to adults; and that "the disposition (preparatory and dispositive) is only *materially* so, but not such as contains grace of the same nature as in regeneration itself."

But what is a *material* disposition to regeneration? Let the author explain himself. "It is one which disposeth, and in some way maketh a subject fit, for the reception of that which shall be communicated, added, or infused into it as its form." By *form* here, I suppose the writer to mean, what was meant by the metaphysical schools of his day. *Form*, in one sense of the word, means a *mould*. Now as melted metal poured into a mould, receives a particular form and shape; so *infusion into a thing as a form*, borrows its meaning from this. The mould (so to speak) of the soul is, in Dr Owen's view, first to be fashioned, shaped *materialiter*, i. e. as to its own natural ingredients or component parts, before the Spirit of God can be infused into it.

He proceeds to explain his idea. "So wood by dryness and a due composure, is made ready and fit to admit of firing or continual fire." Such then is the preparatory work of regeneration, in Dr Owen's view. He distinguishes between this so called *material* disposition and a *formal* disposition of the soul. The latter is an *ἀναρχή* of essential regenerating grace; (*formal* here meaning *essential*, i. e. pertaining, according to the old metaphysics, to *essential form*;) it is "where one degree of the same kind, disposeth the subject unto farther degrees of it; as the morning light, which is of the same kind, disposeth the air to the reception of the full light of the sun." This formal disposition he excludes from the preparatory work; and exactly the same thing do Arminius and Beza.

Dr. Owen proceeds still further to unfold his idea of the new birth. "In natural generation," says he, "there are sundry dispositions of the matter, before the form [essence] is introduced. So the body of Adam was formed, before the rational soul was breathed into it; and Ezekiel's bones came together with a noise and shaking, before the breath of life entered into them." p. 363.

Hear him in another subsequent passage: "There are some

things required of us in the way of duty, **IN ORDER UNTO OUR REGENERATION**, which are so in the power of our own natural abilities, as that nothing but corrupt prejudices and stubbornness in sinning, doth keep or hinder men from the performance of them." These things he states to be, (1) "Outward attendance on the dispensation of God's word ; (2) A diligent intention [attention] of mind in attending on the means of grace." "These things," says he again, "are required of us *in order unto our regeneration*." pp. 364, 365. He goes on to state, that these will not of themselves regenerate us, "without an especial, effectual, internal work of the Holy Spirit on the soul ;" but that God does "ordinarily, in the effectual dispensation of his grace, meet with them who attend diligently to the outward administration of the means of it."

Beside these preparatory steps towards regeneration, Dr Owen avers that there are other and more important ones. "There are certain spiritual effects, wrought in and upon the souls of men, whereof the word is the instrument ;" viz. (1) Illumination. (2) Conviction. (3) Reformation. "The first of these respects the mind only ; the second, the mind, conscience and affections ; the third, the life and conversation." p. 366. Under the head which treats of illumination, he declares, that "there is an illumination [of the unregenerate,] which is an especial effect of the Holy Ghost, by the word, on the minds of men ;" and this he endeavours to establish, by declaring that "such an illumination adds perspicuity to the understanding ; greater assent of mind to things revealed ; some kind of sudden joy ; and sometimes it adds gifts to all the rest." He concludes this head, by saying that such illumination is not regeneration, but "a *third* degree [of illumination] is required thereunto." The second degree has brought the subject of it out of a purely natural state, and placed him on a kind of intermediate ground. A third degree perfects the work. And this second degree, "in the order of nature, is previous to a full and real conversion to God, and is materially [in the sense before explained] preparatory and dispositive thereunto."

Under the head of *conviction*, he states, that "it is antecedent unto real conversion to God ;" it consists "in sorrow or grief for sin committed, because past or irrecoverable ;" also "in humiliation for sin, which is the exercise or working of sorrow and fear in outward acts of confession, fasting, praying, and the like." pp. 368, 369.

To all these he adds, that "the soul is filled with thoughts, desires, inquiries, and contrivances about a deliverance out of that state and condition wherein it is;" and that "a great reformation of life, and *change in affections*, doth ensue hereon."

"All these," he next avers, "may be wrought in the minds of men by the dispensation of the word, and yet the work of regeneration never be perfected in them." Moreover, "These things are good in themselves, and fruits of the kindness of God towards us" (p. 370); "they are the effects of the power of the Spirit of God." p. 372.

An objection then presents itself to the mind of this distinguished theologian. 'How can the Holy Spirit be the author of a work, which is ineffectual and imperfect upon the hearts of men?' To this he answers, (1) In most persons real conversion follows this work; and "their *preparatory actings make way* for the introduction of the new spiritual life into the soul." (2) Their failure is owing to the sinner's extreme wickedness; for "even common illumination and conviction of sin have, in their own nature, a tendency unto sincere conversion." It is "wilfulness and stubbornness in those enlightened and convicted," which defeat the end to be attained. "*They faint not for WANT OF STRENGTH to proceed; BUT BY A FREE ACT OF THEIR OWN WILLS*, they refuse the grace which is further tendered unto them in the gospel. This *will*, and its actual resistency unto the work of the Spirit, God is pleased in some way to take away. . . . but *the sin of men, and their guilt, is in it*, where it is continued; for no more is required hereunto, [i. e. to constitute sin or guilt,] but that it be *voluntary*; IT IS WILL, AND NOT POWER, THAT GIVES RECTITUDE OR OBLIQUITY UNTO MORAL ACTIONS." pp. 373, 374.

So speak the unbiassed feelings of every man on earth, respecting the moral nature of sin, when he forgets system, and comes to vindicate God and the work of his Spirit, as Dr Owen does here. It is "*not want of strength*," says this excellent man and divine, "but a free act of the sinner's own will" which makes him come short of the grace of life. How little Dr Owen, on some occasions, remembered such explicit declarations as these, when he was urging the doctrine of human inability and depravity against the Semipelagians of his day, any one may see who will take the trouble to compare his works. But I return to my immediate purpose.

Dr Owen does not even stop with the preparatory work of

regeneration, where I have left him. He goes on quite beyond Arminius himself; for in speaking of his 'preparatory and dispositive work,' he says: "These operations of the Holy Spirit are, in their own nature, GOOD AND HOLY; illumination is so; so is conviction; so is sorrow for sin; with a subsequent change of affections and amendment of life." p. 374.

Arminius contented himself with averring merely, that these things in the convicted sinner were *pleasing* to God, because they are dispositive towards regeneration, i. e. constitute an initial state of preparation for that work. But Dr Owen does not scruple to say, that these very same things are "*good and holy.*" Both acknowledge that they proceed solely from the influence of the Spirit; so that here is no room for making any distinction. If then Arminius was an *Arminian* in regard to this whole matter, Beza was one equally decided, and Dr Owen was greatly advanced beyond either, in the same heresy. So easy it is, where history and facts are not consulted, and prejudice and popular clamour are followed, to put down one man for heresy, and cry up another for orthodoxy, when, if both are sifted to the bottom, it will be found, that they are substantially agreed on the very points where they are affirmed widely to differ.

The right or wrong of Arminius, or Beza, or Owen, is not what I am labouring to prove or disprove. This is not my present business. But to do historical justice to the parties concerned, by shewing what their opinions really were, and what justice or injustice has been done them by subsequent ages, will be regarded as highly proper, by every candid and discerning man.

My apology for dwelling so long on these points, is, the interest which they claim, at present, in our religious community. Every man who wishes to know "what he speaketh and whereof he affirmeth," will be glad to have facts placed before him; and then he can judge for himself.

I do not refrain from giving any opinion on the correctness of the sentiments above cited, because I have none; but because, as I have already remarked, it would here be out of place. I say, only in a word, that to some of the *things* aimed at by these distinguished writers, I can give my hearty assent; to some others, I cannot; and to the *mode* of representation in general, I feel many objections which do not seem to me capable of being removed.

I proceed to another topic of great interest, and respecting

which I have yet exhibited no very explicit declarations of Arminius; I mean *the sin and fall of our first parents*, In his thesis respecting this, he ascribes their first sin to their own free will, and to Satan, as concurrent causes of it. As to its effect on their posterity, he uses the following language.

“This whole sin is not peculiar to our first parents, but is common to the whole race of their posterity; who, at the time when they sinned, were in their loins, and afterwards descended by natural generation from them. *For all sinned in Adam*, Rom. v. Whatever punishment, therefore, was inflicted on our first parents, has gone down through, and still rests on, all their posterity; so that all are children of wrath by nature (Eph. 3: 3), being obnoxious to condemnation, to death temporal and eternal, and to a destitution of original righteousness and holiness. To these evils they will remain eternally subject, unless they are delivered from them by Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever.” p. 243.

To the same purpose Arminius speaks, in another thesis respecting the effects of the sin committed by our first parents. “If they transgressed, their posterity were to be deprived of such blessings as they enjoyed, [viz. the favour and grace of God,] and were to become obnoxious to the opposite evils. Hence it comes, that all men who are their natural descendants, have become obnoxious to eternal and temporal death, and are destitute of original righteousness; which penalty is usually called, a loss of the divine image, and *original sin*.” p. 378.

If President Edwards, who endeavours to prove the physical and metaphysical unity of all men with Adam and Eve, was sufficiently strenuous on the doctrine of original sin and imputation of sin; then is Arminius to be regarded in the same light as to this point; inasmuch as he maintains the absolute *physical* unity of all men with Adam, and that the same sentence of death, temporal and eternal, has come upon all, because they did thus partake of Adam’s sin. So says the Westminster Catechism, moreover: “Who sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression.” I have met with no orthodoxy of a higher type than that of Arminius, on this much contested point.

My readers will doubtless be curious to inquire, whether Arminius has given us still more particular views, in respect to the hereditary depravity which we derive from Adam. In his thesis on *actual sins*, he has touched this point. He is speaking of the cause of our sinning, when he says: “The efficient cause of all

actual sins, is man's free will. The *causa προηγουμένη*, precedent cause, is our original inclination to that which is contrary to the divine law, which [inclination] we contracted by natural generation from our first parents. The *causa προκατάρκτηαι*, the predisposing causes [of sin], are the objects and occasions which solicit to sin." p. 245.

In his thesis respecting the *free will and ability of men*, he represents the unregenerate man as 'impotent in his will with respect to good; as mangled, wounded, infirm, bowed down, beat down, taken captive, undone, lost; his ability not only weakened and inefficacious, without the assistance of divine grace, but as amounting to nothing at all without such grace; for, adds he, Christ has said, *Without me ye can do nothing*. The mind of man, in his natural state, he declares to be darkened, and incapable of understanding the things of the Spirit. With this is associated the perverseness of the heart and affections, so that the sinner hates what is truly good, and loves and pursues what is evil. The carnal mind is enmity against God, is not subject to his law, neither indeed can be. The heart is deceitful, perverse, uncircumcised, hard, and stony; its imagination is only evil, from youth.'

'His impotence as to all that is good, corresponds to his blindness of mind and perversity of heart. An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit. He is not subject to the law of God, neither can he be so. He is altogether dead in sin. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; the Son only can make us free; "it follows, therefore, that our will, since the first offence of Adam, *is not free to good*, unless it is made free by the Son." pp. 263, 264.

It were easy to make other extracts; but I desist, through fear of wearying my readers. Enough surely has been extracted, to shew what Arminius thought upon all the controverted points of theology in his day. In common with his countrymen in general, he had a full belief in the divine inspiration, the entire sufficiency, and the paramount authority of the Scriptures; in the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the Council of Nice and the Athanasian fathers; in the vicarious sacrifice and atonement of Christ; in justification by grace alone through faith in Christ; in regeneration by the special and supernatural influences of the Holy Spirit; and in a word, in the doctrines at large contained in the usual systems of divinity which the times then afforded. His belief respecting original sin, the corruption of

human nature, hereditary depravity, federal relation to Adam, and every thing connected with these topics, appears to have been of the very strongest and fullest kind. Who has gone farther than the above extracts present him as going? If he halts about some "quasi good works" of the sinner under legal conviction, he does this only in company with other orthodox men of the most strenuous sort. On the subject of falling away from grace, he has doubts; and these arise from such passages as those in Ezek. xviii. Heb. vi. x. and 2 Pet. ii. But he gives no positive opinion on this point. On the doctrine of decrees only, does he appear to have been at open war with some of his brethren, especially with Gomar his colleague. That he was wrong here in some respects; that he reasoned about the decrees of God, as he would about cause and effect in the natural world, and so made out to himself a fatality in the scheme of his opponents; does not seem to me to admit of much doubt. But then, if he represents the views of his opponents correctly, was there not something excessive in their mode of stating them? When it is averred, that 'God predestinated men to eternal life or death, not only without all respect to character, but even without respect to them as created beings, i. e. as brought into existence;' we are ready to ask, How can the human mind, which believes in an omniscient God, "who sees all things from the beginning to the end," ever suppose it possible, that the whole of every man's character must not eternally have been always present to the Divine Mind? If so, then we almost necessarily inquire, How could God decree any thing, wholly irrespective of this character? Has he not decreed that voluntary transgressors shall be punished with death? Has he decreed, that any others shall be so punished?

After the contest had proceeded for a while, it came to pass, as we may very naturally suppose, that neither Arminius nor his opponents were in a state for dispassionate consideration of the subject of it. With the former, nearly all decree was fatality, except some conditional determinations of a general nature, suspended on man's conduct. With the latter, *stet pro ratione voluntas*, was too much the order of the day. God could not have regard to any thing but to himself alone, either in his judgments or in his mercies.

Such is the tendency and end of bitter and heated dispute. If it does not find heretics, it is wont to make them. *Discussion* is always good; *dispute* almost always evil.

It is easy to perceive, as Arminius has more than once intimated in his declaration, that the subject of *predestination* or *divine decrees*, was the centre and substance of all his controversy with his antagonists. That he doubted whether some might not fall from regenerating grace, and held that saving grace was not always irresistible, connected itself, perhaps unconsciously in his own mind, yet clearly and plainly, with his doubts about the absolute decree of election and reprobation. If this were *absolute*, in the sense in which he supposed his antagonists to maintain it, then of course falling away from saving grace, or resistance to it, must be really out of question. But inasmuch as he rejected the idea of an absolute, i. e. an irrespective or unconditional decree, so he would naturally be led to believe, that the lapse of the regenerate, and their power to resist the influences of the Spirit, were possible, and perhaps probable.

In carefully reviewing his sentiments, it is difficult to see what there is in them that is really opposed to the general tenor of our Westminster Catechism; unless it be, the simple points just suggested. On one of these, viz. falling from grace, it will be remembered that Arminius himself did not express an opinion. He doubted respecting it. The substance then of his positive heresy, if it be such, was that he denied the *decretum absolutum*, maintained by Calvin, Beza, Gomar, and others of that and succeeding times, and that he did not believe grace to be irresistible.

The point of difficulty in the mind of Arminius here was, that this view of the divine decrees made God the author of sin, and took away the free agency and accountability of men. On the other hand, his antagonists most solemnly averred, that they did not in any manner teach, nor did they at all believe, that God was the author of sin, or that man's liberty was taken away by the divine decrees. So say the synod of Dort in Cap. Doctrinæ I. 15. p. 281 of the *Acta*: "Decretum reprobationis: Deum neutiquam peccati authorem, quod cogitatu blasphemum est, sed tremendum, irreprehensibilem, et justum judicem ac vindicem constituit." Calvin, Beza, and even Gomar himself, have often made the like declarations. Mosheim has laboured, in his long preface to Hales' Epistles, which contain the history of the synod of Dort, to shew that these declarations are not worthy of credit, and that it is impossible for the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches to unite together, until the doctrine of *decretum absolutum* is renounced, which makes God, as he says, the author of sin, and is nothing less than blasphemy; thus being himself

guilty of the very excess and violence of which he complains in the contra-remonstrants, viz. charging on them blasphemy by his own construction of their opinions, a blasphemy which they utterly renounce with horror and indignation. In like manner Arminius insisted, that the reasoning of his antagonists led inevitably to such a conclusion ; and that they were inconsistent in denying the conclusion, while they held the premises.

If now analogies from natural causes and effects, as we see them developed in the physical world, are to be applied to metaphysical subjects of this nature, then the consequences which Arminius deduced from the opinions of his antagonists may be correct. A physical necessity admits of no strictly voluntary agency. But in applying such an analogy, Arminius committed a great mistake ; one, however, which has been repeated from that time to this, without any intermission ; and for aught that I can see, always will be committed, until men learn to reason better than to apply *physical* analogies to *spiritual* things.

The manifest object of Calvin, Beza, and others, in maintaining the doctrine of *decretum absolutum*, seems to me to be to stain the pride of human glory, and to ascribe in the highest possible sense all our blessings to the mere good pleasure and mercy of God, and none of them to our own merit. The spirit of the times led to this. The Romish church not only held to the merit of good works, but even to works of supererogation, by which one could lay up in store for others as well as himself. The reformers saw the fatal delusion and error of such doctrines, and they were naturally led to an opposite extreme. They maintained, by the doctrine of *decretum absolutum*, not only that we had no merit of our own in the work of salvation, but that God did not even take it into account whether we believed, in determining to save us. In order to make his decree as irrelative as possible, they advanced still farther, and declared, that God did not even regard us as created beings, in determining that he would save us. Independent of all character or of all development, antecedent to any contemplation of us as actually existing, and only in and of himself, he determined to create some to life, and others to death, in order to display his goodness on the one hand, and his justice on the other. Thus *all* is of grace ; and our election in Christ is only the result of the previous decree, and not with any reference to what we are or may be.

With all this, the free will of the sinner and the saint, and the

accountability of both were allowed; whether consistently or not, has been long disputed, and will long continue to be. There is no end of reasoning upon these subjects, until men will define more, and assert less. How easy to lose one's self in such a theme! How easy to ask questions, also, which the advocates of the *decretum absolutum* find it difficult to answer without great embarrassment! Their opponents have often asked: 'Is God omniscient and immutable? Did he from eternity know the whole character of every individual, whom he intended to create? Is man made in his image, and in reality a free agent? Was it not a part of his decree, that man should freely receive or reject the gospel? Was it a part of his decree, that any should be saved, except such as did freely receive it? And if God has always been omniscient and immutable, and the whole character of every individual has always been before him, how is it that the decree was made respecting him, without any reference to his whole character?'

These and the like questions are met, on the other hand, by others of a different tenor, viz. 'Whether God could know with certainty all events, actions, etc. unless he had decreed them? Whether if decreed, they must not be absolutely certain? Whether God has a plan of his own, which he will fully accomplish, and which his creatures cannot disappoint? Whether he did not choose the elect in Christ Jesus, before the world began, and of his own free will?' Other questions of a similar nature might be multiplied almost without end.

But when all such questions are urged, is the controversy brought any nearer to a termination? Not at all. Both sides are equally confident, and equally able to argue without end. From what does this result? From two things, I answer; the first, that men do not define what they mean, in many essential respects; the second, that they go on beyond the boundaries of human knowledge, and make propositions about that respecting which they neither know nor can know any thing.

Whom can enter into the *secret* reasons of God's decrees? Has he revealed them? The very statement of the subject contradicts this. How then are we to know them? We do not, and we cannot. If my brother, then, thinks it competent for him to make affirmations about them, from which I think it more prudent to refrain, why should he judge me? Or why should I condemn him, if I see that he is not actuated by a spirit of presumption, but of inquiry, and of zeal for the honour of divine grace?

That God does not regenerate men by his Spirit, because they have any merit of their own, must be clear. He meets them in a state of enmity; he "quickens them when they are dead in trespasses and sins." All boasting is forever excluded; from the foundation to the top-stone, *all* is of grace. That God has a plan of government and salvation; that he had definite purposes in view when he made the world, and that he will accomplish them all; that we live and move and have our being in him; that his *special* grace begins, continues, and completes the work of salvation; must be true, and must be clear to the enlightened and humble mind, whatever objections may be raised against these truths. All this Arminius seems to have fully believed. Why may we not content ourselves with this, without endeavouring to urge our speculations further? If any one thinks he can determine what was or was not the *secret* ground or reason of God's decrees, and finds satisfaction in such speculations, we need not zealously attack him, and accuse him of making God the author of sin, if we see that he acts like a pious and humble man, and abhors such a consequence of his doctrine, and denies that it follows from it. And if, on the other hand, any one thinks it more safe to stop short as to such inquiries, and to exclude them as evidently leading on to what lies beyond the bounds of human knowledge, let him not be proscribed. When he denies that God is omniscient, that he reigns with universal sway, that he will accomplish all his glorious purposes, that he will make the wrath of man to praise him, and bring good even out of evil; then it is time to deal seriously with him as an erring brother, and to admonish him that he is forsaking principles which are fundamental in our holy religion.

The synod of Dort itself contained Sublapsarians as well as Supralapsarians. So did the churches of Holland; so may ours. I do not see how it can be shown that the *secret* grounds of God's decrees are open or revealed to us, which they must be, if we can determine of what nature they are; and if not, men may be pious, who do not think that these grounds are revealed, and who, while they believe that salvation is *all* of grace, do not think it necessary, in order to maintain this, that they should also maintain some of the propositions of Gomar and his friends.

An impartial observer, however, while he sees much to condemn in the severity and violence of the times, in the days of Arminius, will not, after the views given above, attribute it all to the party of the contra-remonstrants. It is evident, as has been

already remarked, that Arminius was desirous of enlisting the civil government on his side, and that he took great pains to do this. It is plain that he made his appeal to popular prejudice against the doctrine of divine decrees; and that he meant to impress it on the minds of the churches, that those who held to this doctrine made God the author of sin. Ardent, aspiring, *tenax propositi*, bent upon victory, fully satisfied that himself was in the right and his opponents in the wrong, it was not sufficient for him in a modest and peaceful way to hold his own sentiments, without publicly contending for them, and as publicly calling in question those who opposed them. That in all this he was conscientious, I feel compelled to believe, if I regard either the tenor of his life, or his own solemn declarations. He believed himself to be contending for truth, and not for victory. That he mistook himself in part, I can hardly avoid supposing. Men of such a temperament as his, and who withal are furnished with such gifts and acquisitions, when they are suspected and privily called in question and defamed, are not wont to pursue their way with an even tenor, and to turn neither to the right hand nor to the left. They look down with indignation on the attempt to rob them of their fame and influence, (for so they are very apt to construe all detraction,) and this rouses them to put forth all their strength to carry those points in regard to which they have been accused, and to make them popular instead of odious. Pride has something to do with all this. They are loth to be called in question, and judged, and condemned by men whom they regard perhaps as inferiors, and who, to their certain knowledge, have investigated much less than themselves. In a word, take the whole together, and one may easily see, that Arminius did, in all probability, overrate his own conscientiousness in the matter of his dispute, and that in not a few instances, while he thought himself to be doing God service, he was either defending himself, or contending for victory.

His ardour and forwardness (I had almost said, his presumption) have already been the subject of remark, on p. 232 above. We have seen him teaching, and openly and warmly contending for, Ramus' philosophy, in the face of Beza and the whole theological faculty at Geneva. At Basle too, we find that in the eyes of his friend Paraeus, he seemed too ardent and *opiniâtre*. That he carried these traits of character forward into subsequent life, his whole course and history seem abundantly to testify.

Let us hear an impartial observer, in respect to these mat-

learned, eloquent, bold, ardent, fearless, persevering, and undismayed by partial defeat. If he was repulsed, and his forces scattered, and the enemy were retiring to celebrate their supposed final triumph, he would rally again, pursue his exulting foes, and attack them while crowned with the garlands of victory. He was so thoroughly versed in the ancient fathers of the church, so acute in school logic, and familiar with the masters of it, and withal so much of an adept in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, that his declarations respecting these matters carried along with them a weight among the learned, which his antagonists could not well resist. Then, when he appeared in public as a preacher, his great engagedness, the great remove at which he placed himself from the school theology, which was unintelligible to the common people, and withal his sweet voice, his winning manner, and his seriousness and fervour, overcame all the prejudices that his opponents could raise against him, and made him the idol of his congregation at Amsterdam, and equally so of the students at Leyden. Not a little of the asperity of Gomar's opposition to him, sprung, in all probability, from this source. How can we bear, not only that another should venture to differ from our own opinion, but that he should even make it and himself more popular than we can make our cause and ourselves? It is one of the hardest burdens to bear, that poor human nature ever takes upon itself. Nothing but magnanimity above the ordinary stamp, and even this sanctified by the grace of God, will enable a man meekly and patiently to sustain such a load.

With all the superior advantages of person and talent which Arminius possessed, there was joined an expertness and dexterity of management, which he had acquired by long personal experience. When a child, he became an orphan. From the very dawn of his being, then, he was inured to struggle with difficulties and trials. Early in life he went abroad, and began to contend with some of the first geniuses of the age, in regard to metaphysics and dialectics. In all the universities where he came, he was put forward as a leader and spokesman. Defamation attacked him on his outset in life. All these things gave him experience and dexterity; and these, united with his talents and learning, his personal manners and appearance, his fervour and eloquence, fitted him in an extraordinary manner to gain popularity and influence, and to foil his adversaries in serious conflict.

Besides these things, which account for his influence and success, it must be remembered, that his own personal heresy, (if indeed such a name must be given to his opinions,) was not a very grievous one in the eyes of sober and reflecting persons, who were not partisans in theology. On all the great doctrines of the gospel, total depravity, special grace, atonement by the death of Christ, justification by grace alone through faith, the doctrine of the Trinity, the divine authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures, and other doctrines necessarily connected with these, he was altogether orthodox. He only contended against the *decretum absolutum* and irresistible grace, and doubted about final perseverance, because he thought that this could not be maintained, without infringing upon the liberty and free agency of man. And admitting that he reasoned wrongly here, it amounts to an error in the philosophy of religion, rather than in its *theosophy*, if I may use this word in the sense which its origin indicates. Consequently the moderate part of thinkers in religion, did not regard Arminius as deserving of decided and hostile reprobation. They first sympathized with him under the abuse which he received; and (which is very natural) at last with his sentiments. This done, the more he was impinged upon by his opponents, the closer did his friends draw around him.

He had powerful friends. Uytenbogart was the most distinguished pulpit orator of his day in Holland. Oldenbarneveld, Grotius, Hogerbeets, Casaubon, J. G. Vossius, Vorstius, some of them among the most distinguished scholars the world has seen, were the decided friends of Arminius. He well knew this; and supported by such influence, he redoubled his zeal and his confidence.

To sum up the whole of Arminius' character in a word; he was a man of very distinguished talents and learning; he possessed shining and popular talents to an uncommon degree; he was too much actuated by the love of popularity and novelty; and too much intent on making his opponents unpopular. He was fitted, in an unusual manner, to become a powerful heresiarch; but most of the accusations of heresy made against him, appear to be the offspring of suspicion, or of a wrong construction put upon his words. In reference to what is now, and has for a long time been, called Arminianism among us, we may well and truly say, that *Arminius himself was no Arminian*. The justification of such an assertion is altogether unnecessary, after having made such copious extracts from his writings as I

century. Afterwards followed the famous J. Le Clerc, born and educated at Geneva, but altogether opposed to the views inculcated there. Other distinguished men of the Arminian party, (and many such it has produced,) have gradually verged, one generation after another, towards Pelagianism, or rather towards the neology of Germany at the present day. Le Clerc may be viewed as a kind of neologist in embryo. That he had strong doubts about the real inspiration of the Scriptures, seems to be manifest from the tenor of his commentaries; although he very cautiously avoids a direct expression of these doubts. The ablest men of the whole party as writers, in its earlier period, were Grotius, Episcopius, Limborch, J. G. Vossius, Casaubon, and Le Clerc. In later times, the remonstrant college at Amsterdam has produced not a few characters very conspicuous in the walks of science and literature.

What Arminianism has now got to be, is well known. It is Semipelagianism in some respects, and Semirationalism in some others; a compound of latitudinarian sentiments, such as Dr Taylor of Norwich was accustomed to advocate, with divers other views which he rejected. Yet all who are called Arminians, are not of this thorough-going sort. Some approach nearer to the modified views of Limborch, of Hey, of Laud, and others of this class; some are Arminians on a few points, and Calvinistic on others; while others agree throughout with Dr Taylor above mentioned; and others still are rationalists in all but the name. The Arminians as a sect, organized and united, seem in fact, among us, to be no more. Arminians, in the sense in which this term was applied in the days of Arminius himself, would such men have been called as Richard Baxter, Sherlock, Tillotson, and even Doddridge, with a multitude of others in this country and abroad, who have been honoured and revered as burning and shining lights in the church. In short, Arminius himself, to use the language of the present times, was merely a *moderate Calvinist*; and moderate too in a very limited degree; for on most points, he seems to have been altogether as strenuous as Calvin himself.

If now the question be repeated, What are we to think and say of *Arminianism*? The answer is; define what you mean, before you form or give your opinion. Arminianism now, is, one might almost say, every thing or any thing that is opposed to orthodoxy. It exists in all forms, and in all gradations. Tell

which of these you mean, and then you may say what you think of Arminianism.

I have done ; and if what I have written shall serve to correct any wrong impressions about Arminius and his times, or to cast light on that part of doctrinal history which was before obscure in the minds of more or fewer readers, or to enable any one for the future to speak and write more correctly about Arminians ; my object is accomplished.

I have endeavoured to do historical justice to the subject of this memoir. It is quite possible, that there are some in our community, who will think that I have spoken too favourably of Arminius, and without sufficient praise of his opponents. I can only say, that an attentive study of the whole subject, has brought me to the positions which I have advanced. If my sources are all wrong, and speak falsely of Arminius and of his opponents, then I may have represented him in too advantageous a light. But unless this be the case, I cannot easily be persuaded that I have not, on the whole, made a just estimate of Arminius and of his doctrines ; and also of the conduct and views of his opponents.

In Arminius himself, we may see some things to admire, and some to condemn. We might say this of his opponents also. *Humanum est errare.* Arminius did not dream that he had set open the flood gates of latitudinarianism, when he was attacking the *decretum absolutum*, and expressing his doubts about some other doctrines of the times. Nor would this have been the case, had no dispute arisen, and no parties been formed. The synod of Dort, in excommunicating the Arminians and appealing to the civil power to punish them, were doubtless the efficient instruments in raising up and perpetuating the party, and of driving them away from orthodoxy ; although these consequences were something very diverse from their intention. So it has always been. The council of Nice perpetuated the Arian heresy, in the very same way. If there had been no such council, I verily believe that Arianism would have expired of itself, within one century. So the council of Trent, designing to establish the Roman catholic system on an immoveable basis and make it universally triumphant, only erected a citadel, at which all the battery of the enemy has been directed, as the grand rallying point of their opponents.

Councils cannot make or unmake Christianity. This has been tried often enough ; but they have never succeeded, and never can. God's word will live, when all their decrees are a

dead letter. What men can make, men can unmake. So it is, and ever will be. The best way to oppose heresies, is by reason and argument; not by a plurality of votes. Pascal, in his *Provincial Letters*, speaking of the Jesuit council at the Sorbonne, and their condemnation of Arnauld without assigning any reasons for it, says, that "it was more easy to find monks than reasons." Such tactics, however, have not been confined to Jesuits. They have been practiced quite too much, in the churches of all denominations. Yet experience testifies against their soundness. Men ardent in the pursuit of truth, and at the same time enlightened, will bow only to God's authority. When the violence of pressure begins to abate, independent thinkers and investigators will start up; nor can the decrees of any council either guide or control their opinions. It is Scripture and reason and argument, and these only, that in the long run will prevail. The God who made us in his own image, rational and moral and immortal, designed it should be so; Christianity has explicitly taught that it should be so; and every history of past or future times, has served, and will serve, only to confirm it.

It were easy to occupy almost as much space as I have already taken up, in reflections upon the facts that now lie before us. But I must abstain; although the temptation to indulge is very strong. My design was to act the historian; not the theologian or the moralist. I must leave it to my readers, then, to make their own reflections.

I will add only, that I am quite sensible of the delicacy of the whole subject; so much so, that I should have entirely abstained from it, had I not been fully persuaded that something of this nature is needed, in the present state of our religious public. Very few can have access to such books, as communicate all the historical information necessary to qualify them rightly to judge of the principles and controversies of particular persons and times, in remote countries and at a distant period; and when such principles and controversies become directly or indirectly the subject of renewed discussion, a correct and adequate knowledge of them is altogether desirable.

In reviewing the whole of the preceding sketch, I am induced to think it probable, that I may be blamed both by the friends and the opponents of Arminianism. The friends will find too many sombre colours in the picture which I have drawn; the opponents, too many bright ones. I anticipate the remark, on the part of a few, that the faults of some members of the ortho-

dox party should not have been made so prominent as they are ; nor the extravagance of some of their doctrinal assertions have been so fully disclosed. The apprehension of those who will be prone to make remarks of this nature, is, that orthodoxy itself is in danger of being injured, by an exposure of the faults and extravagancies of its professors. This feeling may be honest in its motive ; but I must believe that it is a mistaken one, yea, that it is one which does dishonour to religion in its highest and noblest sense. So the holy men of old, guided by the Spirit of the living God, did not think, when they drew the pictures of Noah, of David, of Hezekiah, of Peter, and of many others. It has always been, to my mind, one of the most convincing arguments that the authors of the Scriptures were honest and upright and independent men, that they have given a full-length portrait of the faults as well as of the virtues of their principal and (so to speak) favourite characters. Can we do better than to walk in their steps? Or are the world at present to believe, that there have been orthodox men in past ages, or that there are any now, who have had no faults and committed no errors? Or is our attachment to party, to rise higher than our regard to the truth and the word of God? I cannot doubt how these questions should be answered ; and I have performed the duty of a historian, in the preceding pages, in accordance with the answer which I cannot refrain from giving to them. I have as faithfully and fully avowed the truth, concerning those with whose sentiments I should, for the most part, be in unison, as I have concerning those from whom I should more widely differ. It results from the very nature of the case, that a dispute which leads to banishment and shedding of blood, has not been conducted with moderation, and extravagancies must be looked for in both parties. I have found them, and endeavoured faithfully to represent them. I can only say, it is my full persuasion, that no intelligent and candid man, who peruses all the sources from which my materials have been drawn, will see much cause of dissenting from the views that have now been given.

It is proper here, both for the information and satisfaction of the reader, to state the sources from which the preceding representations have been drawn. These are the following.

1. JACOBI ARMINII *Opera Theologica*. Lugd. Bat. 1629, small 4to. To this is prefixed PETRUS BERTIUS, *De Vita et Obitu J. Arminii*.

2. BAYLE, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, Tome I. 1730.
3. *Supplement au Dictionnaire de M. Bayle*, par J. C. CHAUFFEPIC, Tome I. 1750.
4. SCHROECKH, *Christliche Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation*, Theil V. 1806.
5. *Histoire abrégée de la Reformation des Pays Bas*, traduite du *Hollandois de Gerard BRANDT*, 3 vol. 12mo. 1726.
6. *Acta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtii habitae*, to which is appended the *Judicia Theologorum Exterorum*, who were present at the synod. Dort 1620, published under the direction of the synod. Also DANIEL HEINSIUS, *Prefatio ad Ecclesias*, a narrative concerning Arminius and his party, prefixed to the *Acta Synodi*.

7. SIM. EPISCOPII *Opera Theologica*, Goudae, 1665, 2 Tom. fol. in which are contained many pieces of a historical nature respecting the remonstrants.

8. Last, but not least, J. HALESII *Epistolae*, i. e. Letters of John Hales, chaplain to the English embassy at the Hague, and published originally in English in the *Golden Remains of the ever memorable John Hales of Eton college*, 1659, 4to. The Latin edition, *Halesii Epistolae*, was published by Mosheim at Ham-burgh in 1724, and is prefaced by about 200 pages concerning the synod of Dort, and the life of Hales. Mosheim has inveighed, in unmeasured terms, against the synod; and he shews his partiality for the remonstrants, in his notes throughout the book. Hales was not a member of the synod, but a secret deputy of king James I. of England, sent to watch all its motions. The account which he gives of it, in his epistles addressed to Dudley Carleton the English ambassador at the Hague, is the ablest and most impartial account that we have. As he was at this period on the side of the contra-remonstrants, his letters are not liable to any suspicion of partiality in favour of the remonstrants. I regret that I could not have access to the *Golden Remains*, instead of Mosheim's translation; for this learned professor understood Latin better than he did English.

Never, I believe, were the records of any synod so fully published, as those of the synod of Dort. The remonstrants also published *Acta Synodi*, differing, of course, in regard to some statements from the one mentioned above. But I have not been able to obtain this volume.

ART. III.—ON THE LANGUAGE OF PALESTINE IN THE AGE OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.**AN INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE.**

By the Editor.

To the interpreter of the New Testament no subject can be more important or more interesting, than that which it is proposed to consider in the present article. The character of the Greek style of the New Testament must necessarily be intimately connected with, and dependent upon, the language which the writers used in ordinary life. If they were Hebrews, to whom the Hebrew language alone was vernacular, while they had learned the Greek only as a foreign tongue at a comparatively late period of life,—and either from books, or, as most probably must have been the case, from the necessities of intercourse,—then their style would naturally assume a very different character from what it would have been, had the Greek, in a measure at least, been also their vernacular tongue. If moreover the Hebrew, or its dialects, were the predominant language of Palestine, it is interesting and necessary to inquire also, what were the nature and condition of this tongue; whether it was the pure Hebrew of the Old Testament, or the kindred Chaldee, or the Syriac, or a mixture of both; for the influence of the national dialect upon the Greek of the New Testament must be different, according to the different nature of that dialect. If, for instance, the vernacular tongue of Matthew was the Chaldee or the Syriac, it would obviously not be the best course of proceeding in interpretation, to resort, for the sources of oriental colouring in his Greek style, first to the ancient Hebrew. The interpreter would naturally first look to the native Chaldee or Syriac of the writer; and if these failed him, might then have recourse to the Hebrew as a kindred tongue, and, in some respects, the common source of both. The first question then which presents itself, is, If the Hebrew, or any of its kindred dialects, were still spoken in Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles, which of these dialects was the current one, and constituted the language of the country.

The character of the Greek style of the New Testament would also depend, in some measure, on the extent to which the Greek language was diffused in Palestine. If it was not spoken there at all, or at most only by a comparatively small number among the higher classes, then the authors of the New Testa-

ment, who, with the exception of Paul and perhaps Luke, were "unlearned and ignorant men," must have written in a language originally foreign to them; one in which they were neither accustomed to think, nor to speak; and of course the interpreter might expect to find in their writings all those appearances both in construction and in the use of words, which would naturally occur in the style of a man writing under similar circumstances at the present day. For we are not to suppose that the inspiration under which they wrote, was one principally of words; nor that it enabled them to write better Greek, than was spoken by the people to whom their writings were addressed. If, on the other hand, the Greek language had become very generally diffused in Palestine, if it were understood and spoken not only by the learned and the upper classes, but also more or less among the common people, then we may expect to find in the New Testament a species of Greek, certainly not pure and flowing like the native Attic, but yet a national language, coloured indeed by the manners and customs and also the idioms of the country, but still no longer bearing those marks of unacquaintance and want of skill, which indicate that the writers were using a *foreign* tongue.

It is obvious, that these circumstances have also a very important bearing, not only on the mode of interpretation in general, but also on the very sources of interpretation in respect to the New Testament. If the writers, being Hebrews, wrote the Greek only as a foreign idiom, then of course they thought only in their own Syro-Chaldaic or Aramaean; and their thoughts, expressed in foreign words, are to be explained almost wholly by a reference to their vernacular tongue. In this case, the Greek of the classic writers would have very little to do with the Greek of the New Testament; and the rules applicable to the former could not be taken as our standard in judging of the latter. If, on the contrary, the writers of the New Testament wrote as men who had understood and spoken Greek all their lives, then they partially at least thought in it, and their thoughts are to be explained by a reference to the Greek of that day and of that country, as known from other writers under the same or similar circumstances, and by a comparison with the language as used in Greece itself. Under such circumstances, the direct Hebrew or Aramaean colouring would naturally be much less conspicuous, than under the former supposition. There arises then a second question, Whether the Hebrew or its

kindred dialects were exclusively the national language of Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles; or whether, along with this, the Greek had come into common use among all classes of the people?

The general question relative to the language of Palestine, has most usually been treated of in connexion with that of the original language of Matthew's Gospel. Although these two questions are in fact totally distinct, (for the question in regard to the original language of Matthew does not properly depend on the language of the country, any more than does the case of Mark or John,) yet the supporters of the opinion that Matthew originally wrote in Hebrew, have also commonly endeavoured to show that this was the only language then known in Palestine, because they have assumed it as a fact, that Matthew wrote for the inhabitants of that country; while their opponents, who claim for that Gospel in its present form the rank of an original, have also usually maintained the very general prevalence of the Greek in Palestine. The belief in the Hebrew original of Matthew seems to have arisen from the fact, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites had each of them a Gospel, called *κατ' Ἑβραίων*, and sometimes *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; whether different works or identical, is no longer known. This would appear to have been the foundation of the testimony of Papias, on which the concurrent testimony of succeeding writers chiefly rests. In support of this evidence, the exclusive prevalence of the Hebrew or Aramaean dialect in Palestine, has been called in as supplementary proof. Generally this has been done in a very cursory manner; and the topic has only been treated of as a subordinate consideration. The principal writers on both sides of the question, who have thus cursorily alluded to the subject, are the following. For a Hebrew original of Matthew and the exclusive prevalence of Hebrew in Palestine,—Du Pin,¹ Mill,² Michaelis,³ Marsh,³ Weber,⁴ Kuinoel,⁵

¹ Dissertatt. ou Prolegom. sur la Bible, Tom. II. c. 2. § 3.

² Prolegg. in N. T. p. 8. Comp. also Waltoni Prolegom. c. 13.

³ Introduction to the N. T. by Marsh, Vol. III. c. 4. § 6, and the Translator's notes.

⁴ Untersuchung über das Alter und Ansehen des Evangeliums der Hebräer, von M. C. F. Weber, Tüb. 1806.

⁵ Commentarius in Libb. N. T. historicos, Vol. I. p. xviii.

Olshausen,⁶ etc. For the original Greek of Matthew and the prevalence of Greek in Palestine,—Cappell,⁷ Basnage,⁸ Masch,⁹ Lardner,¹⁰ Walaeus,¹¹ etc. These, in addition to others who will be mentioned below, are the principal writers; a fuller list by Kuinoel may be found in *Fabricii Bibliotheca Graeca* ed. Harles. Tom. IV. p. 760.

The subject however has been treated more at large, sometimes independently of the question in regard to the Gospel of Matthew, and sometimes in connexion with it, by Isaac Voss (or Vossius),¹² Simon,¹³ Diodati,¹⁴ Fabricy,¹⁵ Ernesti,¹⁶ J. B. De Rossi,¹⁷ Pfannkuche,¹⁸ Hug,¹⁹ Binterim,²⁰ and Wiseman.²¹ As it is proposed to lay before the readers of this work the two essays of Pfannkuche and Hug, it will be proper to present here a

⁶ *Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien*. Königsb. 1823, p. 21 ff.

⁷ *Observatt. ad N. T.* p. 110.

⁸ *Annal. ad An. 64*, § 13.

⁹ *Von der Grundsprache des Evangeliums Matthaei*. Against Michaelis.

¹⁰ *Suppl. to the Credibility, &c.* Vol. I. c. 5. § 5. Also in *Watson's Tracts*, Vol. II.

¹¹ *Commentarius in Libb. N. T. historicos*, p. 1.

¹² *De Oraculis Sibyllinis*, Oxon. 1680, p. 88 sqq.—*Responsum ad Objectt. Theologor.* Leyd.—*Respons. ad iteratas et tertias P. Simonii Objectt.*

¹³ *Histoire Crit. du Texte du N. T.* Rotterd. 1689. c. 6. p. 56.

¹⁴ *De Christo Graece loquente Exercitatio*, Neap. 1767.

¹⁵ *Des Titres primitifs de la Revelation*, Rom. 1773, Vol. I. p. 116.

¹⁶ *Neueste Theologische Bibliothek*, Vol. I. for 1771. p. 269 ff.

¹⁷ *Della Lingua propria di Cristo, etc.* *Dissertazioni del Dottore Giambernardo (John Bernard) De Rossi*, Parma, 1772.

¹⁸ *In Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek*, Vol. VIII. pp. 365—480.

¹⁹ *Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.* 3d ed. Stuttgart and Tübing. 1826, Vol. II. p. 30 ff.

²⁰ *Epist. Cathol. interlinealis de Lingua originali N. T. non Latina*, Düsseld. 1820. p. 146 sqq.

²¹ *Horae Syriacae*, Romae 1828, Vol. I. p. 69 sqq.

view of the controversy up to the time at which they wrote. They exhibit a full and fair view of both sides of the question; and the two later writers, Binterim and Wiseman, have not professed to add any thing important to their arguments.

Vossius, although a staunch believer in the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel,²² had nevertheless, in various passages of the works above referred to, advanced the paradoxical assertion, that the Greek was the *only* language spoken in Palestine;²³ and that those who had any knowledge of the Hebrew or Chaldee, had acquired it in the same manner as we learn Latin at the present day, or by intercourse with the Jews who dwelt beyond the Euphrates, where this language was still spoken. To those who suppose that Christ and the apostles spoke in Aramaean, he modestly applies the epithets of *semi-docti et fanatici*.

To the refutation of these assertions Father Simon devotes Chap. VI. of the work above cited. He shews conclusively, that the Jews of Palestine did speak the Chaldee or Aramaean language; but at the same time, although a warm advocate for the Hebrew original of Matthew, he admits that Greek was spoken in Palestine, and takes indeed the position, which probably most at the present day will be ready to adopt, after reading Hug's essay, viz. *That the two languages were both current at the same time in Palestine, during the age of Christ and the apostles*. "The Jews," he says (p. 60), "who lived beyond the Euphrates, and those of Jerusalem, all spoke the Chaldee [or Aramaean]. They differed in this respect, that the former spoke *only* the Chaldee, while the latter, besides this language, could speak also the Greek, which was diffused throughout Palestine." To an objection of Vossius, that two languages cannot subsist in a country at the same time, and that therefore the Hebrew must have been forgotten, Father Simon appeals (p. 60) to the mar-

²² Appendix ad Lib. de LXX. Interp. *Audio semi-theologos quosdam Rabbinitas omnium Patrum omniumque Ecclesiarum testimonia conculcare, ac serio adfirmare Matthaeum non Hebraice, sed Graece scripsisse. Stulti simus, si istiusmodi deliriis aliquid reponamus.*

²³ Respons. ad Object. Theol. Leyd. *In imperio Romano Graecus sermo et Latinus omnibus erat in usu; Hebraea vero lingua ne ab ipsis quidem Judaeis intelligebatur.—De Sybill. Orac. p. 290, ut in Aegypto, Asia, et reliqua Syria, ita quoque in Judaea nulla praeter Graecam audiebatur lingua. Cf. Binterim, l. c. p. 171.*

tyrdom of the seven brethren (2 Macc. vii.) where the mother and sons converse with Antiochus in Greek, and with one another in Chaldee. "This manifestly proves," he says, "that the Greek was the common language (*langue vulgaire*) of the country, and that the Jews, besides the Greek, had preserved the Chaldee language which they had brought with them from Babylon, and which they called the *national* language. The Jews of Jerusalem also always retained this language, although the Greek was the common language (*langue vulgaire*) of Palestine."

The next writer of importance on this particular subject was Dominic Diodati, a lawyer of Naples, who published in 1767 his *Exercitatio de Christo Graece loquente*. This work appears to have produced a great excitement in its day; though it has now become exceedingly rare. Pfannkuche was never able to get sight of it, and Hug declares (II. 31) that he could not find it even in Naples. It seems however to be in the library at Leipsic, as Ernesti gives an account of it; and also in the libraries at Rome, where both Fabricy and Wiseman have had access to it.

Diodati sets out to prove, that the Greek language alone was known in Palestine in the age of Christ; that both Christ and the apostles spoke *only* Greek; and made use only of the Greek version of the Scriptures, which, according to him, was also exclusively employed in the synagogues and in the temple. An assertion of this nature might well excite surprise; and would require powerful and convincing arguments in support of it, in order to do away the mass of opposing evidence. Such arguments, however, the author does not bring. His work is divided into three sections; in the first of which he undertakes to shew, that the Greek had become so current in Palestine, as to be the national language; in the second, he brings forward his direct proofs, that Christ and his apostles and all the Jews in their age spoke Greek; while in the third, he contends against the grounds on which the opposite opinion rests. To support an hypothesis so paradoxical, he must necessarily have recourse to many arguments in themselves weak; as well as resort to many shifts to avoid the force of overpowering opposing evidence. This appears actually to have been the case; and the very extravagance of his undertaking and the weakness of his arguments, produced a reaction against the side of the question which he

advocated, and caused the general current of opinion to set strongly towards the opposite extreme.

In 1771 Ernesti published an analysis of this work, accompanied by a refutation of its principal arguments, which he pronounces weak and trivial. In 1772 Fabricy at Rome also quotes the work, and argues against it. He however treats it with respect, calls it *une dissertation ingénieuse*, and says that it announces in its author *de grands talens*. Both Ernesti and Fabricy admit the prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine to a certain extent; although they properly reject the visionary hypothesis of Diodati.

In 1772 J. B. De Rossi, the celebrated biblical critic at Parma, took the field in the work above referred to, written in the Italian language, and expressly directed against that of Diodati. His work is in like manner divided into three parts or dissertations; the first of which treats of the introduction of the Greek language into Palestine, where he undertakes to shew that this had not taken place during the dominion of the Seleucidae; in the second, he endeavours to ascertain the actual extent to which the Greek was employed among the Jews of Palestine; and this, according to him, was only as a foreign tongue; and in the third, he confutes the position of Diodati in regard to the exclusive use of Greek by Christ and the apostles. The arguments employed by him are in general so similar to those brought forward by Ernesti, that the latter declares it unnecessary for him to exhibit an analysis of the work of De Rossi, of which he therefore only gives a cursory notice.²⁴ De Rossi moreover has taken the trouble, in many instances unnecessary and thankless, of following the Neapolitan writer step by step, and confuting his arguments; and has therefore rendered his own work diffuse and prolix, without regular plan, and full of needless digressions. It is wholly polemical; and the tendency of the author, accordingly, is not so much to seek for the exact truth, as to go to the opposite extreme. The consequence therefore is, that in shewing conclusively that the general position of Diodati is false, he also endeavours to shew that the contrary is true, and that the Aramaean was not only the vernacular tongue of the Jews of Palestine, but also *exclusively* the language of that country. He avers moreover that the Greek was

²⁴ Neueste theol. Bibliothek, III. 89.

spoken, if spoken at all, only by foreigners (Hellenists) and as a foreign language, the learning of which was discountenanced by national prejudice and national custom; and which was in fact understood only by the upper classes, and by them generally only so far as was necessary for the purposes of intercourse with those who held the sovereignty of the country. The judgement of Hug upon De Rossi's work is, 'that he sometimes confounds different periods and ages, and often helps himself with feeble weapons; but is at the same time a champion.'

In 1797, H. F. Pfannkuche, then Repetent at Göttingen, now (since 1803) Professor of Oriental Languages in the university of Giessen, published in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek* the essay, a translation of which constitutes the following article of the present number of this work. It seems to have been occasioned by the then prevailing theory of Eichhorn and his school, respecting the existence of an original Gospel in the Aramaean tongue, which served as the basis of the present Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; by which hypothesis, variously modified, it was supposed that the agreement and discrepancies of these Gospels might be satisfactorily accounted for. In aid of this hypothesis it was proper to shew, that the Aramaean was exclusively the common language of Palestine; and this was attempted to be done in the essay in question. The author has professedly taken the work of De Rossi as the basis of his own; and has given a clear and faithful abstract of that work, with various additions. The principal fault to be found with it, is its exclusiveness; to support which, resort is sometimes had to arguments and reasoning that are merely *a priori*. The Translator has in several places annexed notes, where he has thought some minor modifications to be necessary. The necessary modifications of the general proposition, will be found in the article of Professor Hug.

This latter occurs in Hug's Introduction to the New Testament; and stands there in connexion with the topic of the original language of Matthew's gospel. The discussion however is carried on independently of that topic; and is a triumphant vindication of the opinion, that the Greek language prevailed generally and to a very great extent in Palestine. The work of De Rossi, as exhibited in the essay of Pfannkuche, shews conclusively that the Syro-Chaldaic or Aramaean was still prevalent in Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles, and may properly be regarded as having been the national language. It also discusses the

character and condition of that language ; but these writers both go too far in assigning to it an *exclusive* prevalence. This is the point, and the only one, which Hug aims to combat ; and he shews, irrefragably as it would seem, that the Greek had obtained such a footing in Palestine, as to place it at least nearly on an equality with the Aramaean in respect to general prevalence. The essay of Hug is therefore in some sort supplementary to that of De Rossi and Pfannkuche. Both together present the argument in a complete form ; and it is for this reason that these two essays have been selected, in order to lay before the readers of this work a full view of the subject. The article of Hug will be given in the next number.

It may further be observed, that the opinion of Hug is also adopted by Binterim and Wiseman, in the works above referred to, as also by Paulus²⁵ and Rettig.²⁶ Professor Olshausen of Königsberg, in advocating the Hebrew original of the Gospel of Matthew,²⁷ supposes the prevalence of the Greek to have been somewhat more limited ; but does not assign his reasons for this opinion.

ART. IV.—ON THE PREVALENCE OF THE ARAMAEAN LANGUAGE IN PALESTINE IN THE AGE OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

By Henry F. Pfannkuche, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Giessen.
Translated from the German by the Editor.

§ 1.

So long as the Jewish nation maintained its political independence in Palestine, the Hebrew continued to be the common language of the country ; and so far as we can judge from the remains of it which are still extant, although not entirely pure, it was yet free from any important changes in those elements and forms by which it was distinguished from other languages. A few foreign words only had crept in, along with the products of foreign commerce, arts, and inventions ; and these, in conse-

²⁵ *Verosimilia de Judaeis Palaest. Jesu etiam et apostolis, non Aram. Dial. sola, sed Graeca quoque Aramaizante locutis*, 1803.

²⁶ In *Ephem. exegetico-theol. etc. Fascic. III. Gissae* 1824.

²⁷ *Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien. p. 30.*

quence of the want of appropriate terms in the language of the country, received the right of citizenship; a fate common to most of the languages of the earth. Even in the time of Hezekiah, the Hebrew dialect differed so much from the Babylonish-Aramaean, chiefly it is probable in respect to the pronunciation,* that the latter sounded in the ears of the common people at Jerusalem like an entirely foreign language, and was intelligible only to the principal officers of the court; comp. 2 K. 18: 26. But at the period when the Assyrian and Chaldean rulers of Babylon subdued Palestine, every thing assumed another shape. The Jews of Palestine lost, with their political independence, also the independence of their language, which they had till then asserted. The Babylonish-Aramaean† dialect supplanted the Hebrew, and became by degrees in Palestine the prevailing language of the people.

§ 2.

The circumstances which must have combined, in order to render possible, and to effect, such a revolution of language in Palestine, were the following.

1. The Babylonish-Aramaean language was very closely allied to the Hebrew; and was related to it somewhat in the same manner, as the old Saxon dialect to that of Franconia, or the present Lower Saxon to the High German [or as the Scotch to the English]. Both were offspring of the original Shemitish language, which, from the Halys in Cappadocia to the regions beyond the Tigris, and from the sources of this latter river to Arabia, united into one great people,‡ the inhabitants of Cappa-

* *Michaelis*, Spicileg. Geogr. Hebr. exterae, Tom. II. p. 86. Linguam Aramaeam non intelligebant Judaei, qui ei non adsueverant, ut Saxoniae inferioris rustici Bavorum aut Suevum vix intellecturi erant.

† This is still often called the *Chaldee* dialect; but "*Chaldee language is an entirely erroneous appellation for Aramaean or Babylonish language.* We know very well what was spoken in Babylon; but the proper Chaldee, which seems to have had more affinity with the Persian, Median, Armenian, and Kurd languages, is unknown to all." *Schlözer* in the *Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Litteratur*, Th. 8. Leipz. 1781, S. 118. Comp. *Michaelis* Spicileg. T. II. p. 86. [See the addition at the end of the next note.]

‡ *Posidonius* of Apamea in *Strabo* Lib. I. p. 111. ed. *Siebenkees*, Leips. 1796. τὸ τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἔθνος, καὶ τὸ τῶν Σύρων, καὶ τῶν Ἀράβων, πολλὴν ὁμοφυλίαν ἐμφαίνει κατὰ τε τὴν διαλεκτὸν, καὶ

docia and Pontus, the Assyrians, Babylonians, Aramaeans, Hebrews, Phenicians, and Arabians. Both of them, as well as the other Shemitish dialects, had the same stock of ancient radical words, and essentially the same grammar; and they differed from one another chiefly in the following particulars.

a) Many words of the old primitive language had remained current in the one dialect, which were lost in the other; e. g. the verb $\psi\alpha\psi$ in Aramaean, from which only the derived noun $\psi\alpha\psi$ remained in the Hebrew.

τοὺς βίους, καὶ τοὺς τῶν σωμάτων χαρακτηῆρας, καὶ μάλιστα καθὸ πλησιόχωροι εἰσὶ. Ἀηλοῖ δ' ἡ Μεσοποταμία ἐκ τῶν τριῶν συνεστῶσα τούτων ἐθνῶν· μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ἡ ὁμοιότης διαφαίνεται. Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ τὰ κλίματα γίνεται διαφορὰ τοῖς προσβορέοις ἐπιπλέον, πρὸς τοὺς μεσημβρινούς, καὶ τούτοις πρὸς μέσους τοὺς ὄρους, ἀλλ' ἐπικρατεῖ γε τὸ κοινόν. Καὶ οἱ Ἀσσυριοὶ δέ, καὶ οἱ Ἀριοὶ, καὶ οἱ Ἀρμένιοι [prob. Ἀραμμαῖοι as some MSS. actually read] παραπλησίως πῶς ἐχουσι, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς, καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους. 'The Armenians and Syrians exhibit a great similarity in their language, modes of living, and form of body; and especially those who live near one another. And if there is a difference in different regions, according as they lie more North or South or in the midst, still there prevails a common resemblance. And the Assyrians, and the Arians, and the Armenians (Aramaeans) have also a resemblance, both to these and to one another.' Strabo also (Lib. II. p. 225) speaks of τῆς διαλέκτου (Συριακῆς) μέχρι νῦν διαμενουσῆς τῆς αὐτῆς, τοῖς τε ἐκτὸς τοῦ Εὐφράτου καὶ τοῖς ἐντός, 'the (Syriac) language still remaining the same, to those without and within the Euphrates.' Compare also Heeren, Commentatio de linguarum Asiaticarum in Persarum imperio cognatione et varietate.

[The usual representation at the present day is, that the Shemitish languages may be properly reduced to three great branches, viz. 1. The *Aramaeans*, which originally prevailed in Syria, Babylonia, and Mesopotamia; and may therefore be subdivided into the *Syriac* or *West-Aramaeans*, and the *Chaldee* or *East-Aramaeans*, called also in the text the *Babylonish-Aramaeans*. To this general branch belong also the dialects of the Samaritans, Zabians, and Palmyrenes. 2. The *Hebrew*, with which the fragments of the Phenician coincide. 3. The *Arabic*, under which also belongs the Ethiopic as a dialect.—The Aramaean introduced and spoken in Palestine has also been, and is still, often called the *Syro-Chaldaic*, because it was probably in some degree a mixture of both the Eastern and Western dialects; or perhaps the distinction between the two had not yet arisen in the age of Christ and the apostles. Ed.]

b) The same word was current in both dialects, but in different significations; because in the one it retained the original meaning, while in the other it had acquired a different one. So עָבַד, Heb. *to serve*, Aram. *to make*; מָצָא (מָצָא), Heb. *to find*, Aram. *to come*, etc.

c) The Babylonish dialect had borrowed single expressions from the northern Chaldeans, who had made an irruption into the country, and who, like the Mongolian and Mandshu Tartars in China, adopted the cultivation and literature of their new subjects. These expressions were altogether foreign to the Shemitish dialects, and belonged to the *Japhetic* language, which prevailed among the Armenians, Medes, Persians, and Chaldeans, who were probably related to these.* Traces of such foreign words are found in the names of the officers of state, and expressions having reference to the government.

d) The Babylonish pronunciation was easier and more sonorous than the Hebrew. It exchanged the frequent sibilants in Hebrew, and also other consonants that were hard to pronounce, for others less difficult; it dropped the long vowels that were not essential to the forms of words; preferred the more sonorous A to the long O, and assumed at the end of nouns, in order to lighten the pronunciation, a prolonged auxiliary vowel; † it admitted contractions in pronouncing many words, and must have been, as the language of common life, far better adapted to the sluggish orientals, than the harsher Hebrew.

For these reasons it could hardly fail to be the case, that a dialect so nearly kindred with the Hebrew, and so insinuating through its easier pronunciation, should get the upper hand in Palestine, so soon as the Hebrews of Palestine came to be in closer connexion with the Aramaeans of Babylon.

2. The numerous Aramaean colonies (2 K. 17: 24), which took the place of the subjects of the kingdom of Israel carried away to Assyria by Shalmaneser, retained their former language, and caused it to spread in the neighbourhood of their places of residence, even before the destruction of the kingdom of Judah. At a later period, the Babylonish-Chaldean governors who ruled over Palestine, the standing armed force which they had with them for the preservation of tranquillity and which was composed of Aramaeans and Chaldeans (2 K. 24: 2), the host

* See *Schlözer* in the *Repert.* VIII. p. 161.

† The so called emphatic א.

of foreign officers in their train, and the transaction of all public business in the Babylonish-Aramaean dialect, must have limited very much the prevalence of the Hebrew national dialect; inasmuch as the Jews of Palestine who held public offices, or otherwise stood in any near connexion with the new rulers, were compelled to become familiar with the ordinary dialect of these rulers; which probably had also still earlier been the court language at Jerusalem; comp. 2 K. 18: 26.

§ 3.

During the dominion of the Persians over Palestine, the Aramaean dialect could not but obtain still firmer footing. The great multitudes of Palestine Jews, who, during an exile of seventy years in foreign lands, had become entirely Aramaean, and now returned with the permission of the Persian monarch to their ancient dwelling-place, must have fully accomplished the banishment of the few remains of the Hebrew national dialect, which here and there might still have been extant as the language of common life. The manifold connexions also, which they maintained from this time onward with their numerous countrymen who remained in the Persian dominions and spoke Aramaean, must have been to them the occasion of retaining the dialect common to both, and of cultivating and enriching this in as great a degree, at least, as the other. Besides this, the Aramaean dialect continued also during the rule of the Persians to be the government language, which both the Persians (Ezra 4: 7, 8) and their inferior officers, who were mostly Aramaean, employed in the ordinances and documents intended for the western part of their empire, and consequently also for Palestine. This dialect moreover suffered in the earlier periods no other changes, than that it now adopted from the Persians, as before from the barbarous Chaldeans, single words belonging to the language of government or of fashion; e. g. דר, בר, ברב, and the like. At a later period, during the Greek and Persian war, in which nations speaking Shemitish,* and probably also Ara-

* Fl. Josephus, c. Apion. I. 22. *Χοιρίλλος δὲ ἀρχαιότερος γενόμενος ποιητῆς μέμνηται τοῦ ἔθνους ἡμῶν, ὅτι συνεστρατεύεται Ξέρξῃ τῷ Περσῶν βασιλεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα. καταριθμησάμενος γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τελευταῖον καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον ἐνέταξε λέγων·*

*Τῷ δ' ὄπιθεν διέβαινε γένος θαυμαστὸν ιδέσθαι,
Γλώσσαν μὲν Φοίνισσαν ἀπὸ στομάτων ἀφιέντες.
᾿Ωκέει' ἐν Σολύμοις ὄρεσι πλατὴν ἐνὶ λίμνῃ.*

maeans, took part in the service of the Persians, many Greek words may have been brought back to their countrymen by the returning warriors. At least the adoption of Hellenisms, which are already met with in the oldest Aramaean fragments in Daniel,* and which in later times were so frequently received into the Aramaean language, seems to belong to a very early age.

This seems in general to have been the way, in which the Babylonish-Aramaean dialect, enriched by no great number of Chaldaisms, Persisms, and perhaps also Hellenisms, migrated into Palestine during the Chaldean supremacy, and spread itself generally abroad as the language of the people. That all this did not take place at once; that in the earlier periods the common people, along with the Aramaean, retained also the Hebrew; that the Hebrew, which they still always heard in the synagogues in the reading of the law, continued to be intelligible to them for several generations, and so long indeed as the Aramaean of common use was not yet disfigured by a multitude of barbarisms, and especially if the public reader adopted a somewhat Aramaean pronunciation; and that the learned, who occupied themselves with the interpretation of the holy national books, retained the Hebrew as a learned language, and employed it still for a long period in their writings;—all these are assertions founded on the history of the later books of the Old Testament; and, in the near relationship in which the two dialects stand, these assertions cannot be doubted.

§ 4.

The Babylonish-Aramaean dialect thus introduced into Palestine under the Chaldeans and Persians, must have also main-

* Choerilus, an ancient poet, makes mention of our nation, as having followed the expedition of Xerxes, king of Persia, against Greece. Having enumerated all the nations, he arranges ours last, saying: "Afterwards came a race of singular appearance, speaking the Phenician language, and inhabiting the mountains *Soly-mi* near a broad lake." Even if Josephus be here in an error, and out of mere predilection for his own nation, should choose to seek in Palestine the mountain ridges of Taurus inhabited by the *Soly-mi* (Strabo I. p. 57. ed. Siebenkees), which Choerilus perhaps had in his mind; still, so much is clear from this passage, that a people speaking the Phenician language took part in the expedition of Xerxes against Greece.

* Eichhorn's Einl. ins A. T. III. p. 389. Ed. 3d.

tained itself as the common language of the country under Alexander the Great, who, after his victory over Darius, made himself master of Palestine. The army with which he occupied Palestine and appeared before the gates of Jerusalem, was composed not of Greeks, but of Phenicians and Chaldeans,* whose temporary sojourn in the land could not effect any revolution in language. He permitted the Jews in Palestine, as in Babylon, to retain their ancient laws and customs, and left them their former magistrates. And although he received many Jews, as volunteers, into his army,† yet these could have had but very little opportunity to become acquainted with the Greek language. For he allowed them to remain faithful to their paternal manners and customs, and consequently also to their language; and they probably afterwards always formed a particular corps, separate from the Greeks, or perhaps united with the Chaldeans, among whom also there may have been many Jews. These, therefore, on their return to their country, with the exception of a few Greek words which they brought with them, could effect no important change in the language of their nation.‡

§ 5.

The period of the Greek-Egyptian sovereigns, who, after the death of Alexander, sometimes actually maintained the dominion over Palestine, and sometimes contested it with the Syro-Macedonian kings, was in like manner not so prejudicial to the Aramaean language of Palestine, as one would be inclined to expect from the prevalence of the Greek language in Egypt under the Ptolemies. At all events, this at least could not occasion the general spread of the Greek language among the inhabitants of Palestine.

1. The Palestine Jews experienced, in their dependence on the Egyptians, no great change in their former mode of administering the government. The priesthood continued to hold

* Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* XI. 8. 5. [Josephus however does not say what he is here made to say. In the passage cited he speaks of Phenicians and Chaldeans who *followed* Alexander's army; referring no doubt to the 8000 auxiliaries brought over to him by Sanballat, mentioned in XI. 8. 4. Alexander had his own army of Greeks with him. Ed.]

† Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XI. 8. 5.

‡ The whole of this statement is a broad assumption, and not in accordance with general facts. Ed.

the reins of government in their hands under the protection of the Egyptians; native citizens administered the public offices; and there was therefore no necessity to introduce the Greek language throughout the nation. The few persons who stood at the head of public affairs, who had to treat immediately with the Greek-Egyptian officers of state at Alexandria, and who were therefore compelled to be acquainted with Greek, were and continued to be too thoroughly Jews, to wish to see the Greek language diffused among their nation.

2. It is indeed true, that even in the times of the first Ptolemies many Palestine Jews resided in Egypt, having been carried away as prisoners, partly by the Persians,* and partly by Ptolemy Lagus after the taking of Jerusalem; † or having voluntarily settled there afterwards, under the mild government of the Ptolemies. That these kept up an intercourse with their countrymen in Palestine, there can be no doubt; but whether by this means, or through the migration of Egyptian Jews to Palestine, the there predominant Aramaean language could have been limited in its prevalence, is a question, which may be with great probability answered in the negative.

On the other hand, the Egyptian Jews do not seem, either in the beginning of their sojourn there, (which is a thing of course,) nor even in the age of Christ, to have forgotten the language which they brought with them from Palestine; but they appear to have retained it along with the Greek, which was current in the maritime and commercial cities, and along with the Coptic, which still maintained itself especially in the interior of the country, and which began to lose its purity only from the period of the Ptolemies, through the many Hellenisms which by degrees crept into it. It is moreover in itself probable, that the Jews, who in the large cities inhabited separate quarters, ‡ and still retained many of their oriental customs, did not so very soon renounce their language; and Josephus asserts expressly even of his own Jewish contemporaries in Egypt (Ant. I. 6. 2): τὴν Αἴγυπτον Μέστρον (more correctly Μέσρον), καὶ Μεστραίους τοὺς Αἴγυπτίους ἅπαντες οἱ ταύτην οἰκοῦντες καλοῦμεν, 'we call Egypt *Mestren* (מצרים) and the Egyptians *Mestraei*, i. e. all of us who reside in Egypt;' which he could not have said, if the

* Josephus, Ant. Jud. XII. 2. 4. † Ib. XII. 1.

‡ Strabo apud Joseph. Ant. XIV. 7. 2. Philo in Flaccum p. 973. A. ed. Franckf. 1691.

Jews of his time in Egypt used only the Greek language. This is also apparent from Acts 21: 37, 38, where the Roman chiliarch, when Paul addresses him in Greek, replies: Ἐλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις; οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος, ὁ πρὸς ταύτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας—τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων; ‘Canst thou speak Greek? Art not thou that Egyptian, who, before these days, excited to sedition—the four thousand men of the *sicarii*?’ It follows from this, that the Roman commander presupposed in an uncultivated Egyptian Jew, such as this disturber of the public peace was, an acquaintance with the common language of Palestine,* but not with the Greek. According to this supposition, for which perhaps still more decisive grounds might be discovered, the intercourse between the common Jews of Egypt and Palestine, in which both would naturally have employed their Babylonish-Aramaean dialect, can have had on the language of Palestine no other influence, than that perhaps in this way some of the Hellenisms adopted by the Egyptian Jews into their ordinary Aramaean dialect, may in like manner have migrated into the common language of Palestine.

§ 6.

Under the Syro-Macedonian kings also, who for a long period of time strove with the Egyptian monarchs for the possession of Palestine, several times wholly or in part wrested it from them, and at last, after wars of many years' duration, acquired exclusive dominion over it, the inhabitants of Palestine were not under the necessity of exchanging their vernacular language for a foreign tongue. For although the Greek was the court language of these princes, who were themselves of Greek extraction, and was by this means rendered the current language of the higher ranks; still, the Aramaean, which from this time seems to have become more and more corrupted by the introduction of Hellenisms, remained throughout their whole empire, and consequently in Palestine, the common language of the people; and the Greek, like the French at the present day in Europe, was nothing more

* De Rossi supposes (p. 44) that the Roman officer merely expressed his wonder, that Paul, whom he took for an Egyptian, did not speak *Coptic*. This seems to me very improbable; for how could any one who spoke only Coptic, have made himself understood by the common people of Palestine?

than a fashionable language, prevailing by the side of the language of the country.* This assertion rests on the following grounds.

1. The first of the Syro-Macedonian kings built at once Seleucia, Antioch, and fourteen other cities. These became rapidly and immediately large, flourishing, and populous. Did they become so by means of colonists from Greece? Emigration does not take place so suddenly; and moreover such large emigrations would have depopulated the largest Grecian cities. Would not also the subject have been too important, not to have been noticed by any writer? Besides, would the kings of Macedonia, who were the sovereigns of Greece, have permitted such emigrations to the cities of their rivals, or of their enemies, as the kings of Syria often were? We know from the history of Alexander's successors, that in the armies of those chiefs, who settled in the interior provinces of Asia at a distance from the sea coast, there were always only a few native Greeks, and that their troops consisted for the most part of Asiatic barbarians; † of whom several corps were disciplined in the Macedonian manner, and are therefore often called by writers Macedonians. They stood in about the same relation to the Greeks, as the Seapoys in the service of the English East-India company to the native English troops. Under these circumstances, the rapid growth and population of these sixteen mostly large cities built by Seleucus, would have been impossible, had not the interior of Asia ‡ furnished the greater part of the first settlers. Syria, in its ancient wide extent, i. e. Mesopotamia, Babylon, etc. long before the time of the Greeks and from the earliest periods, had been full of large cities, which in a course of wars were destroyed or fell into decay. What could therefore be more natural, than that those inhabitants, who had fled out of the cities destroyed, or removed from those in decay, should be again collected in the cities built or enlarged by Seleucus? Thus it came, that large domestic colonies of Aramaeans esta-

* The reader is particularly referred, on this point, to the article of Hug, which will be given in the next number. Ed.

† Diodor. Sicul. XIX. 14. F. Foy-Vaillant, *Seleucidarum imperium, seu Historia regum Syriae ad fidem numismatum adumbrata*. Hagae Com. 1732. fol. p. 49, 50 et al. freq.

‡ T. S. Bayeri *Historia Osrhoena et Edessena ex numis illustrata*. Petropol. 1739. 4to. p. 9 seq.

blished themselves in these cities; and at the very first even Jews* settled in Antioch and other cities, and enjoyed equal rights with the other citizens. It is therefore evident, that the number of real Greeks, who chose their residence under the Seleucidae in the new cities of Mesopotamia and other lands subject to these princes, was too unimportant to dislodge the Aramaean language from the cities, and still less from the open country, of which the native inhabitants yet held possession. We may also derive a not improbable ground of support for this assertion, from the double names, Aramaean and Greek,† which these and other Syrian cities ever retained; for how could the Aramaean names have maintained themselves, unless a great portion of the inhabitants and neighbours had continued to employ them, along with the still current Aramaean language?

2. Among the inscriptions at Palmyra,‡ many of which reach back almost to the age of Alexander the Great, there are several composed in the Aramaean language. The Tyrians also, in honour of a Syrian king of Greek extraction, Antiochus IV. surnamed Epiphanes, even caused coins to be struck, partly with Greek and Syrophenician inscriptions, and partly with Syrophenician alone; some of which have been preserved to our time.§ This serves to shew clearly enough, that in the age of the Seleucidae, the Greek language had not obtained an exclusive prevalence in the countries which they governed. The objection

* Joseph. Antiq. Jud. XII. 3. 1.

† Ammian. Marcellin. XIV. 8. Seleucus—urbes construxit, multis opibus firmas et viribus: quarum pleraeque, licet Graecis nominibus appellentur, primogenia tamen nomina non amittunt, quae eis Assyria lingua institutores, veteres indiderunt.—Josephi Ant. J. VIII. 6. 1. *Ἰόλιν οἰκοδομήσας (Σολομῶν)—Θαδάμορα ὠνόμασε, καὶ τοῦτ' ἔτι νῦν καλεῖται παρὰ τοῖς Σύροις· οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες αὐτὴν προσαγορεύουσιν Παλμυράν.* 'Solomon having built a city—called it Tadmor; and so it is still called by the Syrians; but the Greeks name it Palmyra.'

‡ Rob. Wood, The Ruins of Palmyra, otherwise Tadmor in the Desert, Lond. 1753.—*Reflexions sur l' alphabet et sur la langue, dont on se servoit autrefois à Palmyre, par l'Abbé Barthelemy, in the Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript. Tom: XXVI. p. 577.*—Relandi Palaestina, p. 526. [Among the inscriptions at Palmyra, however, there are more in Greek than in Aramaean. See the article of Hug. Ed.]

§ Engraved pp. 106, 109 of the work of Vaillant above quoted; see p. 326 note † above.

against this assertion, which may be drawn from the many Greek coins of the Seleucidae, requires no refutation, because every one knows that in ancient, just as in modern times, it was not usual that coins should always be furnished with inscriptions in the language of the country. Probably the artists were Greeks, and found the coins to be handsomer with the regular Greek uncial letters, than with the strange oriental characters.

3. After the subjugation of the Syrian kingdom by the Romans,—who, like the Byzantine monarchs at a later period, maintained for a long time their sovereignty over the countries which had belonged to this empire; but who were nevertheless in several instances compelled, both to wink at the rise of single independent states, which formed themselves in Mesopotamia and the neighbouring provinces, and also to yield large districts for a time to the Parthians and other eastern nations,—the Aramaean continued still to be the common language of the people throughout these regions. This appears from the need of versions of the Bible in the Syrian language, among which the Peshito certainly existed as early as the end of the third century after Christ, and also of Syriac homilies and commentaries on the Bible. Whenever any part of these countries maintained for a time their independence against the Romans, as the kingdom of Edessa,* and later that of Palmyra,† it was ever the Aramaean language in which the public documents and other writings were composed. Even under the dominion of the Arabs, who wrested these countries from the Byzantine sovereigns, and whose kindred language was better adapted than the Greek to supplant the Aramaean, this latter tongue maintained for a long time its predominance; as is shown by the multitude of Syriac writers who lived during this period. These phenomena would be entirely inexplicable, had not the Aramaean language ever main-

* Bayer, *Historia Osrhoena*, praef. p. 5. The letter also purporting to have been written from Abgar to Christ, was originally composed in Aramaean, and was then translated into Greek. The writer of the letter would assuredly not have chosen that language, had it not been prevalent in Abgar's time at Edessa. Bayer, l. c. p. 104.

† Even the letter of queen Zenobia, in answer to the summons of the emperor Aurelian, was composed in Syriac. Nicomachus translated it into Greek; Vopiscus in Aureliano c. 27. Compare note ‡ on p. 327 above.

tained itself as the common language of the people down from the times of the Seleucidae.

4. Although the Asiatic nations that were subject to the Seleucidae, might exhibit a preference for Greek customs and names, yet we cannot thence draw with safety the conclusion, that the Greek language was generally diffused among them. They copied rather only the fashions of dress, games, mimic representations, sacrifices, festivals, splendid processions, and other customs* of the Greeks; all of which could take place without the use of the Greek language, or at most only occasioned the adoption into the language of the country of some expressions peculiar to the Greeks. It is true that even among the Jews, who were otherwise so obstinately devoted to their paternal customs, there were many who fell in with these Greek novelties,† exchanged their Jewish proper names, and found the sounds of Jason, Menelaus, etc. more agreeable to the ear than Joshua and Manasseh. But this *Hellenomania* occurred only in the case of some unpatriotic Jews, who wished to insinuate themselves into the good graces of their Syro-Macedonian masters, and raise themselves under their patronage to be tyrants over their own nation. The very abhorrence, which by far the greater part of the nation openly and strongly manifested towards these slaves of self-interest and their deceived followers, shews clearly enough that the ancient customs and the vernacular tongue were still dear to the common people.

5. Even during the despotism exercised in Palestine by Antiochus Epiphanes, when he attempted to banish the Mosaic religion and to combine the Jews, so isolated by their religious separation, along with his other subjects into one closely united people by means of a common worship, the Aramaean language still maintained its ground. This appears from the well-known history of the cruelties, which he caused to be practised upon the seven Jewish brethren. It is expressly related, that these youths, who met their fate with such heroic fortitude, were exhorted by their mother to the firm endurance of the tortures prepared for them by the tyrant, *in the language of the country*;‡ that they answered their mother in the same lan-

* Vaillant, l. c. p. 96 seq. † 2 Macc. 4:10.

‡ Τῆς Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, Josephus de Maccab. c. 16.—Τῆς πατριῶς γωνῆς, 2 Macc. 7: 8, 21, 24, 27.

guage; and that the executioners employed by Antiochus, who were probably not Jews, in like manner understood this language.

From the time of the Maccabees, whose undaunted courage, after long and bloody conflicts with their Syrian tyrants, obtained for the Jews of Palestine an independence from foreign masters, which was maintained with variable fortune for about eighty years, there commenced a very favourable period for the preservation of the Aramaean as the common tongue; for the maintenance of national independence always holds an equal pace with the maintenance of the national language. The frequent wars which the Palestine Jews were compelled to wage for their independence against the Syrians, (who beheld with an envious eye the rise of a new neighbouring power,) and the mutual alliances which both, when weary of shedding blood, several times contracted with each other, could have no further influence upon the Aramaean dialect of Palestine, as appears from what has been said above, than henceforth still to keep open the way in which so many Hellenisms had already wandered into Palestine. The same holds true of the alliances which the inhabitants of Palestine afterwards formed with the neighbouring Aramaean Arabs.* The domestic tyrants who managed to get possession of the sovereignty of Palestine, must indeed have been acquainted with the Greek language; like Aristobulus, whom Josephus calls a friend of the Greeks, *φιλέλλην*.† But on the other hand, it must have been for their interest, to prevent the diffusion of this foreign language among the great body of their subjects, in order to hinder the alliance of the people with the neighbouring Greek-Asiatic princes, and thus, by isolating the nation, to uphold themselves in the possession of the sovereignty. That during this period the common language in Palestine maintained itself in the consideration which it had hitherto asserted, is confirmed by the following grounds, in addition to those already stated.

1. In the army of Judas Maccabeus, the language of Palestine was the common one; for according to 2 Macc. 13: 37, he prayed before the commencement of a battle at the head of his troops in the language of his country, *τῆ πατριῶ φωνῆ*, and caused the troops to raise a war-song in the same tongue. From this circumstance we may deduce the commonness of the Ara-

* Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* XIV. 1.

† *Ib.* XIII. 12. 3.

maean dialect among the people with so much the more certainty, because in such an army, in which there were probably many foreigners, we should be more likely than elsewhere to find the Greek or some other foreign language, unless the Aramaean had maintained itself in an exclusive predominance.

2. After the times of the Maccabees, there came into circulation coins with Hebrew and Aramaean legends. Simon, the celebrated descendant of this family, made use of the privilege granted him by Antiochus,* of coining and circulating money in his own name. Coins of this age are still in existence, with the following inscriptions: שמעון נשיא ישראל, *Simon prince of Israel*; שקל ישראל, *shekel of Israel*; שנת א' לגאולת ישראל or שנת א' לחרות ישראל, *in the first year of Israel's deliverance*; ירושלים קדושה, *Jerusalem the holy*, etc. The genuineness of these coins has often been attacked; and that many of them are derived from a later period there can be no doubt; but the genuineness of them in general, has been placed out of doubt by Souciet,† Prileszky,‡ Ugolini,§ by that doubter as to every thing ancient, Harduin,|| and in more recent times by the discussions between Bayer and Tychsen.¶ And should any obstinate historical sceptic still be unwilling to yield conviction, yet these coins at all events serve to prove, that the Aramaean prevailed in Palestine as the language of the country in the time of the Maccabees, and that the ancient Hebrew also must still have been understood; since the fabricators of these coins, without being immediately detected as impostors, could not have been so bold as to employ a language then entirely unknown in Palestine, upon coins ostensibly struck under the authority of independent Jewish princes.

3. Even at the court of the Jewish kings who lived near the end of this period, the Greek language cannot have been predominant. In order to be acknowledged as genuine Jews by the great body of the people, they dared not manifest any preference for the Greek tongue; and the religious sects of the Pharisees

* 1 Macc. 15: 6.

† Dissertat. critiq. p. 104 sq.

‡ Annales comp. regum Syriae, p. 79.

§ Thesaurus Antiquitatt. Tom. XXVIII. c. 9. || Ib. p. 1065.

¶ For a notice of these and other works on this subject, see Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek, Vol. VI. p. 534, 886.

and Sadducees, which by turns had interest at court, guided the affairs of state, and stood in the closest connexion with the princes, must also have sustained at court the consideration of the Aramaean. We may also draw the same conclusion from this fact, that the Jewish female regent, known by the Greek name of Alexandra, as Josephus remarks,* properly bore the genuine Jewish name of Salome. The same was probably the case with many other Palestine names of Jewish regents and grandees, which were translated by Greek writers into Greek, or exchanged for like-sounding Greek names; although I will not deny, that some of them may have borne double names in the two languages.

4. The writings of this age, which were intended for Palestine, were all composed in the language of the country. The apocryphal books of the Old Testament are probably productions of this period; and were originally written in Aramaean,† and afterwards translated into Greek; as the History of the Maccabees, the first book of which, according to Origen,‡ bore the original title of *Σαφβηθ Σαφβανὲ ἔλ*,§ the books of Tobit, Judith, Jesus Sirach, etc. We shall speak farther hereafter of the Targums on the law and the prophets, which, if not of a still earlier date, existed at least in this age in almost the same form, and most probably in the very same language, in which they have come down to us.

§ 8.

Thus, for about five hundred years, the Aramaean dialect, adopted by the Jews in exile during the Babylonish captivity, and brought back with them on their return, maintained itself in Pa-

* Antiq. Jud. XIII. 12. 1.

† Compare the prologue of Sirach, and the prefaces of Jerome to the books of Tobit and Judith, where he relates, that they were written *sermone Chaldaeo*.

‡ Commentar. in Psalm. I. et ap. Euseb. Hist. eccl. VI. 25.

§ Compare Eichhorn's Einl. in d. apokryph. Schriften des A. T. Leipz. 1795. p. 221, where several interpretations of these words are given. [Eichhorn here supposes them to stand for *שְׂרֵבֶת שָׂר* *שְׂרֵבֶת שָׂר*, *history of the princes of the children of God*. Gesenius, in his manuscript lectures, gives the same solution, reading, however *שָׂרִי* instead of *שָׂר*. The word *שְׂרֵבֶת* is Chald. and equivalent to *הַלְדָּת*. Ed.]

lestine,—where it had already become domesticated nearly two hundred years earlier in a large portion of the country (§ 2. 2) —notwithstanding the political storms, which so often threatened the nation with utter ruin ; until at last the Jewish state, distracted by internal dissensions, was compelled to yield submission to the mighty Romans, and behold Pompey, as conqueror, make his triumphal entry into their capital, B. C. 62. However much this catastrophe may seem to have prepared the way for the extinction of the common language of Palestine ; still, the former Babylonish-Aramæan dialect maintained itself as the common dialect of the nation during the first hundred and fifty years of the Roman dominion, and especially in the age of Christ and the apostles, to which this essay chiefly has reference ; and this language was neither supplanted by the Greek, which was then understood and spoken by all cultivated Romans, nor, as Harduin supposes,* by the Latin. This position may be so strongly supported, partly by direct, and partly by indirect proofs, as to satisfy every unprejudiced mind of its truth.

§ 9.

Among the *indirect* proofs, that the common dialect of Palestine was generally retained during this period, the following seem to deserve the most attention.

1. The only circumstances in which a vanquished people suffer their national language to be torn from them, and another of an entirely different character to be forced upon them, are when the conqueror breaks up and destroys the internal organization of their state, carries off to other lands the greater part of the inhabitants, and introduces in their place a multitude of foreign colonists, who must be far more numerous than the remaining inhabitants. This is the only condition, which renders the entire extinction of a national language possible ; and this condition could never have taken place under the mild dominion of the Romans in Palestine. The entire internal administration of the government, the courts of justice, etc. remained without any important change ; the nation were permitted to retain their code of laws, so inseparable from their religion ; ethnarchs or titular kings, who professed the Jewish religion, administered with the Sanhedrim the internal affairs of the state ; and there can be no

* J. D. Michaelis, Einl. ins N. T. I. p. 107 seq. Marsh's Michaelis I. c. 4. § 2.

but of Asiatic, and mostly of Aramaean warriors; and could not, therefore, have had much influence upon the common language of the country, even if they had stood in closer intercourse with the inhabitants, than the hatred of the latter against every thing that bore the name of Roman, permits us to suppose.

2. The close intercourse in which the Palestine Jews lived, until the destruction of their capital, with their countrymen in the region of the Euphrates, must have furthered the maintenance of the Aramaean dialect among the former. Of all the Jews transplanted into the countries of the Assyrian and Babylonian rulers, only the smaller part returned to Palestine; the greater portion remained behind, in the places of residence assigned them by their conquerors. These Jews, living in the vicinity of the Euphrates, in the very country and home of the Aramaean language, and whose number in the days of Josephus* amounted to many thousands, had not, like the Egyptian Jews at Leontopolis, a temple and priests of their own; but were compelled, in order to offer the sacrifices prescribed in the Mosaic ritual, and especially on the high festivals, to take a journey to Jerusalem.† The Sanhedrim also, which continued to be to them the highest court for the decision of all civil matters that stood in any connexion with their religion, unceasingly attracted many of them to this central point of the true Judaism. Emigrations‡ from these countries to Palestine were not unfrequent, and we find even in this age high-priests out of Babylon.§ By this incessant communication between the Jews of

* Ant. Jud. XI. 5. 2. *αι δὲ δέκα φυλαὶ πέραν εἰσὶν Εὐφράτου ἕως δεῦρο, μυριάδες ἄπειροι, καὶ ἀριθμῶν γινωσθῆναι μὴ δυνάμεναι.* 'But the ten tribes dwell beyond the Euphrates unto this day, in unknown myriads, and in numbers impossible to be computed.'

† Josephus, Ant. Jud. XVII. 2. 2. *πρόβλημα ἦν οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ—Ἰουδαίων τοῖς ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἀφικνουμένοις διὰ θυσίας ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλῶν.* 'This man was a protector for the Jews who went from Babylon to Jerusalem on account of the sacrifices.' Philo de Legat. ad Caj. ed. Frkf. p. 1022. D.

‡ Jos. Ant. XVII. 2. 1. Ej. Vita c. 11.

§ Jos. Ant. XV. 2. 4. *Ἡρώδης—μεταπεμφάμενος ἐκ τῆς Βαβυλῶνος ἱερέα—Ἀνάηλον ὀνόματι, τοῦτω τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην δίδωσιν.* 'Herod—sent for a certain priest from Babylon, Ananelus by name, and gave him the pontificate.'

Babylon and of Palestine, the Aramaean language could not but have maintained itself among the latter, and have been moreover restored again to its purity through the influence of the emigrations from Babylon, had it at any time begun to be in Palestine too much corrupted by the introduction of Hellenisms.

3. The proper names of persons, which are given in the New Testament and in Josephus, are mostly Aramaean. We need only refer to the frequent names compounded with the Aramaean *Bar* (son); as Bar Tolmai, Bar Jesu, Bar Timai, Bar Abba, etc. all of which sufficiently betray their Aramaean origin. The significant surnames also, which certain persons bore on account of their moral or corporeal character, as Boanerges, Barnabas, Cephas, Chagiras, etc. are Aramaean; and these certainly would not have been given to them, had they not been common at that period in the language of the country. This is also true of most of the significant geographical names; among which the most frequent are those compounded with *Beth* (בֵּית), *Capfar* (כַּפָּר), and *En* (עֵין), on which one needs only to consult the index of *Relandi Palaestina*.

4. In this age, if not earlier, the Aramaean Targums were in general use in the synagogues of Palestine and among the learned. Probably also several of the Targums which are still extant, as those of Onkelos and Jonathan, and many fragments incorporated into later paraphrases, already existed at that time in their present form and language; although none of the Targums now extant, in an existence of so many centuries, have remained free from later interpolations.

The full and detailed proof of this position, which is very generally and confidently denied since the doubts raised against it by Morin, would demand a treatise of its own, and would here be out of place. We will therefore at present limit ourselves to some general remarks on the early existence of the Targums, and on the total or partial identity of several of the Aramaean paraphrases still extant, with those that existed in that age.

a) However contradictory the Jewish traditions* respecting the age and the authors of the Targums may be, yet they all agree in this, that the Targums were prepared a long time before the birth of Christ, for the benefit of the Jews who returned

* Wolfii Biblioth. Heb. Tom. II. p. 1143 seq. Waltoni Prolegom. XII. § 9, 10. A. Pfeifferi Exercit. II. de Targumin, in cj. Opp. philolog. Ultraj. 1704. p. 862 seq.

from the Babylonish exile. This tradition has the greatest probability in its favour; for the ancient Hebrew was at that time as strange to the inhabitants of Palestine, as the old German language of the eleventh or twelfth centuries to the Germans of the present day [or the language of Chaucer to the present race of Englishmen]; and it was therefore unavoidably necessary, that for the public readers in the synagogues, and for the unlearned Jews generally, who might wish to read the holy writings of their nation, there should be aids prepared in the language of the country, of which they might avail themselves in the reading of the Scriptures.

b) The language in the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos,—the latter of whom, according to the very probable Jewish tradition,* critically revised the older Targum of Ezra, and rejected the interpolations which had crept into it, just as Origen did the Alexandrine, and Jerome the old Latin version,—is entirely such as we should be entitled to expect it in the age before Christ. It is indeed not entirely pure, and is somewhat more disfigured by Hellenisms, Persisms, and other barbarisms, than the language in Daniel and Ezra; but is by far less intermixed with foreign words than the Gemara, (which was composed some centuries afterwards,) and other later writings. The same is true of many fragments of older Targums, which have been incorporated in paraphrases compiled in later times, and are easily distinguished by their purer style. Does not this condition and character of the language authorize us to refer several of the existing Targums, either wholly or in part, to an age when the Aramaean language had not become so degenerate as it was after the destruction of Jerusalem?

c) The Alexandrine version seems to have been made, not from the original Hebrew text, but from ancient Aramaean Targums, which lie at the foundation of the later ones. The frequent striking correspondence of the Seventy with the readings, interpolations, and allegorical interpretations of the Targums that are still extant, and of which it cannot be asserted that they have been interpolated from the Greek; and the assertion of Philo, that the Old Testament was written in the Chaldee language,† by which he unquestionably meant the Chaldee-Baby-

* Pfeiffer, l. c. p. 864.

† De Vita Mosis, lib. II. p. 657. ed. Frckft. τὸ παλαιὸν (not πρῶτον) ἐγράφησαν οἱ νόμοι γλώσσῃ Χαλδαικῇ, 'anciently our laws were written in the Chaldee tongue.' Comp. p. 658. C. p. 659. D.

lonish paraphrases at that time in circulation, render this conjecture in fact very probable. It could also not be expected of the Jews, that they would confide the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which they esteemed so holy, to the profane hands of the Egyptians, either in an exact transcript or in a version made directly from the original. Moreover the addition to the book of Job, found in the Alexandrine version and also mentioned by Origen, speaks expressly of an ancient Aramaean Targum (*βιβλος Συριακή*), from which the Greek translation, which differs so much from the Hebrew, must have been made; since the Greek also harmonizes, in respect to several interpolations and explanations of words, even with the later and still existing Targum; as I have ascertained by a careful examination of both versions. More minute and complete investigations in respect to this relation of the Septuagint to the Targums—on which subject, so far as I know, we have as yet had nothing—will hereafter, as we may hope, throw a clearer light upon this point, and in this way restore to the criticism and hermeneutics of the Old Testament, which have hitherto been so long dependent on the version of the Seventy, their long lost independence.

d) Christ himself, as he uttered when dying on the cross, Matt. 27: 46, the words taken from Ps. 22: 2, ἦλι, ἦλι, λαμὰ σαβαχθανι; employed the Aramaean language of the Targum, in which he had probably often read the Psalms; which, on account of the frequent use of them by the Jews, must already have been early translated into the language of the country. But whether these words were borrowed by Christ out of a Targum now lost, or out of one still extant, we must leave undecided, since there are no grounds by which we can determine this question. The only variation in the present Targum from the Greek words as quoted by Christ, is מוּל מוּל instead of λαμὰ; but this may have arisen from later copyists, who were ever prone to exchange synonymous words.—The apostles also, after the example of their Lord, availed themselves of the Targums current in Palestine. Origen at least sought for the passages quoted by them from the Old Testament and which are cited neither according to the Hebrew nor the Seventy, in the Jewish *apocryphal* books;* and the mode of explaining the Old Testa-

* Origenes, Proleg. in Cantic. Cant. 'Illud tamen palam est, multa vel ab apostolis vel ab evangelistis exempla esse prolata et N. T. inserta, quae in his Scripturis, quas canonicas habemus, nun-

ment which the apostles often follow, so similar to that of the Targums, may be most naturally referred to this source.

e) Josephus in like manner, in his Jewish Antiquities, which work, as he assures us, was drawn from the holy writings of his nation, among which also the Targums were reckoned, harmonizes in many passages where he forsakes both the Hebrew and the Seventy, in respect to single readings and additions, with the Targums that are still extant. The instances already known* might doubtless be greatly increased, were any one to institute throughout a comparison of Josephus with the Targums; and such an investigation would perhaps confirm my conjecture, that Josephus, in the composition of his history, had chiefly before him the Targums, and next to them the Septuagint; but the Hebrew text very seldom.—Whether Philo, in whose writings much occurs that bears a great resemblance to the style of the Targums, did not in like manner make use of ancient or of still existing Targums, is a question, which perhaps has never yet been raised, and the consideration of which I must leave to those who are alike familiar with the spirit and the contents of the Targums.

f) The silence observed by the earliest Christian fathers respecting these Targums, cannot be surprising. In the first centuries of the Christian era, it must have been a matter of moment to the Jews, to hold them concealed from the learned among the Christians, who might have made great use of many an interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies in the Targums, to support their own theory of the Messiah; and the Targums belong unquestionably to the Jewish apocryphal books, of which the earlier fathers not unfrequently speak.† Further, the costliness also of the Targums,‡ which were mostly purchased

quam legimus, in apocryphis tamen inveniuntur, et evidenter ex ipsis ostenduntur esse assumpta.' Comp. also Jerome on Eph. c. 5.

* Michaelis Orient. Biblioth. Th. V. 1773. p. 227, 239, 240, 249.

† J. A. Fabricii Codex pseudepigraphus N. T. Vol. I. Ed. 2. Hamb. 1722. p. 1088. [See the note on p. 338.]

‡ Elias Levita, in the preface to his *Meturgeman*, says, that before the invention of printing, there were scarcely one or two copies of the Targum on the Prophets and Hagiographa in one province (מדינה) or in one climate (אקלים). This assertion however is exaggerated; for even among the MSS. of the O. T. compared by Kennicott and De Rossi, and written before the end of the 15th

only for the synagogues, and the unacquaintance of the fathers with the Aramaean language,—in which even the learned Jerome must have made as little progress as in Hebrew, since in translating and explaining the Old Testament he was almost always compelled to call in the aid of Jews,—may probably have contributed not a little to cause them to remain so unknown among the Christians. That however the Jews did not entirely withhold from the Christians the explanations given in the Targums of dark passages in the Old Testament, we know from the commentaries of Jerome, in which interpretations of this kind are to be met with, entirely of the same character with those that occur in the printed Targums.*

5. It is an unquestionable fact, that Jesus, whose sphere of action lay chiefly among the common people,—who were less corrupted than the higher classes, and for that reason more susceptible for purer moral and religious instruction; out of whom also he chose his most intimate friends and disciples, *ἄνθρωποι ἀγγάμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται*, Acts 4: 13,—employed in his teaching and on other occasions the Aramaean language. Several fragments of his language which are given in the original,† the Aramaean colouring which is every where visible in the translations of his discourses by the evangelists, and the relation of Paul, that

century, there is a very considerable number that have these Targums side by side.

* Comp. the author's Exercitatt. in Ecclesiast. 11: 7—12: 7. Gött. 1794. p. 16 seq. where he has quoted an example of this mode of interpretation.

† Matt. 27: 46. Mark 15: 34. 5: 41. 7: 34. Why some words of the original should be retained in just these passages of the Greek Gospels, which every where else give the discourses and declarations of Jesus only in Greek, can only be accounted for conjecturally. In the first two passages they seem to have been left, because they serve to explain a circumstance immediately following, viz. that some of the bystanders understood Jesus to have called upon Elias. In the other two passages, the retaining of the original words seems to have been rather accidental than designed; just as in the Alexandrine version, where sometimes a Hebrew word is retained without any ground, and probably merely through inattention; e. g. Judg. 13: 5 *Ναζιρ*. v. 8 *Ἀδωναιέ*. Having once obtained a place in the Greek Gospels, these untranslated words were of course, on this very account, spared by later criticism. [On the subject of the language of Jesus, see the article of Hug. Ed.]

in his vision of Jesus at his conversion (Acts 9: 5. 22: 8) he was addressed in the new Hebrew, or Aramaean dialect of Palestine, *τῆ Ἑβραϊδι διαλέκτῳ* (Acts 26: 14), place this assertion beyond doubt. But how could Jesus, the teacher of the common people, employ the Aramaean dialect, unless this was generally diffused as the national language?

6. The few works that were composed by natives of Palestine in the first centuries after Christ, intended for their countrymen or for the Jews who dwelt near the Euphrates, were all written in Aramaean, or sometimes also in Hebrew, which was ever cultivated among the Jews as a learned language. Few writers however appeared in this age; because the study of the law and of the traditions which referred to it, constituted the central point of all learning; and it was rare to write down any thing upon these topics, through fear that it might fall into profane hands. But these few writers, whenever they wrote for the Jews of Palestine or of the interior of Asia, always employed their own domestic language, the Aramaean. So Matthew, a Jewish Christian of Palestine, who wrote for his countrymen the history of Jesus in their national language;* and so Josephus,† who in like manner employed this language in the first sketch of his history of the Jewish wars. These are the only writers who wrote for the Jews of Palestine and inner Asia, who can be referred with certainty to the first century; although many fragments of earlier interpreters of the law, which were afterwards incorporated *verbatim* into the Mishna and Gemara, belong probably to this period. The Talmud of Jerusalem, which was intended for Palestine, the Pesikta, Mechilta, Siphra, Siphre, and other Aramaean or Hebrew writings which appeared in Palestine, although their age cannot be definitely fixed, prove at least thus much, that the Greek language, even for many centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem, could not have found favour with the Jews of Palestine, nor have supplanted the former national and learned tongues. This is also confirmed by the apocryphal books of the New Testament,‡ which

* The writer adopts the hypothesis, that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in the Aramaean dialect. On this point, however, see the essay of Hug. Ed.

† *De Bello Jud. Proem. 1.*

‡ *J. A. Fabricii Codex apocryphus N. T. Vol. I. Ed. 2. Hamb. 1719. p. 7, 317, 340, 341, 367, 390, 844, and elsewhere.*

were really or pretendedly composed in Palestine, the more ancient Gospels of the Nazarenes and Hebrews, the later Gospels of Barnabas, Bartholomew, and *de Nativitate Mariae*, the Epistle of Christ to Abgar, the Epistle of Mary to the females of Messina, the Acts of the Apostles of Abdias, etc. all of which actually existed in the Aramaean or Hebrew language, or at least, according to the accounts of those who put them in circulation, were translated from such originals. Besides, the Palestine Jews had in the fourth century translations of several of the books of the New Testament, e. g. the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles,* in their own national language; and this unquestionably, because they did not understand them in the Greek. All this shews sufficiently, I think, that the Palestine Jews, in the first centuries after Christ, still clung to the national language, which they had so long retained.

7. If now, finally, we reflect on the unexampled firmness with which the Palestine Jews, after their return from the Babylonish exile, remained faithful to their ancient manners and customs, by which they exposed themselves to the contempt of foreign nations as a rude and singular people; on the extraordinary constancy with which Palestine Jews at a remote distance from their native country, after the lapse of centuries from the time of their removal, have retained their language even to our days; † on the total difference between the Greek and Roman languages and the Aramaean; on the difficulties which must have been connected with the learning of an occidental language by the inhabitants of Palestine, in which every word was strange to them; and on the long continued prevalence of the Aramaean language in Palestine and the adjacent countries, where it has been supplanted only in a very late age by the kindred Arabic dialect, and where in some regions of country it has

* Epiphanius Opp. ed. Petav. T. II. p. 127.

† The Jews who reside in the Mogul empire, and have ostensibly adopted heathenism, are said still to speak the Hebrew fluently; see Eichhorn's Bibliothek, II. 581. I conjecture, however, that the person who communicated this intelligence, mistook, through ignorance of the language, the Babylonish-Aramaean dialect which these Jews may have spoken, for pure Hebrew. [For a full account of the Jews in Hindostan and on the coast of Malabar, see Buchanan's Christian Researches in India. Ed.]

maintained itself even to our day* as a living language ;—if, I say, we reflect on all these points, we can have no scruple to assign to the position, that the Palestine Jews in the age of Christ and his apostles maintained their national language, (even if it could be proved by no express historical testimony,) a degree of probability, amounting almost to historical certainty.

§ 10.

The *direct* or immediate proofs of this position, cannot be very numerous. To these we may reckon the express declarations of those ancient writers, who were sufficiently acquainted with the situation of Palestine in the first hundred and fifty years of the Roman dominion, and single facts which necessarily presuppose a general diffusion of the Aramaean language among the Palestine Jews of that age. In the writings of the Greeks and Romans we can look for no trace of a familiar acquaintance with the history and language of Palestine ; since they did not regard the language and national writings even of the cultivated nations of antiquity, the Carthaginians, Phenicians, etc. as worthy of their attention ; and Strabo, from whom we have already quoted the passages that belong here (p. 318 above), is perhaps the only one, who gives the general information respecting the Syrians, (under whom also the inhabitants of Palestine were reckoned,) that they and their neighbours spoke a kindred language ; but in regard to their differences of dialect, he explains himself no further. The few native writers might indeed have left us more definite accounts respecting the history of their language ; but they occupied themselves with historical or religious subjects, which afforded them no occasion to express themselves minutely on this point ; and it would have been, in fact, no wonder, had they not touched upon it with a single syllable. Still, there are in their writings, as it were casually, several hints thrown out unintentionally, which are valuable for their antiquity, and place the continuance of the Aramaean language in Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles beyond all doubt. We will produce them here according to the chronological order of the writings in which they are contained.

I. In the writings of the *New Testament* to which the first place in the order of time must be assigned, there are a few

* J. D. Michaelis, Abhandlung von d. Syrischen Sprache, Gött. 1786. p. 9.

passages to our purpose, which are so clear as to leave no doubt remaining.

1. In Acts 1: 19 a peculiar Jerusalem dialect is spoken of, totally distinct from the Greek and Roman languages, which also, as the language of the capital, must have been current in the adjacent region. No definite name is assigned to it here; but the word *ἀκελδαμά* which is attributed to it, and which belongs to the Babylonish-Aramaean language (ܐܟܠܕܡܐ), shows clearly enough, that no other dialect can here be meant.

2. Paul addressed the common people at Jerusalem, whom the Jews of Asia Minor had excited against him, in the new Hebrew dialect (*τῆ Ἑβραϊδι διαλέκτῳ*, Acts 21: 40. 22: 2) or the Aramaean dialect then current in Palestine, the identity of which will appear from the next section. The attentive silence with which the people listened to Paul, whose attachment to Judaism had been suspected, and the immediate favourable impression which Paul's acquaintance with the Aramaean language made upon them, sufficiently prove that this was the prevailing language of the people at Jerusalem, and that they regarded no man as an orthodox Jew, who was not capable of expressing himself readily in this language.

II. Flavius Josephus, a Jew of Palestine, who was an eye-witness of the wars carried on by the Romans in that country, and of the destruction of the national metropolis and sanctuary, and whose testimony therefore has greater authority than the latter talmudic writings, harmonizes completely with the declarations of the New Testament.

1. According to his express assurance,* there was in his times

* Antiq. Jud. XX. 11. 2. *Λέγω δὲ θαρσύνσας—ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄν ἕτερος ἢ δυνήθη θελήσας, μήτε Ἰουδαῖος, μήτε ἀλλόφυλος, τὴν πραγματείαν ταύτην οὕτως ἀκριβῶς εἰς Ἕλληνας ἐξενεγκεῖν· ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁμολογούμην παρὰ τῶν ὁμοεθνῶν πλείστον αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιχωρίων παιδείαν διαφέρειν· καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δὲ γραμμάτων ἐσπούδασα μετασχεῖν, τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναλαβὼν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκριβείαν πατριος ἐκώλυσε συνήθεια· παρ' ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκείνους ἀποδέχονται τοὺς πολλῶν ἔθνων διάλεκτον ἐκμαθόντας, καὶ γλαφυροῖσι λέξεων τὸν λόγον ἐπικομψεύοντας· διὰ τὸ κοινὸν εἶναι νομίζειν τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα τοῦτο οὐκ ἐλευθέρων μόνον τοῖς τυχοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν τοῖς θέλουσιν· μόνοις δὲ σοφίαν μαρτυροῦσι τοῖς τὰ νόμιμα σαφῶς ἐπισταμένοις, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων δύναμιν ἐρμηνεύσαι δυνάμενοις.*

no other Jew capable of undertaking in Greek such a work as his Jewish Antiquities. As the ground of this, he assigns chiefly ignorance of the Greek language. He himself indeed had studied this foreign language grammatically, and made himself acquainted with the Greek literature, a fact which he cites as something unusual; but, in accordance with the prevailing custom of his country, he had not troubled himself to acquire the power of speaking Greek with fluency.* "For with us," he continues, "we do not esteem those at all who have learned foreign languages, because this is considered as an employment common to the lower class of freemen and to slaves. They alone are regarded as wise, who are accurately acquainted with the precepts of the law, and know how to explain the holy Scriptures," i. e. according to the original Hebrew text, with the help of the oral traditions and the Targums extant in the language of the country, as the whole connexion shews; and not according to the Alexandrine version, of which a despiser of foreign languages could make no use.

2. This same writer composed a History of the Jewish War, in his native language,† for the use of his countrymen in Babylon, Persia, Arabia, and beyond the Euphrates, (who consequently had laid aside the Aramaean language as little as the Palestine Jews,) and designed the Greek translation of this History, which he made at Rome with the aid of several Greeks,‡ as well as his Antiquities (Praef. 2), not for the Jews, but solely for the Greeks and numerous Romans who were acquainted with the Greek tongue.

3. He expressly calls the Greek a foreign language,§ and

* The word used by Josephus is ἀκριβειαν, *accuracy*; which changes the character of the passage, and destroys in a great measure the force of the argument here drawn from it. ED.

† Bell. Jud. prooem. 1. Προῦθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν, ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις (comp. § 2) τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον, ἀφηγήσασθαι. 'I purpose to narrate in the Greek language, to those under the Roman dominion, the things which I formerly composed for the barbarians of the interior, in my native tongue.'

‡ Contra Apion. I. 9. Χρησάμενος τισὶ πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς, 'employing certain assistants for the Greek language.'

§ Antiq. Jud. prooem. 2. Ὅρκος μοι καὶ μέλλουσις ἐγένετο τηλοῦ No. II.

speaks of the Babylonish-Aramaean* in such terms as he could use only of a living language.

4. The Jewish deserters, who during the siege of Jerusalem went over to the Romans, understood neither Greek nor Latin, and could not therefore make themselves intelligible to the Romans. Josephus, who was then with the Roman besieging army, was the only person who could understand them.†

5. The armed national troops who defended Jerusalem against Titus, were mostly, if not wholly, composed of Jews who spoke only Aramaean. The watchmen on the towers, who observed the movements of the enemy, raised a loud cry in the national language‡ when they saw the *catapultae* put in motion, and the huge masses of rock fly along, which were thus hurled against the walls. The emperor Titus, in the interview which he

καὺτην μετενεγκεῖν ὑπόθεσιν εἰς ἀλλοδαπὴν ἡμῶν καὶ ξένης διαλέκτου συνήθειαν. 'Indolence and tardiness came upon me in translating such a mass of materials into another and foreign language.' He is here speaking of his History.

* Ant. III. 7. 2. Μωϋσῆς μὲν οὖν ἀβανηθ (אבנת) αὐτὴν ἐκάλεσεν. ἡμεῖς δὲ, παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων μεμαθηκότες, ἐμίαν (עמיה) αὐτὴν καλοῦμεν· οὕτως γὰρ προσαγορεύεται παρ' αὐτοῖς. 'Moses called it *Abaneth*; but we, instructed by the Babylonians, call it *Emian*; for so it is named by them.' This עמיה is the word which the Targums have for אבנת Ex. 28: 8 and elsewhere. This passage clearly shews, that in the time of Josephus the ancient Hebrew was a dead language, and that instead of it the Babylonish-Aramaean, commonly called the Chaldee, was prevalent.

† Contra Apion. I. 9. Τὰ παρὰ τῶν αὐτομόλων ἀπαγγελλόμενα μόνος αὐτὸς συνήην. [But this passage, if it proves any thing, proves too much. For speaking of the army of Titus (Bell. Jud. V. 1. 6.) Josephus says there were six Roman legions, besides other troops, καὶ συχνοὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας ἐπικούροισι συνῆλθον, 'and many also of the *Syrian* auxiliaries accompanied him.' Comp. p. 334 note * above. The passage cited in the text then, would just as much prove that the Jewish deserters could not speak the Aramaean language, as that they could not speak Greek. Josephus therefore is probably speaking only in reference to the *Roman* troops, or common soldiers, who were unacquainted with the Greek language.—ED.]

‡ Bell. Jud. V. 6. 3. Σκοποὶ—ἐπὶ τῶν πύργων καθιζόμενοι προεμήνουσιν, ὅποταν σχασθεῖ τὸ ὄργανον, καὶ ἡ πέτρα φέροιο, τῆ πατριῶν γλώσση βοῶντες· ὁ ἰὸς ἐρχεται.

held with the Jewish leaders Simon and John in the sight of both armies, had an interpreter at his side,* who propounded his summons to the Jews to surrender in the language of Palestine. Josephus also relates several times, that he himself had to make known the proclamations of the Roman general which were directed to the Jews, in the Hebrew language, as he calls it,† of the time.

6. Even those Jewish princes who resided long at Rome, and stood in the most familiar intercourse with the emperors, and who were no strangers to the language and literature of Greece, as for instance Herod Agrippa,‡ did not forget in foreign lands the language of their own country, but made use of it even in Rome when conversing with their countrymen, or when they

* Bell. J. VI. 6. 2. *Παραγγείλας δὲ τοῖς στρατιωταῖς Τίτος, θυμοῦ τε καὶ βελῶν μένειν ἐγκρατεῖς, καὶ τὸν ἐρμενέα παρασησαμενος, ὅπερ ἦν τεκμηριον τοῦ κρατεῖν, πρῶτος ἤρξατο λεγειν.* 'Titus having ordered his troops to restrain their fury and their weapons, and taking an interpreter, which was a token of imperial power, began first to speak.' [See the essay of Hug above referred to, where this passage is particularly commented upon. Ed.]

† B. J. V. 9. 2. *Τίτος—πολλάκις γινώσκων ἀντικαίτερον ὄπλων τὸν λόγον, αὐτοὺς τε σώζεσθαι παρεκάλει παραδόντας τὴν πόλιν ἤδη παρελημμένην, καὶ τὸν Ἰώσηπον καθίει τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσει διαλέγεσθαι, τάχα ἐνδύναμι πρὸς ὁμόφυλον δοκῶν αὐτοῦς.* 'Titus knowing that counsel is more efficacious than arms, several times exhorted them to save themselves by delivering up the city, which was now on the point of being taken; and sent out Josephus to treat with them in their own tongue, supposing they would more readily yield to one of their own nation.'—B. J. VI. 2. 1. *Ὁ Ἰώσηπος, ὡς ἂν εἰ μὴ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἐν ἐπηκόῳ στάς, τὰ τε ταῦ Καίσαρος διήγγειλεν Ἑβραϊζῶν.* 'Josephus, as if he came not to John alone, but also to the multitude, standing where he could be heard, declared the message of the emperor in Hebrew.'—B. J. VI. 2. 5. and elsewhere. [See Hug.]

‡ Antiq. Jud. XVIII. 6. 10. *Μαρσύας τοῦ Ἀγρίππου ὁ ἀπελευθέρως, πυθόμενος Τιβερίου τὴν τελευτήν, εἶθι δρομαῖος τῷ Ἀγρίππῃ ἀγγελιούμενος· καὶ καταλαβὼν ἐν ἐξόδοις ὄντα εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον, συννεύσας πρὸς αὐτὸν, γλώσσει τῇ Ἑβραίων, τέθνηκεν ὁ λέων, φησίν.* 'Marsyas, the freedman of Agrippa; and meeting him on his way to the bath, he nodded to him and said in Hebrew, The lion is dead.' Agrippa answered him in the same language, which the centurion who was present did not understand.

wished to conceal their discourse from the Romans. If now the higher classes clung so fondly to the national language which they had learned in youth, much more might we expect this from the common people, to whom every thing national is usually doubly sacred, from their total unacquaintance with foreign countries.

III. The declarations of the Talmudists and of the Rabbins who are dependent on them, deserve to be mentioned here, as a minor proof of our position; although this is sufficiently confirmed by the testimonies already adduced from the New Testament and from Josephus.

1. They assert unanimously, that the Greek language was an object of extreme hatred in Palestine, chiefly because it facilitated treachery in the wars with foreigners. When Aristobulus was shut up in Jerusalem by Pompey, who assisted Hyrcanus against his brother, and a Jew who spoke Greek gave the Romans the counsel, that in order to compel the besieged to surrender, they should no longer permit them to supply themselves with victims for sacrifice, the Jews uttered the most bitter curses against every one, who should suffer his son to learn Greek.* During the war against Titus also, it was expressly forbidden to teach their sons Greek.† That these prohibitions were not oc-

* Bava Kama fol. 82. b. Cum principes familiae Asmoneae inter se de dominatione contenderent, Hyrcanus erat extra, Aristobulus vero intra urbem. Solebant illi, qui intus erant obsessi, quotidie per murum nummos in cistula demittere, atque agnos, quibus ad rem sacram faciendam opus erat, referre. Erat forte inter eos, qui extra urbem erant, senex quidam (Judaeus) sapientiae Graecorum peritus, qui (Graecis Pompeianisque Hyrcano opem ferentibus) insusurrat *Graeco* sermone: Quamdiu istis sacra sua peragere conceditis, non facient deditionem. Cum postero die Hierosolymitani nummos in corbe demitterent, obsessentes iis reddiderunt porcum.—Tum dixerunt: Maledictus sit, qui porcos alit, maledictus, qui filium suum docet sapientiam Graecam; ארור אדם שלמד בנו חכמת יונית. [Here however it is the Greek *sapientia*, learning, philosophy, and not the Greek *language*, that is forbidden. The same is true of all the passages quoted below, except in the next following one; and even there the *sapientia* is implied, as is shewn by the fact that females were not forbidden to learn the Greek language. Ed.]

† Sota. Mischnae c. IX. 14. p. 962. ed. Wagenseil. Decreverunt bello contra Titum exorto, ne quis filium linguam Graecam (יונית) doceret. That this prohibition was only temporary and

casioned by any prevailing preference among the Palestine Jews for the Greek language, but were given solely in reference to the common people,—among whom there were occasionally some acquainted with the Greek language, who suffered themselves to be seduced to act as spies in the service of the enemy,—is clear from Josephus; according to whose testimony above quoted, the higher classes possessed too much national pride to make themselves acquainted with a foreign language. For an interpreter of the Scriptures,* an acquaintance with the Greek language was regarded as superfluous and altogether useless. The story, that only the single family of Gamaliel† enjoyed the privilege of being permitted to learn the Greek language, is perhaps nothing else than a more definite shape of the historical proposition, that in the times when this family so distinguished for their learning flourished, an acquaintance with the Greek language in Palestine was exceedingly rare.

only designed to prevent desertion to the enemy, is shewn by the limitation of it to sons; for the daughters, according to the Talmud of Jerusalem might learn Greek. Tract. Sota and Shabbat: *Fas est homini, filiam suam docere linguam Graecam, nam id gratiam illi conciliat*, (Wagenseil. l. c. p. 970.) if indeed this passage has reference to a time of war. And even during the wars, the prohibition was not always obeyed, as is usually the case with such interdictions; for in the writings of Josephus we become acquainted with many Palestine Jews, who understood Greek. Comp. also Lightfoot. *Horae Heb. ad Act. Ap. 6: 1.* The long and persevering hatred which the Palestine Jews of this and the following ages manifested against all that bore the name of Greek, was rather a prevailing national disposition of mind, which may easily be explained from their situation, than a consequence of this express prohibition, which, for the Jew who hung so zealously on his national religion, was entirely unnecessary.

* Menachoth, fol. 99. b. *Dumae filius, qui ex R. Ismaelis sore genitus erat, interrogavit avunculum: Num mihi, qui universam legem addidici, fas est sapientiae Graecae studere? Tunc ei inculcavit avunculus dictum (Jos. 1: 8): Ne discedito liber iste legis ex ore tuo, sed studio ejus incumbe interdiu ac noctu. Age igitur, reputa tecum, quaenam sit illa hora, quae nec ad diem, nec ad noctem pertineat; quam si inveneris, licebit tibi sapientiae Graecae operam navare.*

† Bava Kama fol. 82. 2. *Permiserunt familiae Rabban Gamalielis sapientiam Graecam, quoniam illi cognati erant sanguini regio.*

2. It was solely because the people understood no language but the Aramaean,* that the Aramaean Targums were prepared. For the same reason, various forms of prayer† in Aramaean were allowed to the people; for the prayers borrowed *verbatim* from the Old Testament, and often composed of various passages of the same put together, had to be recited among the Jews at all times in the original Hebrew language. To the learned also, who had a great veneration for the ancient Hebrew, and who had probably taken much pains to make it again current among the people, as before the exile, this disrespect of the national Aramaean language was prohibited.‡ Indeed, according to the Talmudists, this language was also honoured by the circumstance, that the prophets who lived at the destruction of Jerusalem prophesied in it,§ and the voice of heaven (בְּהוֹרֵי קוֹל) || resounded in it.

* R. Asarias in Meor Enajim c. 9. Servatus est mos, interpretandi legem vulgo lingua Aramaea (אַרְמֵי) toto tempore templi secundi, mansitque ista lingua semper inter eos (Hebraeos) usque ad captivitatem Hierosolymitanam.

† Berachoth fol. 3. 1. Sunt, qui dicant precatiunculam istam, cujus initium Aramaea proferri, quod sit lingua nobilis et summae laudis. And further on: In more fuit, orationem קְרִישׁ recitare post concionem; adfuit autem ibi vulgus, qui linguam Hebraeam non intellexit, ideoque in lingua Targumistica eam instituerunt, ut intelligeretur ab omnibus; nam haec eorum lingua.

‡ Hieros. Sota fol. 21. 3. Beresch. Rabba fol. 83. 4. Ne vilescat lingua Syriaca (סוּרְסִי) in oculis tuis. Nam ecce honorem tribuit ei Deus in lege (Gen. 31: 47), in prophetis (Jer. 10: 11), et in hagiographis (Dan. 2: 4). As these passages are all Babylonish-Aramaean, the word סוּרְסִי must here mean the same as אַרְמֵי.

§ Hieros. Sota fol. 24. Samuel parvus in articulo mortis dixit: Simeon atque Ismael ad gladium, atque omnis reliquus populus ad spoliolum et calamitates plurimae futurae sunt. Lingua Aramaea loquebatur, sed non intellexerunt verba ejus, h. e. verum predictionis sensum. In Lightfoot. Hor. Heb. ad Matt. 1: 23, this passage is incorrectly translated: Atque *ideo*, quod haec loqueretur lingua Syriaca, non intellexerunt, quid esset locutus.

|| Sota. Gemarae c. VII. 2. p. 689. ed. Wagenseil. Extat traditio, Jochananem, summum pontificem, audivisse vocem e sacratissimo penatrali prodeuntem et בְּלִשׁוֹן אַרְמֵי dicentem: Vicere juvenes, qui iverant ad proelium committendum Antiochiae, נְצוּרֵי

3. In some passages of the Talmud and of the Rabbins the common language of Palestine is sometimes called *Syriac* (סורסי) and distinguished from the Babylonish-Aramaean.* According to the later Jewish commentators, the former was somewhat more corrupt than the latter. But as the Talmud in other places expressly† declares the Syriac and Aramaean to be identical, I conjecture that these commentators‡ speak only of the later period of the third and fourth centuries, when the Jews of Babylon especially paid particular attention to the purity of their language; and that we are by no means authorized to assume, in the age of Christ and the apostles, any such difference between the Aramaean language prevalent in Palestine and that of Babylon, as shall require us to mark them with different names.

§ 11.

The character and condition of the common language of Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles, a point so important to the interpreter of the New Testament, can be determined with certainty. The character of it remained the same as in the preceding ages; i. e. it was still, in its essential elements and forms, the same Babylonish-Aramaean (new Chaldee) language, which is known to us in its earliest remains in the books of Daniel and Ezra. Genuine Aramaean words constituted still the foundation or stock of the language; and their external form suffered as little change as their former syntax. The foreign words which had been introduced, and which were mostly Greek, remained in circulation; and since a regard for strict purity of language had long since been given up, they were increased under the Roman dominion by new ones, and even by

סליא דאזלי לאגחא קרבה באנטוכיא. Another בח קיל which Simon the Just heard in the Temple, is immediately afterwards quoted in like manner in the Babylonish-Aramaean language.

* Bava Kama fol. 83. 1. Sota fol. 49. 2. R. Jose dixit: Lingua Syriaca (סורסי) in terra Israelitica quare? cum potius adhibenda aut lingua sancta aut lingua Graeca. In Babylonia Aramaea (ארמי) quare? cum potius adhibenda vel lingua sancta, vel lingua Persica.

† Pesachin fol. 61. 1. לשון סורסי הוא ארמי. Comp. note ‡ on p. 350.

‡ Comp. Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. sub voce סורסי p. 1554. Lightfoot. Hor. Heb. ad Act. 6: 1.

many Latin words, of which last there is no trace at any earlier period. But the national language neither suffered injustice, nor was confined within narrower limits than before, by this introduction of foreign expressions; which is a thing permitted in every nation that is not entirely isolated. For these foreign words and expressions thus introduced, were for the most part intended to designate such objects as first became known to the inhabitants of Palestine through foreigners, and for which they had in their own language no appropriate appellations. The adoption therefore of such foreign words could by no means have the result, that any portion of the vernacular tongue should thereby be supplanted, or thrown out of ordinary use. They served rather really to enrich the national language, which, augmented by these exotic words, continued its progress in peace, and maintained itself undisturbed in the possession of its former domain.

That this was actually the character of the national language of Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles, appears from the following considerations.

I. From the few remains of this language* which occur in the New Testament, written in Greek letters. We will here exhibit the principal ones before the eyes of the reader, along with the corresponding later Chaldee words; as this will serve to render our position perfectly obvious.

Matt. 3: 7 *Φαρισαῖος*, פְּרִישָׁי.

— 5: 22 *ῥακά*, רִיקָא. † *Γέεννα*, גֵּהֶנְמָ.

— 6: 24 *μαμωνάς*, מַמּוֹנָא.

— 12: 24 *Βεελζεβούλ*, בְּעֵל זְבוּלָ.

— 16: 17 *βαρ' Ιωνᾶ*, בַּר יוֹנָא.

— 23: 7 *ῥαββί*, רַבִּי.

— 26: 2 *πάσχα*, פֶּסַחָא and פֶּסְחָא.

— 27: 33 *Γολγοθᾱ (κρανίου τόπος)*, גּוֹלְגוֹתָא. †

* Comp. A. Pfeifferi *Loca Hebraica et exotica N. T.* in *Opp. omn. philol.* p. 467 seq.—*Cheitomaei Graeco-barbara N. T.* in *Rhenferdi Dissertatt. de Stylo N. T. Syntagma*, Leov. 1702. p. 325 seq.

† Whether there was anciently also another form רִיקָא, or whether the Greek copyists have here exchanged *ῥηκά* for *ῥακά*, cannot now be determined. That they did thus make mistakes in writing the foreign Hebrew and Chaldee words, is apparent from the various readings of the Septuagint and of Josephus.

‡ It was usual in common life, in order to facilitate the pronun-

- Acts 1: 19 ἀκλδαμά (χωρίον αίματος), אַקְדָּמָא לְרַחֵם.
 — 9: 36 Τυβιθά (δορκάς), אַתְּבִיבָא.
 — 16: 12 κολωνία, אַקְלִיבָא.
 1 Cor. 16: 22 μαρὰν ἀθά, אַמְרָא לְרַחֵם.
 2 John 12 χάριτης, אַחְרִיבָא.

II. In Josephus also we find single words out of the national language of his time, which are either exclusively Babylonish-Aramaean, or belong to it in common with the Hebrew. We adduce here some of these passages in illustration, without however aiming at completeness, which is here unnecessary.

- Antiq. Jud. I. 3. 3. ἐν μηνὶ δευτέρῳ, Μαρσουάνη (אַרְבִּיבָא) ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων λεγομένην.
 — II. 1. 1. Ἰσθαμὰ (אַחְדָּמָא) Ἑβραῖοι τὸ ἐρυθρὸν καλοῦσι.
 — III. 7. 1. — τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, οὓς Χαναλας (אַחְדָּמָא) καλοῦσι, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀρχιερεῖ, ὃν Ἀναραβάχην προσαγορεύουσι. This last word but one has evidently been corrupted by the transcribers, as the great variation in the MSS. shews, and has probably arisen out of χαναράβα, אַחְדָּמָא אַרְבָּא.
 — III. 7. 2. Μωϋσῆς μὲν ἀβανήθ (Heb. אַבְנֶה) αὐτὴν ἐκάλεσεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων μεμαθηκότες, ἐμὴν (אַחְדָּמָא) αὐτὴν καλοῦμεν.
 — III. 7. 2. χεθὸν (אַחְדָּמָא and אַחְדָּמָא) τὸ λίνον ἡμεῖς καλοῦμεν.
 — III. 7. 6. τῆ σακχάρῳ (אַחְדָּמָא) βοτάνη παρ' ἡμῖν λεγομένη, ἣς δὲ κύαμον Ἕλληνες—προσαγορεύουσι. This genuine Babylonish-Aramaean word is not indeed found in Buxtorf's Lex. Chald. Talm. Rab. but in the Syriac lexicons we find ܟܘܟܪܐܢ in this signification; and also in Arabic شوكران.
 — III. 8. 3. εἶν (אַחְדָּמָא) μέτρον ἐστὶ ἐπιχώριον.
 — III. 10. 6. τῆ πεντηκοστῆ, ἣν Ἑβραῖοι ἀσαρθά (אַחְדָּמָא) καλοῦσι.
 — III. 15. 3. ἀσσαρών (אַחְדָּמָא), mensura quaedam aridorum.
 — IV. 4. 7. μηνὸς καλουμένου Ἀββά (אַחְדָּמָא) παρ' Ἑβραίοις.
 — IV. 4. 4. κορβᾶν (אַחְדָּמָא) δῶρον σημαίνει.

- Antiq. Jud. IV. 8. 49. τῷ μηνί, καλουμένῳ Ἀδάρω (ܐܕܪܐ) ὑφ' ἡμῶν. Comp. 2 Macc. 15: 36, Ἀδάρ λέγεται τῇ Συριακῇ φωνῇ.
- XII. 5. 4. ὁ μῆν, ὃς καλεῖται κατὰ ἡμᾶς Χασλεύ (ܚܫܠܝܐ).
- XIV. 2. 1. ἡ τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτή, ἣν φάσκα (ܢܗܪܫܬܐ) λέγομεν.
- Bell. Jud. V. 2. 1. πρὸς τινι κώμῃ Ταβαθσαούλῃ (ܩܒܠܐ ܒܝܢܫܐ) καλουμένη, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο λόφον Σαούλου.
- V. 11. 5. Τεφθαῖος τις ἀπὸ Γαρσίς πόλεως τῆς Γαλιλαίας,—κληθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης Χαγείρας (ܚܝܓܝܪܐ) ὅπερ σημαίνει χαλός.
- Contra Apion. II. 2. τὸ μὲν σάββατον (ܫܒܘܬܐ) κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν διάλεκτον ἀνάπανσις ἔστιν.

III. If now we turn from these fragments of the national language of Palestine which occur in the New Testament and in Josephus, to the Aramaean Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, we find in them again every where the same Aramaean and exotic words. This circumstance authorizes us to draw the conclusion, that the national language of Palestine in the age of Christ and the apostles was, generally speaking, wholly identical with the language of the Targums; and that consequently it differed from the ancient Aramaean, as exhibited in the books of Daniel and Ezra, chiefly in exhibiting a greater proportion of foreign words, the adoption of which was rendered necessary by the circumstances of the times.

That, however, this Aramaean language was not spoken by all the inhabitants of Palestine with equal correctness and with an uniform pronunciation, is a matter of course. The language of the learned and of the educated part of the nation, which may be termed the *dialectus communis*, was distinguished by grammatical correctness, a more select and nobler mode of expression, and by a pronunciation conformed to the written language. It was also uniform throughout the whole of Palestine; because all those who laid claim to intellectual cultivation, were instructed in Jerusalem, and there disaccustomed themselves from the rougher provincial dialects that were spoken out of Judea. The language of the common people, on the other hand, was different in the different regions of Palestine, and was divided, like almost

every other language, into several *dialects*, whose chief differences consisted merely in the difference of pronunciation, and in some few idioms, which the cultivated language rejected.

1. The dialect of Jerusalem and the adjacent parts of Judea, was recommended, according to the Talmudists,* above the other dialects of the country, by its general correctness, and especially by the distinct pronunciation of the guttural letters, which in many parts were not properly articulated. The credibility of this testimony cannot be called in question; since Jerusalem was the place of common resort for the most learned and distinguished of the Jews, who bestowed greater care on the accuracy of their language than the uneducated Jews who dwelt in the interior, and must necessarily have had, through their consideration and various connexions, an important influence upon the dialect of the capital and of the neighbouring country.†

2. The Galilean dialect, as would appear from Matt. 27: 73, and as is placed out of doubt by the Talmud,‡ was directly the contrary of that of Jerusalem. It was rough and unpolished, allowed itself arbitrary contractions and mutilations of words, slurred over many letters in pronunciation, and confounded the so

* Babyl. Erubhin fol. 53. 1. Dixit R. Abba: Si interroget quis homines Judaeae, qui polita utuntur lingua, utrum מאבריים doceant pronuntiandum אנ מעבריים (distincte scil. litteris א et ע pronuntiat) sciunt illud.

† The Jerusalem version of the N. Test. from which Adler has given extracts in his work: *N. T. Versiones Syriacae*, Hafn. 1789, bears this name merely in consequence of a hypothesis, which is supported on no solid grounds. It cannot therefore be regarded as a source, from which any accurate knowledge of the dialect of Jerusalem can be drawn.

‡ Erubhin f. 53. 2. Homines Galilaeae, qui impolita utuntur lingua, quid de illis traditum est? quod Galilaeus quidam diceret cuidam (Judaeo) אמר למאן אמר למאן. Respondebatur ipsi: Galilaeae stulte, intelligisne חמר (asinum) ad equitandum aut חמר (vinum) ad bibendum, עמר (lanam) ad vestiendum aut אימר (agnus) ad abscondendum ad mactationem.—Ibid. Mulier quaedam Galilaea, cupiens dicere sociae ואתי דאוקלך: חלבה (veni et comedendum dabo tibi lac), dicebat ad eam שלוכתי היקלך: חלבה (est vox Galilaeae i. q. הברה: socia). Comp. Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. Rab. sub voce גליל. Lightfoot. Hor. Heb. in Act. Ap. Lips. 1684. p. 151. Schoettgen Hor. Heb. ad Matt. 26: 73. Pfeifferi Exercit. X. de dialecto Galilaeae, in Opp. philolog. p. 616.

frequently recurring gutturals א, ה, ו, פ; which gave occasion for frequent misapprehension. It had also several idioms, which the dialect of Jerusalem and the cultivated language avoided. How the Galileans pronounced the vowels (for all of which the Aramaean language had anciently no signs) in connexion with the letters, is unknown.

3. The Samaritan dialect coincided, in respect to the indistinct pronunciation of the gutturals, with the Galilean, from which it seems in general to have differed very little.

4. The Phœnician-Aramaean dialect was distinguished above all the other dialects of Palestine, by the multitude of Hellenisms and Latinisms which it had adopted. Its other peculiarities cannot be assigned with certainty; because, with the exception of a few coins and inscriptions, there are no sources of information respecting this dialect.

If now the national language of Palestine in the age of Christ, as we have hitherto attempted to shew,—notwithstanding its difference of dialects, which referred rather to the pronunciation, than to the essential elements of the language,—was still the Aramaean language so long domesticated in that country, and which in the lapse of time had lost none of its characteristic qualities, we can be under no hesitation in regard to the name which we ought to give this language. The New Testament and Josephus call it the *Hebrew*,* on no other ground than because the Jews of that period, as well as those of later ages, often bestowed on themselves the ancient national name of Hebrews; and for this reason gave also the same appellation to their own Aramaean dialect, which was spoken by most Jews in and out of Palestine. Old as the appellation is, however, it has nevertheless one important defect, viz. that it is too indefinite, and may mislead those unacquainted with the subject to confound the ancient Hebrew and

* The Jewish writers also call the Babylonish-Aramaean dialect עברית. Comp. Lightfoot. Hor. Heb. ad Joh. 5: 2. So also Epiphanius, who pronounces many words to be Hebrew, which are entirely unknown to the ancient Hebrew. e. g. Tom. II. ed. Petavii p. 117. *χαρία* (כַּרְיָא) *καλεῖται* (ἐν τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ) *βουνοῦ*. p. 188. *κογγιασιον μέτρον ἐστὶν ὑγροῦ, καὶ αὐτὸ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἐκφωνούμενον*. In other places he distinguishes indeed, sometimes between the old Hebrew and Syriac, as Tom. I. 83; but what he calls Syriac, is every where, even in its external form, the same that is usually called Chaldaic.

the Aramaean, which took the place of the Hebrew after the Babylonish exile. It has therefore properly been attempted in modern times, to give to this national language of Palestine in the time of Christ a name which should not be exposed to this misapprehension; and the appellation of *Syro-Chaldaic** language has been employed for this purpose. Since however, as is said above, the proper Chaldee is entirely unknown to us, and the Syriac (Aramaean) language, so far as we know, did not differ down to the time of Christ from the Chaldaic (Babylonish) language, and consequently in the above appellation Syriac and Chaldaic seem to be identical, it will probably be most appropriate to bestow on the language of Palestine, (originally the Babylonish-Aramaean,) in order to distinguish it from other dialects, the simple name of the *Palestine-Aramaean*, or the *Palestine-Syriac*; for the terms Aramaean and Syriac are fully identical.†

§ 12.

Reference is often made, in order to prove the familiar acquaintance of the Palestine Jews in the age of the apostles with the Greek language, to the *Hellenists* who were established at Jerusalem, as mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. These, according to the common opinion, were entirely ignorant of the national language of Palestine, and on this account had their own Greek synagogues, in which the version of the Seventy took the place of the original Hebrew text and of the Targums. However willingly we admit, that many of the Palestine Jews, and especially those of the higher classes, were able *along with* their mother tongue to understand the Greek or Latin, and to

* The occasion for this appellation was probably given by Jerome, who uses Hebrew (Babylonish-Aramaean) and Syro-Chaldaic as synonymous terms. Thus Lib. II. Comm. ad Matt. 12: 13, he says that he had translated the Gospel of the Hebrews *de Hebraeo sermone*; and Lib. III. adv. Pelag. c. 1, he calls this same Gospel "Chaldaico Syroque sermone, sed Hebraeis litteris, scriptum." Fabricii Cod. apocr. N. T. Ed. 2. Hamb. 1719. Vol. I. p. 367 seq. [The name *Palestine-Aramaean* proposed by the author has never been generally adopted; see the note on p. 319 above. Ed.]

† Strabo I. p. 112. ed. Siebenkees. *Οἱ ὑφ' ἡμῶν Σύροι καλοῦμενοι ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν Σύρων—Αραμμαῖοι καλοῦνται.* 'Those whom we call Syrians, are called by the Syrians themselves Aramaeans.' Joseph. Ant. Jud. I. 6. 4. *Αραμμαίους Ἀραμος ἔσχεν, οὓς Ἕλληνες Σύρους προσαγορεύουσιν.* 'Aramus had the Aramaeans, whom the Greeks call Syrians.'

express themselves imperfectly in them, (for this may be shewn even from Josephus and the Talmudists,) still, we have scruples as to the propriety of adopting the common opinion above mentioned in regard to the Hellenists. The grounds of our scruples are the following.*

1. The opinion in question grounds itself solely on the name *Hellenists*, which was borne by a certain party of the Jews at Jerusalem, Acts 6: 1. 9: 29. But it by no means follows from this appellation, that their distinguishing characteristic is to be sought in the Greek language, as being their vernacular tongue. For (1) if the Jews who spoke Greek bore this name, how does it happen, that the Jews in Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece, and other lands, where Greek was the prevailing language, are never called Hellenists in the book of Acts? and that Paul who was born at Tarsus, a Greek city, never calls himself a Hellenist, but always a Hebrew or Jew? (2) It was the Jewish custom to divide all the nations of the earth, in respect to religion, into Jews and Greeks or *Hellenes*; *Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας*. This last name they gave to all who were not Jews, because at the time when the appellation first arose, the neighbouring heathen nations with whom the Jews were best acquainted, as the Syrians and Egyptians, were under the dominion of Greek sovereigns, and were therefore called Greeks. According to this custom, even those nations which spoke Aramaean, as Syrians and Syrophenicians,† were called Greeks, although they did not speak Greek. If now we derive the word *Hellenist* from this signification among the Jews, then the Hellenistic Jews can be no other than *proselytes* or the descendants of proselytes. These were always regarded with some degree of slight by the Jews who belonged to the twelve tribes, or by the Hebrews in the stricter sense, and in respect to their heathen origin were called

* The subject of the Hellenists is fully discussed by Hug in the article so often referred to, and with particular reference to the opinions here advanced. Ed.

† In Mark 7: 26 the *γυνή Συραφοινίκισσα*, who consequently spoke Aramaean, is called *Ἕλληνίς*; and Josephus (B. J. II. 13. 7. coll. 14. 4.) uses the words *Ἕλληνες* and *Σύροι* as synonymous. Even the Peshito sometimes limits the term *Ἕλληνας* solely to the Aramaeans, e. g. Acts 16: 1. 19: 10, and substitutes for it at once *Ἰουδαίους*.

Hellenists. According to this view of the subject, the Aramaean proselytes and their posterity were just as much Hellenists as the Greek and Roman. These last however could assuredly not be very numerous in Palestine; because those proselytes who were admitted in foreign countries by the Jews who spoke Greek, could have no special occasion to forsake their own country and establish themselves in Palestine.

2. But if there actually were among these Hellenists many Jews who spoke Greek, still it is very improbable that they were so entirely unacquainted with the language of Palestine, as is generally assumed. The Jews who sojourned in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, in Egypt, in Greece Proper, and in other regions where the Greek language was prevalent, constituted every where a sort of independent colonies, which were entirely isolated by their religion, manners, and customs, and sedulously avoided all connexion and intermixture with the natives of these countries. Such colonies are always accustomed to retain their mother tongue for a long period even in foreign countries; and it is sufficient for carrying on intercourse and commerce with the other inhabitants, when only a few among them understand the language of the country. Must we not therefore regard it as probable, that all the Jews who dwelt among the Greeks long retained their Asiatic-Aramaean language,* and troubled themselves about the language of the countries in which they lived, only so far as it was necessary in order to make themselves intelligible to the inhabitants? This seems at least to have been the case in all the large and numerous colonies of the Jews, as in Egypt,† and even in the smaller ones also, which had not

* *Judaei fere omnes—olim erant bilingues. Praeter originariam, quae ab antiquo Hebraea erat, et qua sua sacra celebrabant, vernaculam locorum, in quibus nascebantur, ediscebant. Salmasius de Hellenistica Comm. L. B. 1643. Ep. dedic. p. 29.* It is here obvious that Salmasius does not distinguish between the ancient and later Hebrew; for of the Jews who lived after the exile it cannot be affirmed, that the ancient Hebrew was their mother tongue, as is here assumed. In all Jewish colonies founded after the exile, to which are probably to be reckoned all the colonies of Jews planted in countries where Greek was spoken, no other language than the Aramaean can be considered as domesticated.

† Philo, an Alexandrine Jew, understood also Aramaean; for he rightly explains words which are not Hebrew, and belong only to the Aramaean; e. g. *Ἐσσηῖνος* (עֲשֵׂי) by *θεραπευτής*, Philo

been long separated from their mother country. Besides, the frequent journeys to Jerusalem, which the Jews scattered in foreign countries were obliged to make in obedience to their religious precepts,* and the intercourse which they maintained with the inhabitants of Palestine (Acts 18: 21), must have had no little influence upon the continuance of the Aramaean language among them. And although their mother tongue might become somewhat corrupted in a foreign land, yet it could not be difficult for them to understand the Palestine Jews; and the public services in Aramaean of the synagogues in Palestine could not be so unintelligible to them, as to render it necessary that they should have Greek synagogues of their own. There is therefore no ground for supposing, that the synagogues of the Libertines, (i. e. of Jews who had been made slaves by the Romans and afterwards set free,) of the Cyrenians, Alexandrians, etc. mentioned in Acts 6: 9, were at all distinguished from the other synagogues at Jerusalem by the use of the Greek language.

3. The assertion, that there were synagogues in Palestine in which the version of the Seventy was publicly read instead of

de Vita contemplat. init. The passage where he relates (Lib. in Flacc. p. 970. ed. Frft.) that the common people at Alexandria named king Agrippa in derision *Μαθν* (מֶרְךְ), and then proceeds thus: *Οὕτως δὲ φασιν τὸν Κύριον ὀνομάζεσθαι παρὰ Σύροις*, cannot be brought as proof of the contrary; for Philo might very well know what מֶרְךְ signified in general, without at the same time knowing that it was employed as an honorary title of the king, *τοῦ Κυρίου*. [This solution however is evidently lame; and the more general opinion is that Philo was unacquainted with Hebrew or Aramaean. Ed.]

* The Egyptian Jews also frequently made pilgrimages to Jerusalem, in order to offer sacrifices and prayers. Philo himself was once sent thither, in order to offer sacrifices in the temple in the name of his brethren in Egypt; Opp. Tom. II. p. 646. ed. Mangey. Even the common Jews of Egypt must also have gone in troops to the high festivals at Jerusalem; for among the multitude of foreign Jews, who had assembled to celebrate the passover at Jerusalem, and were compelled to remain through the investment of the city by Titus, there were not a few from Alexandria, who distinguished themselves by their brave defence against besiegers; Joseph. B. J. V. 6. 6. It would seem therefore, that the Egyptian-Jewish temple at Leontopolis, either never obtained any high degree of consideration, or at least did not long maintain it.

the Hebrew text, must simply on this account be regarded as improbable, because the supporters of this opinion have not as yet sufficiently proved, what seems so easy to be proved, that it was generally the custom even in the synagogues of the Jews who lived out of Palestine and among the Greeks, to use the Septuagint in their public religious services. Justin,* whose testimony is quoted for this purpose, says nothing more than that the Jews preserved copies of the Septuagint in the libraries of their celebrated synagogues. From this circumstance we can draw no conclusion as to the public use of them in the synagogues; for the Jews had in like manner in these libraries† translations of some of the historical books of the New Testament.—Tertullian,‡ who is also adduced as a witness, expresses himself so ambiguously, that his words may just as well be understood of the Hebrew text.—The Talmud nowhere speaks of the use of the Old Testament in the synagogues in the Greek language. The only passage§ which is supposed to allude to it, simply treats, as both Lightfoot and Hody have already remarked, of the audible recitation of the form of prayer שמע, which is taken from Deut. 6: 4—9. 9: 13—21. Num. 15: 37—41, and was well known among all Jews, because it stood upon the *Tephillin*; see Buxtorf. *Lex. Rab. Chald. Talm. sub voce*. If now the stricter Rabbins were dissatisfied, when in Cesarea, a city inhabited by Jews, Syrians, and Greeks, this form of prayer, which according to an ancient prescript|| might be recited in any language, was thus repeated aloud in the Greek language; much more may we suppose that they would have been displeased, had the text of the Old Testament been publicly read in Greek.—Finally, from the praises which Philo and Josephus bestow upon the Alexandrine version, and the use which both of them make of it in their writings, there follows

* Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 298, and in other passages quoted in H. Hody de Bibliorum textibus origin. Lib. IV. Oxon. 1704. p. 224.

† Epiphanius Opp. ed. Petav. Tom. II. p. 127. Comp. p. 342 above.

‡ Apolog. c. 18.

§ R. Levi ivit Caesaream, audiensque eos recitantes ר' שמע Hellenistice, voluit eos impedire. Talm. Hieros. Sota c. 7. See Buxtorf. *Lex. Chald.* p. 104.

|| Lingua quacunque proferri possunt sectio de muliere adulterii suspecta, confessio decimorum, lectio audi (קריית שמע), etc. Sota. Mischnae c. 7. p. 656. ed. Wagenseil.

nothing more, than that they both considered it as a faithful version, and worthy to be recommended to those who were not Jews, although it was only a private version.

4. That the version of the Seventy was of any public authority in the synagogues of Palestine, is nothing more than a hypothesis occasioned by the ambiguous word *Hellenist*; but which is founded on no one authentic historical fact, that may not be explained without this hypothesis. And it is so much the less to be regarded, because it is sufficiently refuted, partly by the grounds which may be adduced to shew the general use of the Targums among the Palestine Jews (p. 336 above); and partly by the express testimony of Epiphanius,* who was familiar both with the Hebrew and Aramaean languages, and with the usages of the Jews of Palestine.

ART. V. INTERPRETATION OF ROM. VIII. 18—25.

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

18 *Λογίζομαι γὰρ, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν και-*
ροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς.
 19 *Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν*
 20 *υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις*
 21 *ὑπετάγη, (οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα,) ἐπ' ἐλ-*
πίδι, ὅτι καὶ αὕτη ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δου-
λείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων
 22 *τοῦ θεοῦ. Οἶδαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ*
 23 *συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν*
ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυ-
τοῖς στενάζομεν, υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν
 24 *τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν. Ἐλπίς δέ*

* Opp. ed. Petav. T. I. p. 122. *Ἑβραϊκὴν δὲ διάλεκτον ἀκριβῶς εἰσὶν ἠσκήμενοι* (sc. Nazareni), *παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ πᾶς ὁ νόμος, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ τὰ γραφεῖα λεγόμενα—Ἑβραϊκῶς ἀναγιγνώσκονται, ὡσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις.* 'The Nazarenes are accurately skilled in the Hebrew dialect; for with them the whole law and the prophets and hagiographia—are publicly read in Hebrew, just as also among the Jews.'

βλεπομένη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τίς, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει ;
 25 Εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπόμονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

18 Moreover, I count not the sufferings of the present time as worthy of comparison with the glory which is to be revealed
 19 to us. For the earnest expectation of the creature is waiting for the manifestation [of this glory] of the children of
 20 God. For the creature was made subject to frailty, (not of
 21 its own choice, but by him who put it in subjection,) in hope that this same creature may be freed from the bondage of a perishing state, and [brought] into the glorious liber-
 22 ty of the children of God. For we know that all creatures sigh together and are in anguish, even to the present
 23 time. And not only so, but we who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for [our] adoption as children, the redemption of
 24 our bodies. For even we are saved [only] in hope. Now hope which is seen, is not hope ; for what a man seeth,
 25 how doth he still hope for it? But if we hope for that which we do not see, we patiently wait for it.

EVERY reader, in any good degree acquainted with either the history or the practice of sacred criticism, well knows the difficulty of satisfactorily explaining this passage. It is one of those paragraphs, which have been technically named *loci vexatissimi*, i. e. a passage often made the subject of attempt at illustration, but which has not been explained in such a manner as to give general satisfaction.

I am almost afraid that the experienced critic will regard it as a kind of presumption in me, to make a new attempt upon the verses before us. It would seem as if the ingenuity of criticism had been already exercised to the *ne plus ultra* upon it ; and as satisfaction that is general has not been attained, it may seem to be hardly congruous with becoming diffidence to expect it. Still, it is easy to go too far and to argue wrongly in this way ; and this we do, when we endeavour to excuse ourselves from all effort, because we distrust our own strength, and have great

confidence in the gigantic powers of those who have preceded us. "Every little helps," says the homely but sensible proverb. If giants have preceded us, and aimed to take off the load of obscurity which rests on the passage under consideration, but without success; it will not certainly follow that those who come after them, although of inferior strength, may not take the advantage of some lever which their predecessors overlooked, and with less strength be able to raise the weight that had not before been moved. Or to use another figure; if we who are but dwarfs, do but stand upon the giant's shoulders, it surely is not impossible that our prospect, in some cases, may be more extensive than theirs.

The deeply interesting chapter, from which the passage is selected for interpretation, renders it very desirable that we should, if possible, attain to right views of the whole. That those which I am now about to exhibit, are of this nature, I would not be understood to affirm. The most which I wish to be understood as saying, is, that they seem to me to deserve a preference to other views which are examined in the sequel, and which have been entertained by more or less of those who have written on the passage under review. All will acknowledge that a serious attempt to explain a portion of Scripture so difficult as this, if made in a becoming manner and with due diligence, deserves encouragement.

The critical reader of the Bible will often find occasion to remark, that the *general* meaning of a passage, i. e. the general design and object which the writer had in view, may be quite plain and obvious, while, at the same time, the adequate and satisfactory illustration of the *particular* phraseology which it exhibits, may be a matter of great difficulty, and perhaps even critically impossible. For example; in John 1: 12 the writer says, that the privileges of children are conferred on believers in Christ; and in verse 13 he asserts, that no kind of natural generation or descent entitles them to these privileges, but that their filiation is supernatural and divine, i. e. it is of God. It is very plain here, that he means to gainsay what the Jews maintained respecting rights and privileges of a spiritual nature, to which they considered themselves entitled, because they were the natural descendants of Abraham. But when we come to explain the meaning of each phrase by itself, viz. the expressions, οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, and οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, and οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός, we find that they lie, as yet, beyond the reach of any criticism which is entirely satisfactory.

So in the passage before us. The general object of the writer seems to be plain. His theme is contained in verse 18. "I count not the sufferings of the present time as worthy of comparison with the glory which is to be revealed to us;" i. e. I regard the present sufferings of Christians as hardly deserving of notice, because of the unspeakable glory to which they are coming, and which will be heightened by their present trials.

The theme being thus introduced, he seems to proceed in the following manner: 'Now that such a glory is yet to be revealed, (in other words, that there is a world of surpassing glory beyond the grave,) the whole condition of things or rather of mankind, in the present world, abundantly proves. Here a frail and perishable nature serves to shew, that no stable source of happiness can be found on earth. From the commencement of the world down to the present time, it has always been thus. In the midst of the sufferings and sorrows, to which their earthly existence exposes them, mankind naturally look forward to another and better world, where happiness without alloy and without end may be enjoyed. Even Christians themselves, joyful as their hopes should make them, find themselves still compelled by sufferings and sorrows to sigh and groan, and to expect a state of real and permanent enjoyment only in heaven; so that they can only say, for the present, that they are *saved*, because they hope or expect salvation in another and better world. The very fact that here they, like all others around them, are in a state of trial, and that they only hope for glory, shews that the present fruition of it is not to be expected.'

The practical conclusion from all this the apostle now proceeds to draw, viz. 'that Christians, in the midst of sufferings and trials, ought not to faint or to be discouraged, inasmuch as a glory to be revealed is in prospect, which should make them regard their present temporary sufferings as altogether unworthy to be accounted of.'

We see, then, how verses 19—24 seem to cast light on the main position of the apostle in verse 18, and his practical conclusion in verse 25. He means to impress on the minds of his readers a strong conviction, that the glory to be revealed is certain, and that it is great; and he strives to do this, by shewing that the very constitution of nature in the present world is such, that we, instinctively as it were, look away to and long after another and better world. What could he offer which could

make a deeper impression than this? 'The Being who made us, says he, made us so as to look and long for another and better world; it is a part of our nature to do so; it is a law, or a great truth, written on our hearts. Let not Christians, then, indulge in any fears of disappointment!'

In thus endeavouring to express the general views and reasoning exhibited by the passage before us, it will be seen, that I have given to *ἄνθρωπος* the sense of *mankind*, or *the human race, men in general*. I have done so because I apprehend this to be quite the most probable sense of the word. If, however, *the natural creation in general* be understood to be meant by this word, still, the general course of thought and reasoning will be the same. The only important difference will be, that in the latter case, all nature is represented as sympathizing with the distresses which Christians endure, and by its sighs and groans speaking aloud the necessity of a future state, where sorrow and distress can never come. But the comparison of this exegesis, with that which supposes *ἄνθρωπος* to mean *mankind, men in general*, I reserve for the sequel, in which we may enter into a detailed examination of particular expressions.

It has seemed to me, that one great difficulty with respect to the interpretation of this passage has been, that commentators have not sufficiently turned their attention, first to the general scope and design of the writer in introducing it, and secondly to the *usus loquendi* of several important words or expressions in it. The general object of the passage, i. e. the design or purpose which the writer had in view when he introduced it, is of the highest importance; for unless we rightly apprehend this, we may represent the author as reasoning in a very irrelevant or very inept manner, or as saying things which would at best have very little force when applied to the design which he had in view.

In accordance with the important principle contained in these suggestions, it has been my first aim to discover and represent the general course of thought in the passage, i. e. to make out, first of all, what may be properly called the *logical* commentary upon it. And if I am correct in supposing verse 18 to contain the theme or general truth to be illustrated and confirmed by the sequel; and verse 25 the practical conclusion deduced from the whole; then it would seem to follow, as a matter of course, that the intermediate verses (unless they are evidently foreign to the whole subject, which no one will pretend to aver) are to be

regarded as an illustration and confirmation of the great and glorious truth, that there is a world of rich and everlasting enjoyment, into which suffering and sorrow can never enter; and that Christians ought to cheer their hours of trial and darkness, with this assuring and animating belief.

The kind of illustration or confirmation of this, produced by the apostle, is indeed somewhat peculiar; but it is nevertheless highly striking and impressive. It seems to amount to this; viz. 'Christian brethren, be not discouraged by your sorrows and trials; for the whole human race, or all nature, sympathizes in these things, all sighing together for anguish, from the beginning down to the present time. But what does all this betoken? Surely that this is not the end of our being; that this frail and dying state is merely temporary. In this state man does, as it were, only begin to exist. He instinctively looks forward to another and a better state, in which he may go on with the expansion of all his powers, and enjoy an uninterrupted state of bliss forever. The very constitution of our being, the wants and sufferings which we feel, indicate that there is another and better state of existence to which the righteous may look with joyful hope. Wait with patience, therefore, until the appointed time shall come to enter upon that state of being.'

If I have rightly apprehended the course of thought and reasoning here, it is not unlike that which our most expert casuists and moral philosophers employ, in proving or endeavouring to prove the immortality of the soul. They say: 'God has made every thing perfect in its kind. Every plant and shrub and tree, every beast and bird and fish, in a word the whole of this lower creation, attains the summit of excellence or perfection, of which by its constitution it is capable, and for which it is designed. Man alone, unspeakably the noblest of all God's works here below, remains, at his highest point of attainment in the present world, altogether imperfect. He comes infinitely short of that, for which he is by his very nature adapted. He only is capable of boundless progress in wisdom and knowledge and virtue. It would be against all analogy, then, to suppose that his existence is limited to the few and fleeting days which are assigned him here on earth, during which he merely begins to expand. Made in the image of God himself, he must be immortal like his Creator; or else the noblest of all the Creator's works, designed to bear and reflect his image among created beings, must be more imperfectly formed than the meanest reptile; and his

mode of existence be an entire contradiction to that of all inferior beings ; an incredible anomaly, in a universe which is all order and regularity !'

This thought must surely have great weight, with a mind which believes in the perfections of God, and is accustomed to apply arguments drawn from analogy to the works of the Creator. Indeed, one cannot well resist the impression which it makes. The idea that here our state is so frail and perishable, our knowledge and improvement so imperfect at the best, compared with that of which we are capable—this idea must inspire every thinking mind with “longings after immortality,” and with an *Ahndung*, a presentiment, a kind of hope mingled with belief and desire, that immortality may be our future portion. The argument may be named an *internal* one. It is an appeal to our very constitution, our intelligent moral nature. Nor is it any the less forcible, because it is an argument of such a kind ; but rather the reverse. Belief, derived from the source of internal consciousness and the constitution of our nature, is evidently of higher certainty than what we call knowledge, viz. that which is derived from the perception of our senses, or is the result of a reasoning process. Belief of the nature which I have indicated, comprises in itself the first elements, the foundation principles, of all true knowledge.

Say not, then, that the apostle has made an appeal to an argument of little or no force, in respect to the subject of a future state of happiness. On the contrary, one might venture to affirm, that all the arguments which the wit and knowledge of men have ever brought together—all of these combined—have not one half the force to command our real and hearty belief and hope of immortality, that our own frail, imperfect, dying state has. A man who emerges from the stormy sea of passion in early life, where all is turbulence and there is scarcely room for consideration, when he comes to ask, Whence am I? Where am I going? and to feel as he must, that he is not at his own disposal, and that the world can never confer on him any real and lasting happiness—such a man comes, in his sober moments, almost by an instinct of his very nature, to look after and hope for another and better state of existence ; although it does not of course follow, that he will comply with the conditions of obtaining it. And this state of feeling, and the conviction which springs from it, is worth more than all the arguments that can be adduced, to convince him thoroughly that there is a world to come,

and that his present stage of existence is only the dawn of his being.

I would hope that it is not altogether in vain, that I have dwelt so long on the nature of the illustration or argument employed by the apostle, in order to enforce his exhortation to the church at Rome. We too need arguments and consolations, such as Paul then addressed to his fellow Christians. We too are in a frail and dying state; and the hope of a glorious immortality needs to be strengthened and cheered, that we may meet our trials with more patience and more filial submission, and may more habitually look away beyond them, to that world where "all tears shall be wiped from every eye, and sighing and sorrow forever flee away."

Such are the views which I entertain of the general import and design of the passage under review. It will be conceded, at least, that this commentary does not give a frigid or an inept sense to the whole passage. It represents it as conducing to a very important design which the apostle had in view, and which is developed in verses 18 and 25, the commencement and the close of the paragraph before us.

I proceed now to the illustration of words and phrases; in which the reader must be prepared to expect not a little difficulty, and to the right understanding of which his patient attention will be needed.

Verse 18. *λογίζομαι* here means, *I count, reckon, regard, estimate*. The classical Greek writers employed this word rather in the sense of *computing* or *reckoning*, e. g. a sum of numbers, or of *estimating* a conclusion drawn from premises by the act of reasoning.

It is difficult, at first sight, to account for the *γάρ* here, which, in nearly every instance where it is employed, (if not always and necessarily,) has reference to a preceding sentiment, fact, etc. Here it seems to be merely a particle of transition. But, although I have translated it as such, viz. by our word *moreover*, yet this word does not express the full force and design of the Greek particle. The apostle had said, in the preceding verse, "If we suffer with Christ, we shall also reign with him," i. e. we shall be exalted with him to a state of happiness and glory. In reference to our suffering with Christ, he then goes on to say in verse 18, *I regard not the sufferings*, etc. Now as this passage was evidently suggested to the mind of the writer, by the *συνεπα-*

σχομεν in the preceding verse, so *γάρ* intimates such a connexion. Yet as the writer passes on, in verse 18 seq. to a new turn of thought, and a commentary as it were on the words *συνπάσχομεν* and *συνδοξασθώμεν* in verse 17, so *γάρ* in verse 18 also indicates a transition to something which may more fully illustrate or explain these words. *Γάρ explicantis sive illustrantis est*, says Bretschneider in his lexicon upon the word.

That this particle, in itself, should necessarily denote a connexion with what precedes, and at the same time serve as a convenient particle of transition, shews well the nature of the Greek particles, and the exquisite relations of speech which they are employed to express. Our English word *moreover* is a tolerable translation of *γάρ* when employed in this way, inasmuch as it indicates that something had preceded, and also indicates transition. But the superior nature of the Greek *γάρ* is disclosed in this, viz. in indicating not simply that something had preceded, but that this was of such a nature that the sequel was designed to explain or illustrate it.

Such remarks as these may be deemed *minutiae* by some. The student, however, who designs to go deeply into the business of studying the original language of the New Testament, should be duly aware, that the particles of the Greek language are some of the most subtle and difficult of all words which it contains; and that it will cost him a much severer effort to become well acquainted with these, than with any other class of words whatever. These too are "the joints and bands" of a discourse, that express the *relation* of one part of it to another, and the logical connexion of one part with another. They make up a very important part of concinnity of style. The whole connexion of a writer's thoughts, the method of his logic, the force of his argument or illustration, depends oftentimes on the manner in which the particles of the Greek language are rendered. Need any more be said, in order to show the importance and the difficulty of these words? If so, let any one look into the lexicons, and see what efforts philologists of late have made, in order to illustrate such words as *καί*, *γάρ*, *δέ*, *ώς*, *μέν*, etc. It may with truth be said, that Passow, in his admirable Greek Lexicon, has no where distinguished himself so much, or merited so much, as in his articles on these little words. The same is true of Bretschneider, in the second edition of his Lexicon. One has only to compare these works with the early lexicons, in order to see what estimate has come

at last to be put, by skilful philologists, upon the particles of the Greek language. After all, the student must not depend on any lexicon to give him true skill in respect to the knowledge of them. Nothing but the most minute, distinguishing, and long continued practical observation of them, will answer the end in question.

The reader will pardon this digression for the sake of those who are young in the study of sacred philology. It is for those, in particular, that I am writing.

Παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ means suffering, such as Christians were then called to endure, or sufferings such as all men are exposed to endure, in the present life. The latter seems to be the preferable sense; because the reasoning of the apostle, in the context, has respect not to time then present only, but to the whole period of the present life down to its close, when a glorious reward succeeds a life of sorrow.

The latitude in which the genitive case is employed should be noted from the phrase before us. *The sufferings of the present time* surely does not mean, the sufferings which *time endures* as the subject of them, but those which Christians endure while they continue in the present world. The genitive here, as often elsewhere, is the *genitivus temporis*, i. e. it marks the time belonging to the noun which precedes it, the designation of which is intended to qualify that noun.

Ὅν ἀξία, non æquiparanda sunt, are not to be put on a level, or are not to be reputed, not to be counted or regarded. The first seems rather the more apposite sense; and then *πρός*, which follows in the construction, may be rendered in its usual sense, *with*. But if the second sense be preferred, viz. *reputed, regarded*, then *πρός* has the sense of *compared with, in comparison of*. So this preposition is sometimes used; e. g. *Ecclus. 25: 19, Every evil is small πρὸς κακίαν γυναίκος, compared with the malignity of a woman.* *Joseph. cont. Apion. II. 22, All matter is worthless πρὸς εἰκόνα τὴν τούτου, compared with the image of this [god].*

The phrase *τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, is equivalent to *ἀποκαλυφθησομένην*. The Greek could use his regular future without a helping verb; or he could, as here, use the verb *μέλλω* and the infinitive, instead of a regular future. The word *δόξα*, which here signifies *future happiness*, is used by the New Testament writers in a sense quite different from the classic one, which is, *opinion, fame, reputation*, etc. But the New

Testament meaning of *δόξα* is borrowed from the Hebrew כבוד or כְּדָר, *splendour, magnificence, excellence*. The idea of *δόξα* in the presence of God, seems to be founded upon being there in the *light* or *splendour* of his presence. Hence light is used so often in the Bible as the image of happiness. Hence too, we may see something of the plenary meaning which *δόξα* has, when used to describe a state of future happiness. In the present world, "eye hath not seen;" but when another world bursts upon the vision of Christians, after death shall have rent away the veil of mortality, there, "in God's light they will see light;" there too, they shall enjoy "everlasting light, for God will be their glory."

Verse 19. Here we have another *γάρ*, which sustains a relation to the preceding verse, like that which *γάρ* in verse 18 sustains to verse 17. The apostle in verse 18 has introduced, as an object of attention, *the glory which is to be revealed*. That there is such a glory he now proceeds to shew, or at least to adduce reasons why Christians should confidently expect it. *Γάρ*, therefore, is in verse 19 prefixed to a clause added by way of confirming the sentiment of the preceding assertion.

Ἀποκατάδοξα, *earnest expectation*, the German *Ahndung*. The etymology favours this meaning; for the word comes from *ἀπό*, and *κάρα* *head*, and *δοκέω* *to observe, look after*. The Etymologicum Magnum explains it by *τῇ κεφαλῇ προβλέπειν, to thrust forward the head and see*, i. e. to look with anxiety or eagerness; like the Hebrew לְהִוָּחֵד. The same sense the word has in Phil. 1: 20. Ernesti observes, that the word is not intensive in the New Testament (Inst. Interpr. I. § 2); but in this he seems to be plainly mistaken, if we may judge either from the composition of the word itself, or from the nature of the passages in which it stands.

We come now to the principal word, on which very much of the difficulty of the passage before us turns, viz. *κτίσις*. In order to proceed in a satisfactory manner with the investigation of it, I shall consider, in the first place, its meaning in the other passages of the New Testament where it occurs, and as compared with the corresponding Hebrew words; and then, in the second place, I shall propose and examine in order the various meanings which have been assigned to the word in this place, and endeavour to vindicate that sense to which the preference seems to belong.

I. In regard to the meanings of *κτίσις*, in all the other pas-

sages of the New Testament where it is found, excepting the one before us, they may be distributed into two classes; viz.

1. It means *the act of creation, creating*.

In such a sense it is generally conceded that it is employed in Mark 10: 6. 13: 19. Rom. 1: 20. 2 Pet. 3: 4. But the two first and the last of these significations might well be referred to no. 2, which follows. This is the proper and primary meaning of the word, according to the usual principles of the Greek language, in which words of this class commonly denote *the act of doing any thing*, they being what grammarians call *nomina actionis*. So in the Greek classics, the sense of *making, constructing, building, creating, etc.* is the one attached to this word. But in the majority of examples in which *κτίσις* occurs in the New Testament, the meaning is different from this.

2. It means *creature, created thing, any product of creating power, creation* as an existing thing.

Such a deflection from the primary meaning of a word, is very common, not only in the Greek, but in all other languages; the abstract (*nomen actionis*) passing, as grammarians say, into the concrete sense; i. e. the word which denoted action, being also used to denote the consequences or effects of that action. So here, *κτίσις, the act of creating*, is more commonly employed in the New Testament to signify the effects of this action, viz. *a thing created, res creata*.

But this second signification being in its own nature generic, is either used generically, or is also employed to designate any of the several *species* of meanings that may constitute a part of the generic one.

a) It is used in its generic sense, i. e. as meaning *created things, creation, any created thing*, in Rom. 1: 25. 8: 39. Col. 1: 15. Heb. 4: 13. Rev. 3: 14, perhaps also in Mark 10: 6. 13: 19, and 2 Pet. 3: 4. In a sense very nearly allied to this, it is used in Heb. 9: 11 to designate the *material* creation as such, in distinction from the *spiritual* one. This distinction, however, results rather from the exigency of the passage, and the distinction made here by the word *ταύτης*, than from the force of *κτίσις*.

b) *Κτίσις* is also used in a specific sense, and means *the rational creation, man, men, the world of mankind*. Thus in Mark 16: 15, *Go preach the gospel πάντη τῇ κτίσει, to all men, to every man*. Col. 1: 23, *which [gospel] has been preached ἐν πάντη τῇ κτίσει, among all nations, or to every man*.

1 Pet. 2: 13, *Be subject then πάση ἀνθρώπινῃ κτίσει, to every man, to every human being, for the Lord's sake, i. e. out of regard to the Lord Christ.* What the meaning of this is, the explanation immediately subjoined informs us; viz. εἴτε βασιλεῖ, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι· εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. i. e. 'Be subject to every man placed in authority, whether he be a king who has præminence, or a governor appointed,' etc.—These examples make it clear, that *κτίσις* is employed to designate a *specific* class of created beings, as well as created things in general.

c) The word is then sometimes employed in a more specific and limited sense still, viz. to designate the *new rational creation, those who are created anew in Christ Jesus, Christians.* Such is the meaning in 2 Cor. 5: 17, *If any one be in Christ, he is καινὴ κτίσις, a new creature.* Gal. 6: 15, *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails any thing, but καινὴ κτίσις.* This rather seems to mean, *a new act of creating, the power of the Spirit in renovating the soul.* But in both of these cases, the *special* meaning depends on *καινὴ*, rather than upon *κτίσις*.

These are all the cases in which *κτίσις* occurs in the New Testament, excepting those in the passage under examination. From these we gather the conclusion, that the *usus loquendi* allows us to assign to *κτίσις* either of the three meanings ranked under no. 2, i. e. it may be interpreted as meaning *things created* or the *natural creation, men or mankind, or lastly, Christians.* But this last meaning is made, as we have seen, by the addition of the epithet *καινὴ*.

I have only to add here, as a confirmation of the above meanings assigned to *κτίσις*, (which however are not altogether peculiar to the New Testament, see Judith 9: 12. 11: 14. Wisd. 2: 6. 16: 24. 19: 6), that the Chaldee and the Rabbinic Hebrew coincide with the usage just exhibited. The words in these languages which correspond to *κτίσις*, are בְּרִיָּה, בְּרִיָּה, בְּרִיָּה, בְּרִיָּה, בְּרִיָּה, בְּרִיָּה, which all mean *creatio, creatura, res creata*, i. e. the act of creating, and the thing created, just in the same way as *κτίσις* does. Moreover, in Rabbinic Hebrew, the plural form בְּרִיּוֹת sometimes means *homines, men, specially the heathen.* All this, we see, corresponds with the New Testament use of *κτίσις*, and explains it when a reference to the Greek classics would not. In regard to the last particular of all, viz. that בְּרִיּוֹת sometimes means the heathen, by way of degrada-

tion or contempt, it is singular that we have adopted, into vulgar English, the very same meaning of the word *creature*, and applied it in a derogatory sense to human beings; e. g. 'the creature refused to obey.'

II. We have seen what meanings are assigned to *κτίσις* by the writers of the New Testament, and what belonged to the corresponding Chaldee and Hebrew words. Which of all these, now, shall be applied to *κτίσις* in the passage before us?

That the reader may see how variously this question has been answered, I will lay before him the different interpretations given to it. These are, 1. The angels. 2. The souls (the animating principle) of the planetary worlds. 3. Adam and Eve, because they were the immediate work of creative power. 4. The souls of believers, in distinction from their bodies. 5. The bodies of believers, i. e. their dead bodies, in distinction from their souls. 6. Christians in general. 7. Christians in particular, i. e. either Jewish Christians, or Gentile Christians. 8. Unconverted men in general. 9. Unconverted men in particular, i. e. either unconverted Jews, or unconverted heathen. 10. The material creation, inanimate and animate, exclusive of rational beings. 11. The rational creation or men in general, mankind.

The mere enumeration of these opinions is enough to shew, that the passage before us has indeed been a *locus vexatissimus*. According to the plan proposed, they must all be examined. But we may make short work with most of them, without incurring the danger of being charged with any presumption.

1. *The angels.* But as the *κτίσις* here mentioned is made subject to a frail and dying state (*ματαιότητι*), and is represented as longing after *τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν νιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, it cannot be good angels; for they are not subject to such a state, and are already in possession of the glory which is to be revealed. It cannot be evil angels; for neither are they mortal, nor do they wait for (*ἀπεκδέχεται*) the glory of the future world, since they know it is impossible they should ever be made partakers of it.

2. *The souls of the planets.* This hardly seems to be worth an attempt at confutation. Yet no less a writer than Origen has gravely advanced this idea. It is, at least, worth something as a matter of curiosity, to see how the ancient fathers could philosophize. "This vanity (*ματαιότης*)," says Origen,

“is to be referred to the bodies into which the souls that before existed, have been detruded, on account of their sins in the preexistent state. Such bodies are the sun, moon, yea the earth, and the heaven. *All these have souls*, which had a previous existence; consequently they may commit sin; and so doing, they must be subject to the judgement of Christ, as well as men. These bodies, therefore, are waiting for the resurrection; and they may properly be said to hope and sigh for liberation from their present corruption.” Could one believe that such a passage as this existed in Origen, if he did not read it with his own eyes? This he may do in his *De Principiis*, cap. 7.

My readers will neither demand nor expect that I should refute this speculation of the greatest scholar among the ancient fathers. I mention it only that it may be noted, in order to determine of how much authority in matters of philosophizing about religion, the opinion of the ancient fathers sometimes is. Let him look well to it, who leans on such a broken reed!

3. *Κτίσις* means *Adam and Eve*. What induced any one to adopt such an opinion, probably was, that Adam and Eve were the immediate production of creative power; and in this respect might be called *κτίσις* with an emphasis. But to what purpose would such an exegesis be here? And then, the *κτίσις* here mentioned, has in every age of the world been sighing with anguish, even *ἄχρι του νῦν*, down to the very time when the apostle was writing. In what sense could this be predicated of our first parents?

4. To the supposition, that *the souls of believers* are designated by *κτίσις*, we may oppose, (1) The fact that no *usus loquendi* can be adduced to justify it; (2) That Heb. 12: 23 represents the spirits of the just as already *τετελειωμένοι* in heaven; and with this a multitude of other passages accord. How then can they be groaning with anguish for deliverance? It must have been some advocate of purgatory, who invented such an interpretation as this.

5. *The dead bodies of the saints*. Here again we find no *usus loquendi* to justify such an interpretation. J. A. Turretin objects to this, also, that this sense would be wholly inapposite. “How,” he asks, “would this console afflicted Christians?” I answer, that confirmation of Christian hope is the direct and immediate object of the apostle here; not consolation, except through the medium of confirmation. Then one might

say, that the redemption of the body being understood would compare well with the same thing which is represented in verse 23, as the object of expectation on the part of believers. But there is still a difficulty. How the dead bodies of all i. e. of the wicked as well as the good, should be represented by the apostle as anxiously hoping for a resurrection, it is indeed to see. Is it not true, that the resurrection of the bodies of the wicked, is the immediate precursor of their enhanced misery? Such is the scriptural view of the subject. Then can they be longing for such an event? Or what has this to do with confirming the hope of the righteous? But if you say 'the dead bodies of the wicked are longing for the resurrection of the just,' the violence of the *prosopopeia* is revolting. Moreover, should the apostle resort to such an improbable forced argument as this? Or rather, can it be called any argument at all?

6. 7. The sixth and seventh opinions may both be ranked under one head, viz. that of *Christians*. Can *κτλς*, then, mean Christians, either in general, or in particular?

a) The *usus loquendi* is wanting, to render this probable. The word *κτλς* in 2 Cor. 5: 17 and Gal. 6: 15, does not, as I already remarked, of itself mean Christians. In both cases it is connected with *καινή*. It is *καινή κτλς*, then, this only, which usage authorizes us to believe is employed in order to designate Christians. This argument alone would render the exegesis in question doubtful.

b) But we have another argument, which has been generally deemed a still more weighty one. This is, that in verse 21, the word *κτλς* designates those who are distinguished from the children of God, and who belong not to such as are now entitled to their privileges. But I cannot consider this argument to be so decisive as Flatt, Tholuck, and others think it to be. My reason is, that the expressions in verses 19, 21, are much unlike that in verse 23, where, beyond all doubt, Christians are represented as groaning within themselves and waiting for their filiation (*υιοθεσίαν*), i. e. for the consequences of, viz. the redemption of their bodies from their present, frail, and dying state. I see not, therefore, but that it is possible, in itself considered, to suppose in verses 19, 21, Christians may be represented as waiting for the glory which will be given to the children of God; although if verse 23 were stated out, the expressions there might well be taken for anti-

ones ; I mean, that *κτίσις* might, in such a case, naturally and well be understood, to designate a class of men distinct from the *υιοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ* in verse 19, and from the *τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ* in verse 21.

c) A more conclusive argument, however, is deducible from verse 23, where *αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες* seems plainly to mean Christians, as I shall in due time endeavour to shew. Conceding this, then is it quite plain, that *κτίσις* in the preceding verses cannot mean Christians, because the class of men designated in verse 23, is very clearly distinguished from the preceding class in verses 19—21, designated by *κτίσις*.

On the same ground, viz. that *κτίσις* cannot be regarded as meaning Christians in general, it must be excluded from meaning Christians in particular, i. e. either Jewish Christians or Gentile Christians. How are these to be distinguished from "those who had the first fruits of the Spirit?" Even supposing that *ἀπαρχή* means here *special, miraculous gifts*, (as some believe,) we may ask, Were there no Jewish Christians who possessed these? Surely they above all others possessed them. But still, Were there no Gentile Christians who possessed them? This will not be denied. If we look into the first epistle to the Corinthians, we find there a graphic account of the special gifts of the Spirit, which leaves no room to doubt that they were distributed to Gentile as well as to Jewish Christians. Still stronger is the argument, if we suppose (as I shall endeavour hereafter to shew that we must suppose) *ἀπαρχήν* here to mean, *the prelibation, the foretaste, the earnest* of future glory, which is common to all Christians. For as those who have this *ἀπαρχήν*, are here plainly and explicitly distinguished from those denominated *κτίσις* above; so if these are Christians in general, as they clearly seem to be; it follows that *κτίσις* above is not used to designate Christians, either Christians in general, or Jewish or Gentile Christians in particular. Neither of these classes were distinguished from other Christians, by the exclusive possession of miraculous gifts, or the exclusive possession of the earnest of the heavenly inheritance; and there seems, therefore, to be no ground for making a distinction of such a nature. It must necessarily follow, that if *κτίσις* means either Jewish Christians, or Gentile Christians, as such, then this class of Christians did not partake of the *ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος*; for those who did partake of it are clearly distinguished from those indicated by *κτίσις*. But inasmuch as both these classes of Christians did partake of

the gift in question, so neither of them can be designated here by *κτίσις*.

I should not have dwelt so long on this head, had not such critics as Le Clerc, Nösselt, Schleusner, and others *magni nominis*, defended the exegesis in question.

8. 9. The eighth and ninth opinions may also be classed under one head. These are, that *κτίσις* means either unconverted men in general as such, or unconverted men in particular, viz. Jews, or Gentiles. In regard to the specific meaning here assigned to *κτίσις*, I cannot see any tolerable ground of support for it. Why should unconverted Jews be represented as peculiarly exposed to a frail and dying state? Or why should unconverted Gentiles be so represented? Surely there is no good reason for any distinction here, as all are equally exposed to the miseries of life. We cannot therefore admit the exegesis which here gives a specific meaning to *κτίσις*, limiting it either to unconverted Jews or to unconverted Gentiles.

More probable is the interpretation, which assigns to *κτίσις* the meaning of *unconverted men in general*. In this case, it is easy to make a plain and evident distinction between *κτίσις* in vs. 19—22, and *οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες*, in v. 23. Substantially I think this to be the right meaning. But I would not assign to it the signification simply of *unconverted men*. I apprehend the meaning to be the same as in Mark 16: 15. Col. 1: 23. 1 Pet. 2: 13, i. e. *man, men, mankind in general*. But of this, and of the objections urged against it, I shall say more in the sequel.

On the whole, then, we have reduced our multiplex interpretations down to two, viz. *the material creation in general*, animate and inanimate; and *the rational creation, or mankind in general*. These remain to be carefully examined. Critics of high rank and great abilities, are divided between these two interpretations.

10. I commence with the first of these two meanings, viz. that of *the material creation, the world in general, or the universe*, exclusive of rational beings. This has had many defenders both in ancient and modern times. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, Ambrose, Luther, Koppe, Doddridge, Flatt, Tholuck, and a multitude of others have been its advocates. Flatt and Tholuck, in their recent commentaries, have collected all which has been said in its favour, besides ad-

vancing some things peculiar to themselves. What they have brought forward, deserves a serious examination.

That *κτλς* might be employed to indicate the natural creation around us, consisting of things animate and inanimate, may be seen by examining the *usus loquendi* of the word, under no. 2. 4, p. 374 above. On this part of the subject, there can be no just ground of controversy among philologists. But is it so employed in the passage before us? This is the only question that affords any room for dispute.

Tholuck argues that it is so employed, from two sources; first, from the connexion in which it stands, and the predicates which are assigned to it; and secondly, from both Jewish and Christian belief respecting the renewal of the natural world, at a future period.

Under the first head of argument, he says, that the more usual meaning of *κτλς* is the *natural world*. If he means by this to aver that the word has this signification in a majority of the instances in which it is employed in the New Testament, an inspection of p. 374 above will convince the reader that he is mistaken. But still, the fact that the word may very naturally, in itself considered, be employed in such a way, I freely concede, and this I have already more than once intimated.

His next argument is, that *αὐτῆ ἢ κτλς* in v. 21, indicates a descent from the noble to the ignoble part of creation. He means, that *αὐτῆ ἢ κτλς* signifies as much as to say: 'Not only does the nobler part of creation long for a disclosure of the glory which is to be revealed, but even *this inferior creation*, of which I am now speaking, also longs for the period when this disclosure shall be made.'

The answer to this is, that such an exegesis of *αὐτῆ ἢ κτλς* would necessarily imply, that a higher and nobler *κτλς* had been already mentioned in the preceding context, with which this inferior one is now compared. Had such mention been made, there would be some ground for the remark of Tholuck. But as there is no mention of this nature, I do not see how we can give a *comparative* sense to *αὐτῆ ἢ κτλς*. In order to do this, must not something have been mentioned, with which we may compare it? The expectation of the *nobler* part of creation, is first mentioned in v. 23, *υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεδεχόμενοι*. The force of *αὐτῆ ἢ κτλς*, I apprehend, must therefore be made out in another way. Paul had just said, *ἡ κτλς* is made subject to a frail and perishing state (*ματαιότητι*), with the hope, i. e. in a con-

dition or in circumstances in which it is permitted to hope, that *καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις*, even this very same creature may be freed, etc. Tholuck does not seem to have noted, that the expression is not simply *αὐτὴ*, but *καὶ αὐτὴ*, which necessarily refers it to the preceding *κτίσις*, and means *even the very same κτίσις*, viz. the frail and perishing *κτίσις* which had just been described, is still placed in a state in which it may indulge the hope of deliverance, etc. The force of *καὶ αὐτὴ*, then, seems to consist, in designating that very same perishing *κτίσις* which the writer had just described, as being in a state to indulge a hope of obtaining freedom from this wretched condition. If this be correct, then its force does not consist in any implied comparison with a nobler *κτίσις*, which indulged the like hopes.

A third reason of Tholuck for the signification which he here assigns for *κτίσις*, is, that in verse 22, *πάντα ἡ κτίσις* is mentioned.

But why the apostle could not say *πάντα ἡ κτίσις*, if he meant the world of *rational* beings, just as well as he could if he meant the world of *nature*, I am not aware; and more especially so, since in Mark 16: 15 and Col. 1: 23, this very expression is made use of (*πάντη τῇ κτίσει—ἐν πάντῃ τῇ κτίσει*), in order to denote the universality of the rational world.

Finally, Tholuck avers, that the predicates *ματαιότης* and *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς* (verses 20, 21) more naturally belong to the material creation.

But this I cannot see. Above all, I cannot see it, when the apostle says, that the *κτίσις* was made subject *ματαιότητι, οὐχ ἐκούσα, not voluntarily, not of its own choice*. Does this belong more naturally, then, to the material than the rational creation? Of which is choice more naturally predicated? Then again, is not *ματαιότης*, a *frail and dying state*, as easily and naturally to be predicated of men, as it is of the material world? And taken as a whole, is not the latter far less subject to *ματαιότης* than the race of men? Once more, is not *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*, the *bondage of a mortal or perishing condition*, as naturally predicated of men, as it is of the material world? Rather, is it not much more naturally applied to human beings, than it is to the world in which they live?

None of the reasons, then, assigned by Tholuck for the exegesis which he defends, that are drawn from the exigency of the passage, seem to be well grounded. So much is true, viz. that the *usus loquendi*, in itself considered, would admit the

sense which he gives to *κτious*. But that the *exigentia loci* renders probable this meaning, does not seem in any good degree to be made out.

We come, next, to the second class of reasons assigned by Tholuck in defence of his interpretation; viz. those derived from the Jewish and Christian belief respecting the renovation of the natural world, at a future period.

It has ever been a matter of difficulty to my mind, to know how the apostle could speak of the natural world, as earnestly expecting or looking for the *revelation of the sons of God*, or as hoping to be freed from its state of bondage, and brought to enjoy the *glorious liberty of the children of God*. Tholuck and Flatt seem to have felt the same difficulty; and in order to remove it, both of them resort to the doctrine of a future renovation of the natural world. Both Jews and Christians, they aver, believed in this; and moreover, they maintain, that it has a foundation in the New Testament itself. Such being the case in their view, they interpret the expectation of the natural world, or its longing after the manifestation of the sons of God, as a personification of this world, and as a representation of it (being thus personified) in a state of anxious expectation of its own future and glorious renovation, at the general resurrection of the saints.

To examine this doctrine at length, would require a volume, instead of a paragraph in a brief essay. The disputes which have existed in ancient and modern times, also, and which have recently come up in our mother country with fresh vigour, shew what specious arguments men find, or think they find, in the Scriptures, in favor of such an opinion. The discussion in which I am engaged, obliges me not to pass this matter by in entire silence. First, then, let us glance at the Scripture argument, by which it is said to be supported; and secondly, at the traditional sayings which are brought to favour it.

The passages of Scripture mainly relied on, are 2 Pet. 3: 7—12. Rev. 21: 1. Is. 11: 6 seq. 65: 17 seq. Heb. 12: 26 seq. Hints of the same doctrine are supposed to be contained in Matt. 13: 38 seq. 19: 28, and Acts 3: 21. Brief suggestions respecting these passages, are all which any reader will here expect.

My first remark on them all is, that if literally understood, they present impossibilities, not to say absurdities; if not literally understood, then they contain no proof of the doctrine in question. If this can be made out, then it is unnecessary to proceed any farther in respect to the subject now in question.

The passage in 2 Pet. 3: 7—12, declares that the present heavens and earth are to be destroyed by fire, and that we are to look for a *new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*; i. e. the old creation is to be destroyed, and a new one to come in its place. But what the nature of this is to be, except that righteousness is to dwell in it, Peter does not give any hint at all. To draw the conclusion that a new creation of the heavens and the earth, here means a new, literal, material creation, made out of the old one, and differing from the first only in its degree of perfection, would be the same as to argue, that because the Bible represents a Christian man as being *born again, raised from the dead, and created anew*, therefore his spiritual change in regeneration is to be regarded as being *literally* one, or rather each, of these changes. Would any one subscribe to such an exegesis?

But admitting that the passage in Peter leaves the question doubtful, (which is the most that can be claimed for it,) still the passage in Rev. 21: 1, which is so confidently appealed to, is a very unfortunate proof-passage for the advocates of a literally new earth. The writer says, *I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and there was no longer any sea.* This leaves the question, of course, just where Peter does; and here Tholuck, Flatt, and others, stop in their quotation. But this will not do. Let us see what is the capital of this new world. *And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven,* verse 2. But what kind of city is this? Verses 10—27 and chap. 22: 1—5, give an ample description of it. It is a city with twelve gates, three on each side; the wall has twelve foundations, (I suppose the writer means twelve tiers of foundation stones,) with the apostles' names engraven on them; it is an exact quadrangle; it is 12,000 *stadia* or furlongs long and broad, and of the same height, verse 16; (what *height* here means I know not, unless the writer designs to represent the whole city as one great palace or building;) the walls are 144 cubits high; the twelve rows of the foundation stones, are twelve different kinds of precious stones, verses 19, 20; the twelve gates are twelve pearls, verse 21; the streets are of pure transparent gold, verse 21; it has no sun nor moon to shine on it, (a *new* world therefore indeed,) but God is its light, verse 23; the tree of life grows there, in the midst of the streets, bearing twelve manner of fruits, and producing each month in the year, 22: 2; and finally, there is never to be any night there, 22: 5.

Will any one now even pretend that all this is to be literally understood? If so, then heaven, or the new Jerusalem, the abode of the blessed after their resurrection, is only 12,000 furlongs, i. e. 1500 miles square! A space, I hope and trust, quite too small to contain all those who will be redeemed by a Saviour's blood.

But if the new Jerusalem, the capital of the new earth, is not a literal one, neither is the new earth itself a literal one. How can it be so, when there is to be no sun nor moon to shine upon it?

We may now make less delay upon the remaining passages. The context of the one just examined (Rev. 21: 1) has let us into the real design and conceptions of the writer; which is simply an intention to make a splendid picture of the world of glory, by borrowing the colours of natural objects which attract our attention and command our admiration.

Is. 11: 6 seq. is still less to the purpose of those, who contend for the interpretation which I am controverting. Let the reader open his Bible and read on to verse 10, and then simply ask, Whether it is possible that the writer designed all this to be literally understood? Besides, the whole passage seems to relate to the prevalence of the Christian religion *before* the end of the world; not the condition of the world after the general judgement.

Is. 65: 17 is a passage of the very same nature as that in 2 Pet. 3: 13. From this passage in Isaiah, it seems altogether probable that Peter borrowed his expression in 2 Pet. 3: 13. I need not say again, that these general expressions leave the point under examination just where they find it. It must be arguing *a priori*, to decide that they are to be literally understood. It seems sufficiently certain, from the passage in the Revelation above examined, that they are not to be so interpreted.

Again, Heb. 12: 26—28 is of precisely the same general nature; and the context here affords no ground whatever to give it a literal interpretation.

As to the hints in Matt. 13: 36—43, I believe they never would be taken, except by those who had already formed their opinion about the subject under examination. I am sure I cannot here find such significant hints. It is only the punishment of the wicked, and the glorious reward of the righteous in the kingdom of heaven, which is designated.

Matt. 19: 28, which speaks of a *παλιγγενεσία*, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, is as little to the purpose. Who can doubt that all things will then be regenerated, renewed, i. e. that there will be a new heaven and a new earth? But whether in a literal sense, is not determined by the mode of expression, nor by the context.

Of the same nature is Acts 3: 21, which speaks of the *ἀποκατάστασις* of all things, i. e. the making of all things new, just in the sense which the other passages above cited convey.

How can passages of this nature be urged as having a literal meaning, after reading Rev. c. 21, and 22: 1—5? Or if this does not satisfy the mind, then compare passages of a similar nature, viz. those which have respect to the Messiah's kingdom on earth, his spiritual kingdom *before* the end of time, and during the gathering in of his saints. What immeasurable absurdities and contradictions must be involved in a literal exegesis here? For example; from Is. 2: 1—4 and Micah 4: 1—3, one might prove that in the time of the Messiah, the temple of the Lord is to be built on a mountain, placed upon the top of the highest mountains any where to be found, and that there all the nations of the earth will assemble to offer their devotions. Is. 11: 6—9 would prove that all the brute creation are to experience an absolute change of their very nature; the lion is to eat straw like the ox; the asp and the cockatrice are no more to retain their venomous power. Is. 9: 7 would prove, that the literal throne of David is to be occupied by the Messiah, and that he is to rule in his capacity as literal king, without intermission, and without end. Is. 25: 6—8 would prove, that a feast of fat things and of rich wines is to be made for all nations, and that all suffering and sorrow and death are to be abolished. Is. 35: 1—10 would prove that the deserts of the earth are to be filled with living streams and exuberant herbage and trees, and that all the ransomed of the Lord are to repair to the literal mount Zion, where they will have uninterrupted and everlasting pleasure. Is. 43: 18—21 would prove the same thing respecting the deserts; and also that the beasts of the field, the dragons, and the owls, shall be among the worshippers of God. Is. 55: 1—13 would prove, not only that wine and milk are to be had, in the days of the Messiah, without money and without price, but that the mountains and the hills will break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands! Is. 60: 15—22 would prove that Israel is to feed on the milk of

the Gentiles, and to be nourished by the breasts of kings; and also that there will be no sun by day, nor moon by night, but God himself, by his own splendour, is to make their everlasting light, so that no more night will ever be known. (The very same things are said respecting the new Jerusalem, in Rev. 21: 23; are they literal there?) Is. 66: 22—24 would prove, that all nations are to come, from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, and worship before the Lord in Jerusalem.

But I refrain; for enough has been said fully to expose the principle of exegesis now in question. Is it possible for any man, in his sober senses, to construe all these passages, and many others like them, in a literal manner? Not to speak of the absurd consequences which would follow, many of them would be contradictory to each other. This is enough, therefore, to shew that such a mode of interpretation is utterly out of the question.

But why are not such passages just as reasonably construed in a literal manner, as those which have respect to the kingdom of God *after* the general resurrection? Must it not be true, that in its very nature this kingdom will be still more spiritual than that of the Messiah during its preparatory or disciplinary state? This will not be denied. Is there not reason *a fortiori*, then, why we should understand the language respecting this kingdom as figurative; in just the same manner as we are obliged to do, with regard to all the descriptions in the Bible of the heavenly world? Nay, I may add, that the idea of Flatt, Tholuck, and many others, about a renewed earth becoming the literal abode of the blessed, after the resurrection, is directly at variance with the other declarations of the Scriptures. Paul represents Christians at the general resurrection as *caught up to meet the Lord in the air*, i. e. as ascending to heaven, and *as so being ever with the Lord*, viz. in heaven, 1 Thess. 4: 17. So all the Bible; believers are to dwell with God, to be with him, to see his face, to enjoy his presence, to stand at his right hand. The apostle Paul says, that at the resurrection this mortal will put on immortality, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, that this natural body is to become a spiritual body, and be made like unto Christ's glorified body, 1 Cor. 15: 44, 50, 53; and all this, that saints may be glorified with Christ. But where is Christ's body? And where does he dwell? And where do believers go, when they are "absent from the body," in order

that they may be "present with the Lord?" Our Saviour represents the saints at the resurrection, as becoming incapable of all earthly pleasures, and as being made like to the angels of God in heaven, Matt. 22: 29, 30. And must we believe, after all this, that the present earth, when it has undergone an emendation, is still to be the abode of spiritual bodies, of saints made like to their Lord and Redeemer? Believe it who may, I must first see all these and the like texts blotted out from the Bible; nay, my whole views respecting the very nature of future happiness must undergo an entire transformation, as great as the earth itself is supposed by the writers in question to undergo, before I can admit such an exegesis as they defend. It contradicts analogy; it contradicts the nature of the case; it contradicts the express declarations of the Saviour and of his apostles.

Thus much, then, in respect to the Scriptures concerning the new state after which the natural creation is represented as sighing, in the passage under consideration. As to the proofs adduced, to shew that the Jews believed in the renewing of the natural world under the Messiah, and that Christians have in many cases patronized this sentiment; I concede the whole, without a word by way of calling it in question. I have merely one remark to make on the Rabbinical passages adduced by Tholuck, for the purpose of establishing the fact that such was the Jewish doctrine; and this is, that all these testimonies are from Rabbins who lived a considerable period after the New Testament was written, and will hardly go to satisfy even his own mind, that the Jews of our Saviour's time indulged in such speculations. It must be admitted, however, that the manner in which they construed all the predictions of the Old Testament respecting the Messiah's kingdom, would naturally lead to such an opinion. In their view, the reign of the Messiah was to be literal. All the descriptions of the Old Testament respecting it were to be literally interpreted; and of course, they might easily adopt the conclusion, that in fact a literally new heaven and new earth were to be created.

That there have been Christians who have partially adopted the same exegesis; yea, that this interpretation began very early to exist in the church, is well known. The disputes of ancient and modern times about *Chiliasm*, are too well understood to need any particular description here. The efforts on the part of critics, even of some very learned and respectable ones, to prove a return of Christ to this earth, and a visible reign of a

thousand years here, are equally well known, to every well-read critic. But how can it satisfy an inquiring mind, which reads and compares Scripture with Scripture, to be told that Chrysostom, and Theodoret, and Jerome, and Augustine, and Ambrose, and Luther, and Bucer, and Calvin, and others, believed in such a renewal of the natural world? How, I am ready to ask, could any one have ever dreamed of such an interpretation, which is in the very face of all analogy, and of the express declarations of the Scriptures respecting the condition of the saints after the general resurrection?

Calovius, who puts upon *κρίσις* the same construction as Flatt and Tholuck (*Biblia Illustrata* II. 138), is still very decided against the opinion, that we are to expect a renewal of the natural world. "The object," says he "which the *κρίσις* expects, is not the renewing of itself, but the manifestation of the sons of God. The renewing of created things is neither here, nor any where else, mentioned in the Scriptures. They were formed for the use of man; but in the present world, not in the future one. Nay, we know that all things will be burned up, not renewed, 2 Peter 3: 13. Peter says, there will be a new heaven and a new earth created; not that the old one will be renewed. In this he is not to be literally understood; but he portrays to us the things of another world by borrowing the things of the present world in order to constitute his picture; thus parabolically illustrating our future happy state, by calling the place of our residence a new heaven and a new earth. The material heavens and earth are to perish;—and Christ has already prepared mansions for those who love him, John 14: 2; the spirits of the just made perfect are already with Christ in heaven, Hebrews 12: 23; yea, a kingdom has been prepared for them, from the foundation of the world, Matt. 25: 34."

Thus Calovius, and not a little to the purpose. J. A. Turretin, no mean critic surely, if we may judge of him by his Lectures on Romans and Thessalonians which are contained in his works, says of the interpretation in question: "Quis dicat expectationem creaturarum, gloriæ filiorum Dei participes esse, . . . fuisse quid notissimum?" And then he adds, much to the purpose indeed: "Quid pertineret illa ad consolandos fideles afflictos at vexatos? qui tamen scopus est sermonis istius apostolici." *Opp.* II. 358. It were easy to add other opinions; but I consider it to be unnecessary.

I return from this digression; if that indeed must be called

digression, into which the examination of the exegesis given to our text has obliged me to go. I only add here, that if any have the curiosity further to examine the Jewish speculations concerning the renovation of the earth during the times of the Messiah, they may consult Tholuck's Comm. on Rom. 8: 19; also Corodi, *Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, I. 368 seq. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, II. 826 seq. But how ideas, such as he will here find, differ from the speculations in Virgil's *Poëto*, it would be difficult perhaps to make out.

If I am correct in the suggestions which I have now made, it follows that the exegesis which interprets *κτίσις* as meaning the *natural* world, cannot be supported by such considerations respecting its renewal, as Flatt, Tholuck, and others have suggested. For unless there be some good reason to believe in a renewal of the natural world, i. e. such an one as they speak of, it will be acknowledged that there must be something very forbidding in their interpretation of *κτίσις*; for how can the apostle be supposed to represent the natural world as looking for and longing after the spiritual glory of the redeemed? What has the natural world to do with such a glory?

I have examined the arguments brought to support the interpretation in question; and now I have some positive objections to make against this interpretation, which have not yet been suggested. First, then, I cannot divest myself of the difficulty made by the boldness, not to say violence, of the *prosopopeia* that is rendered necessary by the interpretation which I am examining. We are referred, indeed, to Is. 55: 12. Ps. 98: 8. Hab. 2: 11. Ezek. 31: 15, and Baruch 3: 34, as examples of life and speech and feeling being attributed to inanimate things. That this is sometimes done in the Scriptures, is undoubtedly true. But all the instances alluded to, are in poetry; with the exception only of the passage in Baruch, which is an imitation of poetry. Does it follow that a *prosopopeia* even exceeding any of these in point of boldness and extent, is equally probable in argumentative prose? I must hesitate here; and so, I must think, will most others who look attentively at the subject.

Secondly, I have a difficulty as to the logical commentary of the passage, provided we adopt the interpretation defended by Tholuck. Let us examine this for a moment. The apostle begins by saying, that present afflictions should not be laid to heart by Christians, because of the future glory which is reserved for them. What now is demanded, in order that this

should be believed, and that Christians should regulate their thoughts and conduct by it? Why plainly nothing more is required, than that they should cherish a confirmed belief of it, a steadfast hope that such glory will be bestowed. Such is the conclusion in verse 25. But how is this hope to be animated and supported? Plainly by considerations which add to the assurance, that future glory is in prospect. And what are these? They are, that God has enstamped on our very nature the desire of such a state; he has placed us in such a frail and dying condition, that the whole human race naturally and instinctively look to such a state and hope for it. The present is manifestly a state of trial; even Christians, who have the earnest of future glory within themselves, are not exempt from this. But the very fact that we are in a state of trial and probation, naturally points to an end or result of this. And what is such an end, but a state of *future* happiness? for here, happiness in a higher sense is not to be attained.

But suppose now that the material world is that which sighs after and hopes for deliverance from its present frail and perishable state; has this a direct bearing on the subject in question? The answer must be in the negative; so thought Turretin, as the quotation made above will shew. But then it may be said, that it has a bearing upon it by way of implication; because the renovation of the material world is necessarily connected with the future happiness of the saints. In this point of view, I acknowledge it would not be irrelevant. But is not this less direct, less forcible, less convincing, than the appeal to the wants and desires of which every human breast is conscious? Of two modes of exegesis, either of which is possible, I must prefer that which imparts the most life and energy to the reasoning and argument of the writer.

Thirdly, I have another substantial difficulty with the interpretation under examination. It is this; if *κρίσις* means the material or natural world, on the one hand, and *αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες* means Christians on the other, (which Tholuck and Flatt both avow,) then here is a *lacuna* which cannot well be imagined or accounted for. Christians are subject to a frail and dying state, but are looking for a better one; the natural world is in the same circumstances; but the world of men in general, the world of rational beings who are not regenerate, have no concern or interest in all this; they are not even mentioned. Can it be supposed now, that the apostle has made

such an important, unspeakably important, omission as this, in such a discourse and in such a connexion? The *natural, physical* world brought into the account, but the world of perishing *men* left out? I must have confirmation "strong as proof from holy writ," to make me adopt an interpretation that offers such a manifest incongruity.

Such are my reasons for not regarding as weighty, the arguments offered by the advocates of the interpretation I am examining; and such are my positive grounds for rejecting it.

11. I come, at last, to the interpretation which I have supposed above to be the correct and proper one, viz. that *κτίσις* most probably means *men, mankind in general*, as stated on p. 374 above, no. 2. *b.* That such an interpretation is agreeable to the *usus loquendi*, is clear from the statement there made. It only remains then to inquire, whether it accords with the nature of the passage in which the word stands, and whether it can be vindicated from the objections made to it.

As to its accordance with the nature of the passage, and with the argument which the writer purposes to employ, I must refer the reader (in order to save repetition) to my general statement of the meaning of the passage on page 366 above, and also to p. 391, where I have had occasion briefly to recapitulate the same thing, in order to compare this statement with the claims made by a different exegesis.

It remains, then, only that I take some notice of the objections urged against this interpretation. Flatt has done most justice to the side of objections, and I shall therefore first examine the arguments which he produces.

1. *Κτίσις* in verses 19, 21, is distinguished from *ἡμιὶ θεοῦ*. How then can it mean *all men*, of which *ἡμιὶ θεοῦ* constitute a part?

The answer to this is, that there is not an *antithesis* here of *κτίσις* to *ἡμιὶ θεοῦ*, (which the objection assumes,) but only a distinction of species from genus. 'Mankind,' says the apostle, i. e. men in general, 'have always been in a frail and dying state, have felt this, and have longed after a higher and better state.' In verse 23 he goes on to say, 'Even those whom one might expect to be exempt from this, i. e. Christians themselves who already have an earnest of future glory, have not been exempt from such a condition.' Here is indeed a distinction, but no antithesis. In fact, the nature of the case does not admit antithesis; for both the *κτίσις* and *οἱ τῆν ἀπαρ-*

αὐτῶν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, are partakers of the same frail and dying state. The distinction therefore is of a different nature from that of antithesis. It is made, I apprehend, in the manner stated above.

2. 'How could the apostle represent the *κρίσις* in this sense, i. e. heathen men and all unconverted men, as seeking and sighing after *the liberty of the children of God*, when he every where avers that they are estranged from God, and at enmity with him, and are ignorant of the things of the Spirit?'

But here the *argumentum ad hominem* may be applied to good purpose. How could the apostle represent the natural or inanimate creation as longing after such a happiness, or any other like to it? You reply, 'It is *prosopopeia*.' It is so, truly, if you interpret it rightly; and personification of the boldest kind, so bold that I know not how we can admit it, while it has so much of incongruity in it.

I quit this part of the subject, however, and proceed. Is there not, in the human breast, a longing and sighing after immortality? Hear Cicero, who puts these words into the mouth of Cato, when speaking of Elysium: "O praeclarum diem, cum ad illud divinatorum animorum concilium coetumque proficiscar, cumque ex hac turba et colluvione discedam! Proficiscar enim, non ad eos solum viros, de quibus ante dixi; verum etiam ad Catonem meum, quo nemo vir melior natus est, nemo pietate praestantior;" *de Senectute*. Listen also to Seneca: "Juvabat de aeternitate animorum quaerere, imo mehercule credere. Credebam enim facile opinionibus magnorum virorum, rem gratissimam promittentium, magis quam probantium. Dabam me spei tantae." In other passages the same writer descants upon the meanness of affairs pertaining to the present life, unless one rises in his views above human objects. "Sic creatura," adds Turretin, to whom I am indebted for these quotations, "sic creatura abhorrebat a *vanitate* cui subjecta est. Sic sperabat se aliquando a servitute illa liberatum iri." *Opp. II.* 361.

Who can refuse to see how applicable all this is to our present purpose? Tholuck and Flatt would themselves say, that this sighing after immortality is one of the most convincing of all arguments, that men are truly immortal. Does not the fact, that all nations have had their Elysium, establish the allegation that such a longing is innate, i. e. pertaining to our rational nature? Or if this be questioned, is it not certain, that the present un-

satisfying, frail, dying condition of the human race, does lead them to feel their need of a better state, and to sigh after it?

This does not prove, indeed, that they long for the heaven of the Christian, principally as a place of purity and freedom from all sin. That they have specific views of this, and desires after it, is not true; and if they had, we could not suppose them to desire it in respect to its holiness. But it is not necessary to suppose this, in reference to the object of the apostle's argument. It is not a specific view of heaven simply as a place of purity and holiness, which he here represents Christians themselves as entertaining; for in verse 23, he adverts to them as hoping for *the redemption of their bodies*, i. e. an exemption from the pains and sufferings to which their frail bodies are continually exposed. May not the unconverted long to be delivered from suffering and sorrow? Do they not, in this respect, desire future happiness? I acknowledge they are unwilling to employ the proper means of obtaining it; and that there are actually, as the Christian revelation holds it up to view, things in it which would not of themselves be at all desirable to the unconverted; but do they not, after all, in some definite and important sense, hope and wish for another and better world? This will not be denied, after reading the above extracts from Cicero and Seneca; and this being admitted, it is all which the apostle's argument here demands.

What he means to say, I take to be in substance this: 'The very nature and condition of the human race point to a future state; they declare that this is an imperfect, frail, dying, unhappy state; that man does not, and cannot, attain the end of his being here; and even Christians, supported as they are by the earnest of future glory, still find themselves obliged to sympathize with all others in these sufferings, sorrows, and deferred hopes.'

I acknowledge that if one insists on construing the *revelation of the sons of God*, and *the glorious liberty of the children of God*, as being so specific that they cannot be predicated of the hopes of the world at large, he may make difficulty with the exegesis which I am defending. So Flatt and Tholuck have done. But how should they both have overlooked the fact, that this same rigid interpretation applied to their own mode of construing *κτλεις*, makes a difficulty still greater? For in what possible sense can the natural world be hoping for or expecting the glorious liberty of the children of God? I mean, if these expres-

sions be interpreted, (as they in making their objections insist that they must be,) in their specific and rigid sense.

If there be any difficulty here then, it is evidently less on the ground which I take, than on the other. It is not enough to make objections to a particular mode of interpretation; but one should shew that his own is not liable to objections still greater. And surely it must be deemed a greater difficulty, to represent the natural world as expecting *the glorious liberty of the children of God*, than it is to suppose that immortal beings, made in the image of God, and made sensible of the insufficiency of the present world to render them happy, should anxiously look for another and better state. It is not necessary for the apostle's argument, to shew that they look for this in the way that Christianity would direct them to do, nor even that they have any good grounds in their present state to expect personally a happier condition in future. If even the wicked, who love this world, are not satisfied with it, and are made to sigh after another and more perfect state, then follows what the apostle has designed to urge, viz. the conclusion that God has strongly impressed on our whole race, the conviction that there is a better state, and that it is highly needed.

The ground which Noesselt and others take respecting *ἄλλοις*, viz. that it means Christians in general, would indeed free the whole passage from any objections of the kind under consideration, inasmuch as they might be said, without any limitation, to expect *the revelation of the sons of God*. But this interpretation is pressed with other insuperable difficulties, as has been already stated. It makes no distinction between *ἄλλοις* and *ἰσοὶ θεοῦ* or *τέκνα θεοῦ* in verses 19, 21, when the writer has plainly made one; and then it understands *αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες* of only the apostles, or such Christians as were endowed with miraculous gifts; which cannot in any tolerable manner be defended.

I come then, by virtue of such considerations as have been suggested, to prefer the interpretation which assigns to *ἄλλοις* the sense of *mankind, men in general*, to any other of the proposed methods of explanation. But in so doing, I do not aver that there are no difficulties in the way, or that an ingenious critic can raise none. This is not the question. The more proper question is, whether the difficulties that lie in the way of this interpretation, are not less than those which can be thrown in the way of any of the other methods which have been discus-

sed? I can only say, that they seem to me clearly to be less; and therefore I feel compelled to embrace this exegesis, until a more probable one is proposed. It has been defended by Lightfoot, Locke, J. A. Turretin, Semler, Rosenmüller, Ammon, Usteri, Keil, and many others. This indeed is in itself no reason for receiving it; but it shews, at least, that the difficulties attending it have not been regarded as insuperable, by men of very different theological views, and of no small attainments.

I now proceed with the interpretation of the remainder of the passage, which, for the most part, is attended with but little difficulty, the meaning of *κτίσις* being once settled.

Τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται, *expects, or waits for the revelation of the sons of God*; i. e. the period when the sons of God, in their true state, endowed with all their honours and privileges, shall be fully disclosed. This will be at the general judgement; when the Father who seeth in secret will reward them openly. Here they are in obscurity; the world knoweth them not. They are like to the seven thousand of old, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, but who were not known even to the prophet Elijah. However, it will not always be so. The day is coming, when they will shine forth as the sun in his strength, and as the stars forever and ever, in the kingdom of their God and Father.

In what sense the *κτίσις ἀπεκδέχεται*, *expects or waits for* such a revelation, has been already stated, more than once, in the preceding pages, and therefore it needs not to be here repeated. I take the generic idea of future happiness to be the main design of the writer in this case, although the special import of the expression goes, as I have intimated before, much farther.

Verse 20. *Τῆ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἢ κτίσις ὑπετάγη*, *for the creature, i. e. mankind, was subjected to a frail and dying state*. That *ματαιότης* here has the sense thus assigned to it, is clear from the exegesis of it in verse 21, viz. *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*, which is there used instead of repeating *ματαιότης*. Such as wish for further confirmation as to this sense of the word, may consult in the Sept. Ps. 61: 9. 38: 5. Ecc. 1: 2, 14.

As the Heb. *בְּצַוָּת* *vanity*, to which *ματαιότης* in the Septuagint corresponds, sometimes designates *an idol*; so some commentators have here interpreted *ματαιότης* in a corresponding manner, viz. mankind became subjected to idolatry, or the nat-

ural world was employed as the object of idolatry. So Tertulian, Luther, Mark, Baumgarten, and others. Consequently they interpreted the succeeding clause, *not voluntarily, but through him who subjected it*, as having reference either to Satan, or to Adam, as concerned in the original fall of man. But *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*, verse 21, seems to remove all probability of this interpretation of *ματαιότης*; and of course *ὑποτάξαντα* can be applied only to God the creator of man. Compare Gen. 3: 17—19. I shall, however, more particularly notice the interpretation in question, when I shall have proceeded through verse 22. See p. 399.

Οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, *not voluntarily, but by him who put it in subjection*, viz. to a frail and dying state. That is, the creature did not voluntarily choose its present condition of sorrow and pain, for this cannot well be imagined; but God the Creator has placed it in this condition; it is by his sovereign will, by the arrangements of his holy providence, that man is placed in a frail and dying state. But this is not to be considered as an irretrievable misfortune or evil. Distressing and frail as the condition of man is, it is still a state of *hope*. So we are assured in the next verse.

Verse 21. *Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*, *in hope*. Here the dative designates the state or condition in which the *πίσις* is, although subjected to *ματαιότητι*. It is a state in which a hope can be indulged of deliverance. It is not a state of despair.

Let the reader now ask, whether it is not doing violence to the word *πίσις*, to construe it here as meaning the *natural world*, and then to predicate of it, *ἐκούσα* and *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*? It would be an example of *prosopopeia*, which I believe even the most animated poetical parts of the Scriptures no where present.

But what is the hope in which the creature is permitted to indulge? It is, *ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς*, *that this very same creature, viz. the one which is subjected to a frail and dying state, shall be freed from the bondage of a perishing condition*. *Φθορά* comes from *φθείρω*, *to corrupt, to destroy*. Here it plainly means *a state of corruption*, i. e. a frail and dying state. Such a state the apostle calls *δουλεία, bondage*; first, because the creature was *not willingly* subjected to it; secondly, because it is not only a state of pain and misery, but it places us at the disposal of masters, who inflict upon us suffering and sorrow while we cannot

resist or control them. The word *ἐλευθερωθήσεται* is fitly chosen as the antithetic correlate of *δουλεία*.

Εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ, [and shall be introduced *καὶ εἰσαχθήσεται*] *into the glorious liberty of the children of God*. *Εἰς*, put before the accusative here, shews the state into which the creature is to be brought, after being freed from bondage; i. e. *εἰς* stands before the object unto which the creature is to attain, by being delivered from the bondage of a frail and dying state. That *εἰς* very often stands before nouns designating the event or effect of any thing, is a well known Greek idiom; and the proofs of it may be seen at large in the various lexicons. The phrase, however, I take here to be a *constructio praeagnans*, as the grammarians call it, i. e. an elliptical one which implies some verb before it, and probably, the one which I have supplied above. *Δόξα* here is used as an adjective, qualifying the preceding noun, by an idiom which is very common throughout the Scriptures. In what sense men in general may be said to hope for this state, has been already explained above. If there be any objection to predicate this of men in general, is there not a still stronger one to predicating it of the natural world?

Verses 20, 21, thus explained, render a reason why the creature looks with *ἀποκαταδοκία* to another and better state; which is, because men are born with an instinctive, unquenchable thirst for happiness, and cannot find what they desire, in this frail and perishing condition. This explains the reason why *γάρ* is prefixed to verse 21; "*γάρ* orationi rationem reddenti praefigurur."

Verse 22. *Οἶδαμεν γάρ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν*, *for we know that every creature, i. e. the whole human race, has sighed and sorrowed together, until the present time*. In other words, it has been the lot of man, from the beginning down to the present time, to be subject to a frail and dying state, which has cost much sighing and sorrow. The force of *οἶδαμεν* is, *no one can have any doubt, we are all assured, no one will call it in question*. Of course it seems to take for granted, that the thing to which it refers is well and familiarly known to all. But suppose, now, that the *natural world* is here represented as sighing and sorrowing, from the beginning of the world down to the time then present, and this because it waited for its renovation, which will take place only at the end of the world, or after the general resurrection; was this a thing so familiar to all, that the apostle could appeal to it by saying

οἶδαμεν? I cannot but think, that the advocates themselves of this interpretation must hesitate here. *Γὰρ* is prefixed, in the present case, to a clause which confirms what the writer had said in verse 21, of our frail and dying state; “*γὰρ* illustrantis sive explicantis.”

The verbs *συστενάξει* and *συνωδίνει* denote the mutual and universal sighing and sorrowing of mankind. No one part is exempt; there is a mutual correspondence between them all, in regard to the subject in question. Those who construe *πίσις* of the natural world, of course lay an emphasis on the *σύν* here compounded with the verbs, as indicating the correspondence of the natural world with the rational one. But the difficulty with this interpretation is, that it leaves the great world of rational beings wholly out of the account; a thing exceedingly incredible.

It is proper now to state, that not a few interpreters, as has been hinted page 396, construe verses 20—22 thus: ‘The natural world has been subjected by men to a vain, i. e. wicked use, (*ματαιόζηται* in the sense of *corruption* or *wickedness*), not of its own accord, but through force put upon it by the impious; and this same natural world, to speak in the way of personification, may be said to have hoped and earnestly longed to be delivered from this vile bondage (*δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*); which deliverance will take place, when the manifestation of the sons of God shall take place, i. e. at the judgement day.’

So Calovius in his *Biblia Illustrata*. Gerhard, the *ὁ πάντων* of the older Lutheran divines, goes still farther; for he not only advances the interpretation just exhibited, but proceeds to say, that “the sighs and anguish of the material world are manifested, in its refusing to be subjected to the use of man, in its earthquakes, inundations, and leavings over the boundaries prescribed to it. These are its groanings and heavy sighs, when it pants after liberation. It is thus that we should look upon the world.” *Loc. Theol. IX. De Consumm. Saec. §§ 55, 59.*

My readers will be rather disposed to smile at the minuteness and extent of the good man’s knowledge; and certainly our natural philosophers must admit, that here is a new solution of some of the most perplexing difficulties which they are called to unravel. But apart from this; the whole of this method of interpretation is subject to objections which seem to me entirely decisive against it.

1. It explains *ματαιότης* and *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς* in a manner inconsistent with the exigency of the passage. These words are manifestly the antithesis of *ἀποκαλύψει τῶν νιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ* and *ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ*. And what do these mean? Verse 23 informs us; for it explains them by *ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*, the *freeing of our bodies from a state of pain and frailty*, and making them like to Christ's glorious body. Consequently *ματαιότης* and *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς* being the opposite of this, must mean *a frail and dying state*.

2. It would be difficult to make out, on Calovius' own ground, any object or end to be attained by the sighing of the natural world. He rejects, with scorn, the idea that the natural world is to be renewed, at the day of judgement. He even says that "Socinus (ipse haereticorum novissimorum pessimus) could not endure such a notion advanced by Pucci; nor would the Calvinists tolerate it even in their Lucas Trelcatius." And as to dreams of the papists in the like way, such as Cornelius a Lapide and others have indulged in, about rivers, trees, orchards, etc. in another world, he asks, "Who in his senses will not place these with the fables of the Jews and Mahommedans respecting another world?" II. p. 139. Now if all this be well grounded, (in my own apprehension it is,) then what is it that the natural world are sighing after? A question which is very perplexing. Tholuck and Flatt have pointed out something after which they suppose it to sigh; but Calovius and Gerhard (with others) have left nothing to sigh after, but annihilation or total destruction; for this they admit will immediately follow the revelation of the sons of God. Is it congruous to represent the creature as sighing after this?

On the other hand, Calovius objects to construing *ματαιότης* as meaning *a frail and dying state*, because, he says, 'the Creator has given to the creature such a nature, and how then can it be pained with it, or desire deliverance from it?' But did not the same God subject Christians to a frail and dying state, verse 23; and yet do they not desire deliverance from it? The great difficulty however is, that Calovius has mistaken the meaning of *κτίσις* itself; and this involves him in a labyrinth from which it seems hard to find a way of escape.

3. I cannot see what object is accomplished by the interpretation under review. The apostle is labouring to animate the Christian's hope of future glory. What does he do for this pur-

pose? According to this interpretation, he argues thus: 'Mankind are exceedingly wicked; they have abused the objects of the natural world, in every age, so as to make them groan and sigh for deliverance; therefore—a glorious liberty of the sons of God is to be revealed.' Is this the logic of Paul? or is it the imagination of the good Calovius?

Verse 23. *And not only so, but we ourselves who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we groan within ourselves;* i. e. not only have mankind in all ages, down to the present hour, been in a frail and suffering state, but even we, who are permitted to cherish the hopes of a better world which the gospel inspires, we who have within us an earnest of future glory, a pledge that we are the children of God, who are to receive the inheritance of his beloved,—even we, who, one might naturally suppose, would on account of our privileges be exempted from the common lot of sinful men, we also, like all others, are in distress, and sigh for deliverance from it.

The phrase *καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες*, has been very diversely understood. Some interpret it of *special* and *supernatural* gifts, limiting it to the apostles only; while others explain it in the like way, but extend it to all Christians who were endowed with such gifts. Others regard *ἀπαρχή* as meaning *gift* or *present* merely, in a general way; while most interpret it as meaning the *earnest*, or *first fruits*, or *pledge*, of that which is afterward to be given in a more complete manner.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to investigate the word *ἀπαρχή* with special care. I can find but one meaning of it throughout the New Testament; and this is, *that which is first of its kind*, or *that which is first in order of time*, *πρωτος*. It is applied both to persons and things, in a sense compounded of both of these, viz. *first in respect to kind and time also*; e. g. Rom. 16: 5. 1 Cor. 16: 15. James 1: 18. 1 Cor. 15: 20, 23. Rev. 14: 4. Bretschneider suggests, in his Lexicon, that in this last passage it may have the general sense of *sacrifice* or *offering*, inasmuch as the Septuagint puts it for the Hebrew *קורבן*, which conveys such a meaning. This is possible; but on the whole I should prefer the other sense. I take the meaning of the writer in Rev. 14: 4 to be, that the persons there named may be considered in a light resembling that of the *ἀπαρχή* in ancient times, as the first fruits of a glorious Christian harvest.

I understand *ἀπαρχή* to have the same sense as the Hebrew

רִאשִׁית, for which it so often stands; viz. *caput, princeps, first in its kind, first in point of time*, etc. Comp. רִאשִׁית in Gen. 49: 3. Prov. 8: 22. Lev. 2: 12. 23: 10. Deut. 18: 4. 26: 10. 33: 21. Num. 24: 20. Amos 6: 6.

In the passage before us, all the Greek fathers appear to have attached one and the same meaning to *ἀναρχή*, viz. that of *first fruits*, in the sense of *earnest, pledge, foretaste*, of joys to come. So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Basil. This accords well, too, with the nature of the case. The apostle represents Christians as the habitation of God by his Spirit, Eph. 2: 22, comp. 1 Cor. 3: 16. 6: 19. The Spirit of God dwells in them, 1 John 3: 24. 4: 13. This Spirit, thus conferred on them, is the *ἀρροβών*, the *pledge* of future glory, 2 Cor. 5: 5. Eph. 1: 14.

What hinders now, that with all the Greek fathers, we should understand *ἀναρχή* as meaning, the *pledge, foretaste, first fruits*, of future glory? The *usus loquendi* of the word does not seem to admit of any other exegesis. Nor do we need any other; as this is altogether congruous with the nature of the passage.

With Keil then, in his admirable explanation of this passage (Opusc. p. 294 seq.) I would interpret it in the manner exhibited above. And if this be correct, then it follows, that the *ἀναρχή* here spoken of is common to all true Christians, and that the interpretation which limits this verse to the apostles, or to a few of the primitive Christians endowed with miraculous gifts, has no stable foundation.

That Christians were subject to sorrows, needs not to be proved. That they were exposed to more than ordinary ones, may be seen in 2 Cor. 5: 2, 3. 1 Cor. 15: 19. That they longed and sighed for deliverance, follows from their very nature. That even the *earnest* of future glory did not exempt them from sufferings, is certain. But there is peculiar energy and delicacy in the expression which marks the consequences of their sufferings; *we groan within ourselves*, i. e. internally, not externally. We suppress the rising sigh; we bow with submission to the will of God which afflicts us; we receive his chastisement as children; our frail nature feels it, and we sigh or groan inwardly; but no murmuring word escapes us; we suppress the outward demonstrations of pain, lest we should even seem to complain.

Is this imaginary on my part? Or did the writer mean to

convey what I have attributed to him? So much, at least we can say, viz. that such a sentiment was worthy of Paul, and of all Christians who suffered with him. It is worthy of being carried into practice at the present hour; it commends itself to the conscience of every one, who thoroughly believes in the holy, just, and benevolent providence of God.

Τιθεσίαν ἀπεδεχόμενοι, waiting for [our] adoption or filiation. There is a twofold filiation spoken of in the New Testament. The first is that which takes place, when believers are born again, John 1: 12, 13. 3: 3—5. Rom. 8: 14, 15 represents believers as possessing *πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας*. 1 John 3: 1, 2. But there is another and higher sense in which believers are to become the children of God, viz. they are to be so, when they shall be perfected in the world of glory, when they become “the children of the resurrection,” when they are made “like to the angels,” Luke 20: 36. Their first adoption or filiation is secret, in regard to the world; their second is the *ἀποκάλυψις τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ*, when “he who seeth in secret, shall reward them openly.” It is probably because the word *υιοθεσίαν* here used, is in itself dubious, that the apostle adds an explanatory or expegetical clause, which he places in apposition with it, viz. *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*, the redemption of our body, i. e. its redemption from a state of frailty, disease, and death. It is at the resurrection to be like to Christ’s glorious body, Phil. 3: 21; it is to be a *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, 1 Cor. 15: 44; this mortal is to put on immortality, this *σῶμα φθαρτόν* is to become a *σῶμα ἄφθαρτόν*, 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54. Such is the *ἀπολύτρωσις* of this frail dying body, which believers now inhabit. Comp. *ἀπολύτρωσις* in Luke 21: 28. Eph. 1: 14. 4: 30. Heb. 11: 35.

The reader will note, as I have had occasion already to intimate, that the expression *ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος* here is equivalent to the *ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ* in verse 19, and to the *ἐλευθερίαν τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ* in verse 21. It therefore serves to shew what those expressions mean, in the connexion in which they stand.

Christians then, in their present state, must long and wait for their second and final adoption or filiation. They may wait with confidence; yea, with assurance; for “he who cometh, will come, and will not tarry.” But let them not regard the present world as their home. It is not the Canaan in which they are to rest. They must “seek a city which hath

foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Then the agitated breast, the heaving sigh, the groaning within, will no more annoy or distress them. Let not the child of God complain, then, that his final reward is not anticipated and distributed to him here, in the present world, while he is in a state of trial. He must wait until he comes to the goal, before he can wear the crown of a victor in the race. He must defer his expected laurels, until his combat is over. Then he shall receive a crown of glory, which fadeth not away.

Verse 24. That the Christian cannot expect a reward here, the apostle goes on most explicitly to declare. *Τῆ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν*, for we are saved in hope, i. e. we have as yet obtained salvation only in hope; we have only attained to a condition in which we indulge a hope of future glory. This is all which can be rationally expected or accomplished in the present life. He had said, in the preceding verse, that Christians are in the attitude of waiting for their filiation. Verse 24 is designed to illustrate and confirm this; hence the *γὰρ illustrantis* at the beginning of it.

Ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς, now hope which is seen, is no longer hope; i. e. the object of hope (*ἐλπίς* here means this) is no longer such, when one attains the actual possession of it. *Δὲ orationi continuandae inservit*, as the lexicographers say, i. e. it stands before a clause which is designed to continue the subject already introduced.

Ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; for what a man sees, how does he still hope for it? That is, what a man has actually attained or come to the enjoyment of, how can he be said to look forward to it with hope or anticipation? *Γὰρ rationem rei dicte reddit*, i. e. it stands in a clause designed to explain or confirm the preceding assertion; for such is the nature of the present clause.

Verse 25. *Εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομενῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα*, but if now we hope for that which we do not enjoy, then we patiently wait for it. That is, if it be true, as all will concede, that in the present life we attain not to our final reward, but can be called the heirs of salvation, only because we have obtained a well-grounded hope of it; if it be so, that we cannot rationally expect an exemption from trials and troubles here, but must take our part in them with all around us; if it be true also, that a great and glorious reward is reserved in heaven, for all who endure patiently until the end of their probation; (and that this

is true, the very nature which God has given to men, and which is here so imperfectly developed and therefore points to a state of greater perfection, satisfactorily shews;) then it becomes Christians to endure with all patience and meekness the trials and sufferings of the present life. Time is short; eternity is long. Our sufferings are slight and momentary, when viewed in a comparative light. Who can place them beside that glory, "which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and of which it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive," and which is to endure as long as the God who bestows it, and yet make any serious account of them? *Christian brethren*, says the apostle, *Let us patiently wait the appointed time of our deliverance.*

Who will not respond to this truly Christian exhortation, and say *Amen*? Who can read, without deep emotion, this whole glowing paragraph; one which came from the heart, and reaches the heart? Who can help replying, Meek and holy apostle of the blessed Jesus, thyself next to thy Lord and Master in suffering and sorrow; in perils often, in deaths often, in stripes, in imprisonment, in reproaches, in persecutions often; shall we not turn to thee a listening ear, when thou teachest us such a heavenly lesson? We too are children of sorrow; not of sufferings in all respects like those of thy blessed Master, or of thyself; but still of such as are severe, yea as great as our feeble natures and our imperfect graces will endure. We too groan, being burdened. We feel the obligation, if we do not succeed in obeying it like thyself, to suppress our groans, and to keep them within. We would not murmur against the chastising hand of God, nor shew by our complaints that we are of a repining spirit. The blessed hope of immortality which the gospel has given us, is indeed enough to cheer the darkest hour, had we but faith enough to look beyond this darkness to the regions of eternal day.

Well may we exclaim too, Poor wandering heathen! Groping in nature's darkness, if haply you may "feel after and find out God;" going forward while he is not there, and backward without finding him; groaning and sighing for deliverance from the accumulated evils and sorrows of life, and thus shewing that you were born to be the heirs of immortality, that you are candidates for a better and higher state of existence; and yet "without God and without hope in the world!" Whose bowels of compassion must not yearn over you, when he comes himself to hope in his adoption and final redemption from all

these troubles and sorrows? Who will not say, in view of a condition and sufferings like these, to which the greater portion of our race are still exposed, O Lord how long? Look down, blessed and glorious Redeemer, suffering, dying, risen, ascended, glorified Saviour, King of kings and Lord of lords, God over all and blessed forever, look down from thy throne, in the midst of eternal light above, with that pity which moved thee "to become flesh and dwell among us," to become "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," to be "wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities;" look down and pity the millions "sitting in darkness and the shadow of death!" Make the Sun of righteousness to arise upon them, with healing in his beams; give them the cheering hope of adoption, of redemption from the body; yea, fill the world with the blessed consolations which flow from such a hope. Then may "the whole creation which has groaned and travailed in pain until now," dry up their falling tears, and rise, through Christian faith and hope, triumphantly above all the sufferings of the present life, by "counting them not worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed."

Christian, whoever thou art, bless God that he has given thee such a precious portion of his word, as that on which we have been meditating. Bind it to thy heart. Meditate on it by night and by day. And when trouble comes upon thee, as an overwhelming flood; when "deep calleth unto deep, with the noise of all his water spouts," and all his waves and billows come over thee; then, like the great apostle of the Gentiles, learn to bring the everlasting glory which is to be revealed into view; look to the regions of unclouded light; see, with the eye of faith, the eternal hills and the expanded plains of the heavenly Canaan clothed with unfading verdure; look attentively on all this; gaze upon it until thine eye is filled with it, and overlooks all the intermediate dark and rugged way which remains to be traversed; then bow with meek submission to that holy Providence which exercises thee with suffering and sorrow, and go on thy way of toil, rejoicing that every step brings thee nearer to the end; yea, triumph, in the midst of all thy distresses, in the thought that every one of them will only add a gem to thy crown of glory in the world of light. Then wilt thou know the true spirit of the paragraph which thou hast been examining; then wilt thou in reality enjoy the blessings of those, who are saved by such a hope as the gospel inspires.

ART. VI. LITERARY NOTICES.

By the Editor.

ORIENTAL LITERATURE.

Vendidad, Zend-Avestae Pars XX. adhuc superstes. E Codd. Mss. Parisinis primum edidit, varietatem lectionis adiecit JUSTUS OLSHAUSEN. Partic. I. Hamb. 1830. Ever since the publication of the French version of the Zend-Avesta (1771) by the enterprising, persevering, and enthusiastic Anquetil du Perron, it has been the subject of dispute and controversy in the theological world, similar to that excited by the poems of Ossian in the literary community. It has been stoutly maintained, principally by English writers, (who are but too prone to detract from every literary as well as scientific merit of their neighbours,) that no *such* work existed in the East, and that it was therefore a mere romance got up by the professed translator; or at least, if such a work were current among the Parsees, it was merely a collection of legends of the middle ages, and was therefore of no value as a work of antiquity or authority. As no other person had investigated this subject on the spot, there could be opposed to all these assertions in Europe, only the authority of Anquetil himself, and the manuscripts of various kinds (180 in number) which he had brought from India; and these, as they were not in England, were treated as of no account. Thus matters have remained until within the last few years. In 1819 the enterprising and indefatigable Prof. Rask, of Copenhagen, undertook a journey over land to India, with the purpose of investigating this among other subjects. He visited the places where Anquetil du Perron had been; and found still alive several of the priests who had known him and given him instruction. He was able to bring home thirty-three very ancient manuscripts of the Zend-Avesta and its literature, nineteen of which are in the Zend language; the rest in Pehlvi. The result has been, fully to establish the veracity and integrity of Anquetil. Prof. Rask, in his work entitled: *On the Antiquity and Genuineness of the Zend Language and the Zend-Avesta*, has demonstrated the genuineness of that work, or at least of portions of it, leaving however the question as to the author undecided. It would seem therefore to be now settled, that the Zend-Avesta is a work of great antiquity, containing an important and interesting

exhibition of the religion and philosophy and language of a portion of our race, respecting which, apart from this source, we have very little information.

The French version was a first attempt, and would naturally therefore not be without its faults. It is evidently made in accordance with a traditional interpretation which was far from fixed; and the chasms or deficiencies left by this, are often supplied in a very arbitrary manner. Since the return of Prof. Rask, the subject has assumed a new degree of interest on the continent, and the learned have long been wishing to have the original of the *Zend-Avesta* before them. This wish Prof. Olshausen, of Kiel, has now undertaken to gratify. Supported by the liberality of the Danish government, he resided for a long time in Paris, pursuing the studies connected with this object, and obtaining meantime copies of Anquetil's Mss. of the work, now deposited in the royal library. The part *Vendidad* is the only one of which the manuscript is complete. It is intended to publish this first; and then the other portions in succession; comprising the *Vistasp-Jesht*, which is wanting in the Paris manuscripts, but is contained in those of Copenhagen. The text is printed in the *litho-autographic* manner, i. e. written with a pen and then transferred to the stone; in the manner of Semelet's edition of the *Gulistan*. A grammar and lexicon of the original language will be appended to the work. It is also hinted, that Prof. Rask is also preparing a complete grammar and lexicon of the *Zend* language, so far as the remains of it are known.

The Editor is happy in being able to lay before the readers of this work, the following extract of a letter from Prof. HAHN of Leipsic, dated Dec. 23, 1830. "Your kind invitation to afford you occasional contributions for your new work, (the annunciation of which I have read with pleasure,) I gladly accept, so far as the difficulty of correspondence between two countries so remote, will permit. I intend, accordingly, soon to send you an historical account of the present contest within our church, which now divides our theologians into two great parties; exhibiting the causes, the commencement, and the progress of it, and the various aspects of the struggle, at different times and in different places."

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. III.

JULY, 1831.

ART. I.—THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

By the Editor.

PART III. EXAMINATIONS, MINISTERIAL STANDING, ETC.

WE have already accompanied the German theological student to the close of his regular course of study; to the time when, having resided three years at a university, he is permitted by the government to offer himself for examination, with a view to enter upon the practice of the sacred profession as a teacher or a minister of the Gospel. In the present article it is proposed to follow him through his various examinations and trials, until he is established in his calling; and then to make some observations upon the general character and standing of the German clergy, together with some remarks upon the state of religion in that country.

At the close of his university career, there are two courses open before the student of theology, in order to arrive at a future station in the church; one of which however can be adopted but by few, while the other is open to all. He may either take the regular degrees in theology at the university, and become a teacher or professor there; (which also gives him the right of becoming a preacher;) or he may submit himself to the usual examinations before a commission or consistory, and thus directly enter the church. We will first accompany those who take the former course.

It has already been stated, that all students of theology are

No. III.

52

also inscribed in the faculty of philosophy. In connexion with this, all those who wish to devote themselves to the business of theological teachers, and to become future professors in that department, usually (if not always) take the degree of Doctor in Philosophy, which is equivalent to our Master of Arts. This is granted after examination by the faculty, and after defending in public a Latin dissertation, or being expressly excused therefrom.* This however does not yet qualify a person to be-

* The following translation of a public notice from the philosophical faculty of the university of Halle, shews the mode of conferring the degree of Doctor in Philosophy. This is the lowest degree now conferred in the German universities.

Rules to be observed in conferring Degrees.

I. It is taken for granted, that whoever applies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, *first*, has made such acquisitions as are requisite, in order to attain to a higher degree of learning in some one science; or possesses the knowledge usually acquired at schools of learning; and, *secondly*, that he has pursued some one branch of those sciences which are included in the philosophical faculty, with diligence and success, so as to have distinguished himself in it.

II. He must undergo an oral examination before the faculty, on the result of which it depends, whether the candidate can receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and *Magister Artium liberalium*.

III. For this purpose it is necessary, that the candidate make known his wishes to the faculty in writing in the Latin language, and subjoin to this application the following papers, viz.

1. A *curriculum vitae*, in which he will describe particularly his literary life, his school education, and his university years; how he has employed himself during this time; what branch of science he has chosen for his particular study; to what department of learning he expects in future to devote himself; etc.

2. The *testimonium diligentiae et morum*, which he received on leaving the university where he last studied; from which it must also appear that he has completed a course of at least three years. If however any one should have made, in any other way, such acquisitions as render him worthy of the distinction of the Doctor's degree, he must bring forward the proofs of this, in order that the faculty may be able to judge of their force.

3. An essay or dissertation, written in Latin and composed by himself, from which a judgment may in general be formed as to the skill and capability of the candidate. The place of this, how-

come one of the *privatim docentes* in either faculty. In the philosophical he must, regularly, still hold another public disputation,

ever, may be supplied by any printed work composed and published by the candidate; in so far as from it his qualifications to sustain an examination by the faculty can be estimated. When these works are in German, the candidate must take so much the more pains, in composing his *curriculum vitae*, to shew his acquaintance with the Latin language.

IV. Should the papers handed in not be regarded as sufficient for judging whether the candidate can be admitted to examination, the faculty may require others more appropriate; or may determine upon a *tentamen* by the dean and one or two other members, which shall decide whether the candidate may be admitted to examination or not.

V. If it be decided to admit him to the examination, the dean shall assign a time; when the candidate shall be examined, partly in that general knowledge which is to be presupposed, and partly and chiefly in those particular branches with which, according to his own declaration, he has principally occupied himself.

VI. The examination will regularly be held in the Latin language. In sciences where this would be attended with difficulty, or when there is otherwise reason for a special exception, the examination may be conducted in German. In such cases also it is allowed to hand in a German dissertation, instead of the Latin one required above.

VII. In regard to the examination itself, a record is kept in such a way that every examiner, immediately after he has finished, himself writes down in the record on what subjects he has examined the candidate, and what judgement he has formed of his acquirements. When the last examiner has ended, the candidate withdraws; and after deliberation, the faculty, represented by the examiners present, come to a decision. In this it is determined, whether the candidate in the examination has shewn himself worthy of the degree, or not; and in the first case, how the diploma is to be worded; and especially how it shall express, in what branches he has chiefly distinguished himself. The result is annexed by the dean to the record; which it then belongs to him to carry into execution.

VIII. The decision of the faculty is made known to the candidate by the dean.

IX. The conferring of the degree may either take place privately, by the dean's presenting the diploma to the candidate; or this may be done with the usual solemnities, after a public defence by

if he wishes to become a teacher there ; and in order to teach in the theological faculty, he must further take the degree of Licentiate of Theology. This is the lowest degree in theology, and is granted after examination by the theological faculty, and after maintaining a dispute in public, in the same manner as is pointed out in the note below. The examination for this degree, being by authority of the university and not of the government, is held by the faculty, and not by a commission or consistory, as is the case with those who are candidates for the pastoral office ; but it embraces of course, in most respects, the same ground ; with more particular reference perhaps to those branches, in which

the candidate of a Latin dissertation or theses of his own, in the great hall of the university building.

X. Whoever will establish himself as a private teacher in the university, in addition to his inaugural dissertation, must also publicly defend another Latin essay, composed by himself and approved by the faculty, (*disputatio pro facultate*,) unless he receives from the faculty an express dispensation.

XI. The legal costs and expenses of the candidate, on the occasion of taking the Doctor's degree, and in other cases, are the following.

A. For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. (1) To the faculty for the examination and for many expenses, as for printing the diploma, etc. 8 Frederics d'or=32. (2) For the library, 4 rix dollars=2 80. (3) Other expenses during the sitting of the faculty, etc. 10 rix dollars=7. [In all 41 80.]

B. Further. (1) At the *disputatio pro facultate legendi, pro aperienda cathedra*, to the dean, 2 rix dollars=1 40. (2) *Pro licentia legendi*, when the candidate is not a *doctor philosophiae legitime promotus* of this university, 10 rix dollars=7. (3) For a *tentamen*, 10 rix dollars=7.

Extract from the records of the sitting of the philosophical faculty of Feb. 25, 1827.

The holding of a public disputation seems to depend chiefly on the choice of the candidate. If he is a young man of talent, and hopes to shew off well, such a public exhibition affords him an opportunity to do this, and gives him a name. If he acquits himself with eclat, he is sure afterwards of a good number of pupils. On the other hand, there are instances of total failure. In 1828, a young man who held a disputation *pro facultate* at Halle, after going through with his regular opponents with ability and success, was put down by an opponent from the crowd, and that so completely, that he gave up his purpose, left the place, and changed the whole course and character of his life.

the candidate expects to teach. The examination also assumes a higher and more scientific character, in regard to those few who are to be scientific teachers, than with the many who become only pastors. The privileges, however, conferred by this degree are of a corresponding nature. The Licentiate of Theology is then qualified to read lectures, as a private teacher of theology in the universities, has the liberty of preaching, and should he wish to become a pastor, he stands on the same footing as those, who in the other course have passed two examinations. This degree is now never taken, except by those who thus wish to become teachers; the other course being after all less difficult, and perhaps more speedy.

The appointment of Professor *extraordinarius* makes the licentiate a permanent member of the university, and gives him a higher rank; but does not affect in any way his university degree. Indeed, the term *licentiate* is never employed as a title of address; while the title *doctor* is very extensively given to those who have taken the degree of Doctor in Philosophy, without having been further promoted. But this also is laid aside, when the individual becomes professor; the latter title being of a higher value. As a general rule, the ordinary theological professors are also Doctors of Theology; though this is not always the case. This has now become a merely honorary degree; and is usually bestowed by the universities on distinguished individuals, as a mark of favour and respect. It may also be regularly taken by those who apply for it; but at an expense of about two hundred rix dollars. The privileges annexed to this degree are not yet obsolete. The title of Doctor of Theology supersedes that of Professor of any kind. This degree also entitles the individual to receive ordination, if he desires it, without further examination or delay; and is the highest degree or rank conferred by the universities. The government, however, can and do bestow on theologians honorary titles, which are regarded as still higher. The most usual one is that of *Consistorialrath*, Counsellor or Assessor of the Consistory, a title with which is connected no right or privilege whatever, and which is merely a mark of favour on the part of the government. It is of precisely the same character as the title of D. D. with us, though somewhat higher in name. The same is the case with the title *Oberconsistorialrath*, which is a still higher degree of nominal honour.

The course above described, has been followed by most of the distinguished theological teachers of the day. Tholuck, for in-

stance, both while private teacher and Professor extraordinary at Berlin, was Licentiate of Theology. On being appointed *ordinarius* at Halle, the university of Berlin created him Doctor of Theology. In 1828, when about to set off for Rome as chaplain of the Prussian embassy in that city, he applied for and received ordination at Merseburg, in his character of Doctor of Theology, without examination. In 1830, in consequence of his having declined an invitation to go as court preacher to Dresden, the government conferred on him the title of *Consistorialrath*, which is of course his present style of address. Gesenius received the same title, after declining his call to Göttingen in the place of Eichhorn.

But although these university degrees thus confer the right of preaching and of assuming the pastoral office, yet they by no means render this imperative upon those who receive them. In Berlin, Neander and Hengstenberg are not preachers, and have never entered the sacred desk; while Strauss and Schleiermacher and Marheinecke and others, are also regular pastors of churches in the city, and commonly preach once on every sabbath. In Halle, Marks and Tholuck are the university preachers, and officiate on the alternate Sundays; while Marks is also the afternoon preacher in one of the city churches. Niemyer used formerly to preach occasionally; but Gesenius, Wegscheider, Ullmann, Thilo, and others, have never officiated as preachers, and, like Neander and Hengstenberg, are not even regarded as belonging to the clerical profession. In the subdivision of labour which prevails in theology, as in all the other sciences, they undertake to teach those branches which have not a direct bearing upon the practical applications of theology; for, as a general rule, the professors who teach homiletics and pastoral theology, are themselves preachers. The result of the whole then is, that the government connects with the degrees conferred by the faculties of theology in the universities, the same rights and privileges in regard to preaching, as are bestowed by the consistories; that all theological professors and instructors in the universities have therefore the right of acting in the pastoral office; while the exercise of this right is left to their own discretion.

We return to the other and larger class of theological students, who take the more common course of entering upon the pastoral functions, not through the universities, but in the ordinary way prescribed by the government. This consists in an *examen pro candidatura* or *pro licentia concionandi*, which may

take place before the consistory, or before a commission appointed for that purpose in the universities;* and an *examen pro ministerio*, after the interval of a year, which is held only by the consistory.

In regard to the first examination, the introductory proceedings are similar in their nature and object to those required in an examination before the faculty of philosophy, as detailed above. To each individual who applies for examination a theme or subject is assigned, on which he is expected to write a dissertation, which must be handed over to the examiners within the period of six weeks. After this, other subjects are assigned, on which the candidate must write upon the spot and under lock and key; as in the examinations of the gymnasia. At the same time he must hold a *catechisation*, and also deliver a sermon upon an appointed text. Then follows the oral examination, in which six of the candidates are ordinarily taken up at once. This covers of course all the ground of the several *Brodcollegia* heretofore described; and includes a particular examination on the exegesis of the Old and New Testaments; on systematical and symbolical theology, and ethics; on ecclesiastical and doctrinal history; and also on philosophy and theological literature. The more particular examination on the practical department, is commonly reserved for the trial before the consistory.

* It was formerly the case, that most of the theological students at Halle were obliged to repair to Magdeburg, the chief city of the Prussian province of Saxony and the seat of the consistory, a distance of about 60 English miles, in order to undergo the first examination before the consistory itself. The number of applications however was so great, that the consistory were not able to do justice to them all; and therefore in Dec. 1827 the government appointed a *Prüfungs-Commission* in the university, before which the first examination *pro licentia concionandi* is now held. The second examination is still held before the consistory at Magdeburg. The members of the commission at Halle are Gesenius, Weber, Wegscheider, Tholuck, Thilo, Marks, and Fritzsche; and also one acting member of the consistory. It commenced its operations in April, 1828; and in the course of that year examined sixty candidates. Of these, *two* were classed in the first rank; *eleven* in the second; *twenty-three* in the third; *fourteen* in the fourth; and *ten* deferred for one or more years, or wholly rejected. In that year, therefore, *one in every six* was temporarily or wholly rejected.

The degree of knowledge and acquirements exhibited by the candidates on examination, is marked by the different classes or standing to which they are assigned. These different degrees of merit are designated as follows; 1. Excellent; 2. Very good; 3. Good; 4. Moderate; 5. Deficient. This last, of course, confers no claim to any right or office; but it admits the candidate to another future trial. Those who stand in the first four classes, receive the *licentiam concionandi*; and are called *Candidates of Theology*; but they are not yet qualified to become pastors of churches.

That this is not a mere examination *pro forma*, is at once attested by the characters of the examiners, who are men of profound learning, either professors in the universities, or the most learned and distinguished of the clergy. It is also attested in Halle by the fact above mentioned, that in one year every sixth applicant was turned by on account of deficiency; and although there may have been in this case a more than ordinary strictness, yet the number thus rejected or put by, constitutes everywhere not a very small proportion of the whole. And this is the turning point of the young theologian's life. To this time he has been looking forward in all his previous toilsome studies; because if he fails here, he loses the fruit of all his anxious labours. If he cannot honourably sustain this examination; if, above all, he be once turned by and fail upon a second trial; his bread for life is taken away, his name as a scholar is dishonoured, and there is no part nor portion of his country whither he can retire and there regain his standing. Every avenue to his profession is forever closed up to him; and he must either starve, or consent to get his bread in some other humbler calling, with a mark of disparagement stamped forever on his brow. In these facts we see the secret of that almost universal and unremitting diligence, which forms so distinguishing a characteristic of the students of the German universities.

But in these examinations, rigorous and decisive as they are, there is one omission which strikes our feelings with surprise and grief. By this door enter all the pastors and teachers of the church; of that church, the object of which is to keep alive the pure and holy flame of the Christian religion, and to extend the boundaries of God's kingdom upon earth. But to those thus entering the question is never put, whether they have any regard for this kingdom of God; whether they have ever possessed the pure and holy flame of religious feeling; whether

they are in any degree prompted to undertake this holy calling, from love to God or Christ, or to the souls of their fellow men ! The church, alas ! is no longer at her own disposal, and cannot prove 'the spirits of her prophets whether they be of God.' She is but the slave of civil power ; and all that she is at liberty to ask or know is, whether her prophets are regularly appointed by the king and his ministers. Not one question is ever asked as to their belief in a revelation, nor as to their personal motives in thus undertaking to be the ambassadors of God to man. When the shepherds are thus chosen without any reference to their fidelity, are we to wonder that the flock should go astray and become widely scattered ?

The second examination, or that *pro ministerio*, takes place before the consistory after the interval of a year. During this time the candidate is expected to have continued his theological studies, and to have made further progress, especially in the practical part of them. This is the object of more particular attention in this examination. In other respects it resembles the first, in the dissertations and sermon to be exhibited, in the closet labour, and in the oral examination on all the subjects above mentioned. Besides these, the candidate is also now examined in regard to his knowledge of pedagogics and the practical instruction and arrangement of schools. The standing or degree of merit of each candidate, is here marked by the same classification as before ; and he may in like manner be put by for further preparation and trial. Those who receive the proper testimonials, are now qualified to assume the pastoral office whenever they please.

This interval of a year between the first and second examinations, is employed in various ways. The candidate of theology, as has been said above, is permitted to preach, but may not yet be chosen as the pastor of a church ; a privilege to which he is entitled only after the second examination. Many pursue their studies during this interval at a university ; others at their homes ; and a very few sometimes in the theological seminary at Wittenberg. They are not, as a matter of course, bound to present themselves for the second examination precisely at the end of the year ; the regulation is only that they cannot do it sooner. It is not unusual, therefore, to find candidates of theology acting as teachers for a time, in the gymnasia or in private families ; although, as a general rule, they prefer to have first regularly completed all the requisite examinations.

After the second examination, as is said above, the candidate becomes *wahlfähig*, or capable of being chosen to the pastoral office and to the immediate charge of a church and people. He is now, in this respect, on a footing with a candidate in our country, after he has received license. The *choice* itself, however, is usually very different from any thing that exists among us; and is also different in the various parts of Germany. In some few instances indeed, particularly in Westphalia, the churches themselves have the right of choosing their own pastor, much in the same way as with us; but their candidate must still be approved and accepted by the government, acting through the consistory. In other instances, the pastor is appointed by the owner or lord of the village, who in such cases has commonly the right of property in the whole village and in the church itself; and this appointment must also be sanctioned in like manner by the consistory, while the people of the parish have no voice whatever in the matter. But the fact in a great majority of instances, is, that the gift of the livings depends immediately on the government itself, and is bestowed just like any other office of state, through the ministry of a subordinate department, which in this case are the consistories. Each of these has charge of a certain province or district; and knows of course every vacancy which arises within its jurisdiction. They know also personally every candidate who is under their charge; and it is not rare that a candidate, and especially a favoured one, has his choice between several parishes. Having received his appointment, in any of the above ways, he may if he pleases, after the second examination, be immediately inducted.

But if the candidate, instead of thus entering at once upon the duties of a pastor, prefers to turn aside for a time, and either make further progress in his own studies, or devote himself to public instruction, (in order for which he must undergo an *examen pro schola*,) or take upon him the office of tutor in a private family; if for these or any other reasons he does not within the interval of a year obtain a situation as pastor, he is then required to sustain still another examination before he can be admitted to the pastoral office. This third examination, however, is in some respects an irregular, or rather a variable one; its character depending much upon the circumstances of the case. It is not usually termed an *examen*; but the consistory invite the candidate to a *colloquium*, and then examine him more or less closely, according as a greater or less time has elapsed since his pre-

vious trial; or as they may perceive that his standing or habits require. This regulation is obviously a judicious one; since otherwise a candidate who had sustained the second examination and had then adopted a different course of life, could after the lapse of many years enter unrestrained upon the sacred office, for which, according to the established regulations of the country, he might be no longer qualified in any degree.

When all the previous steps have in this manner been taken; when the young man has thus spent from four to seven years at a gymnasium or under other equivalent instruction, and three years more at a university, and has produced the necessary testimonials of propriety of conduct and of having pursued the requisite branches of study; when he has thus sustained the first examination, which admits him to preach; and after a year the second examination, which qualifies him to enter upon the sacred office; and in default of thus entering within a year from that time, a third examination,—when all this has been accomplished, and the candidate has obtained a place of settlement, either by the invitation of a parish, or by the gift of the government; he then receives ordination, and is inducted into his living. The ordination takes place under the authority and by direction of the consistory; and after this has been accomplished, the future pastor is inducted, and invested with the authority and privileges of his office, by the superintendent of the diocese to which his parish belongs.

Such is the general mode of introduction to the ministry throughout Germany. But the *translation* of a pastor from one church or station to a more important sphere, is by no means uncommon; although perhaps less usual than with us. The tenor by which a minister holds his station there, is so entirely different from what it is in our own country, that *dismissions*, unless from the choice and motion of the minister, are entirely unknown. If a pastor is once settled, it is for life; so long as the government do not depose him, (and this they never do, except for public scandal or crime,) there is no other power which can remove him. But a clergyman who distinguishes himself by the assiduous discharge of his duties, by his talents as a preacher or a scholar, or by the weight and influence of his character, is sure to meet with promotion; i. e. to be called to a living of more value and importance; or to be made superintendent or a member of a consistory; or to be appointed to a professorship in a university; or even, in uncommon cases,

to be called to the capital and made court preacher and member of the ecclesiastical department of the government. All these are a species of solid reward, which the various governments of Germany hold out to the clergy of their respective states, in return for the years of severe study and the rigorous examinations which are imposed upon them. It is also not at all unusual, that distinguished individuals are thus called from one state or territory to important stations in another state and under another government.

In regard however to this whole subject of promotion or translation, not only in the pastoral office and in the universities, but also throughout all the professions and situations of public life, there is one feature universally prevalent and predominant, which an American, and especially a New-Englander, has not yet learned to behold with complacency, and we may hope, never will. It is the direct *personal* application for office and promotion. We have it indeed, in some parts of our country, in regard to civil employments; but in respect to stations in our colleges, and more particularly in reference to *ministerial* employment, we have reason to thank God, that it is here yet unknown. In Germany, it is universal; and is probably in a great measure the offspring of that system, by which all public employment of every kind is made dependent on the will of a despotic government, which gives in general only when it is asked. The candidate asks for a living; if a better one becomes vacant, he applies for that. When he has gained some reputation, and the opportunity occurs, he asks to be made superintendent; and then his hopes and claims mount up still higher. The private teacher at a university besets the government with applications to be created professor extraordinary; and then again to be made ordinarius. This is a fact and feature so notorious, that the governments understand it as a thing of course; and in Prussia, at least, the requisition is made on the instructors in the universities, that a copy of every work which they publish shall be sent to the proper department of the king's ministry; in order that the government may thus have some means of judging of the qualifications of those, from whom they are beset with applications.

Whenever also an important vacancy happens, either in the church or in a university, there are always multitudes of direct applications for the place. The authorities who have charge of these things, do not of course always confine themselves, in

their choice, to such applications; but not unfrequently elect a better man, without knowing whether he will accept the invitation or not. If the person thus chosen be the subject of a different government, there now commences another contest. Those who have invited him, must of course offer him a more honourable station, or a larger income than he already receives. This he makes known to his own government; and if they wish to retain him, they must equal or outbid the offers of the other party. These negotiations are often continued for a long time; and it is not unusual for a person in these circumstances to make some specific demand, such as a sum of money, or a particular salary, or a title of honour, the condition of his going or staying. And these too are things not done in a corner; but are usually the subjects of open and public conversation. They are indeed of such common notoriety, as to have ceased to produce any impression of surprise, and have come to be regarded with the indifference of custom and long familiarity.

We have thus endeavoured to follow, throughout its whole extent, the course of preparation and training required of the German clergy and theologians, before they can arrive at a standing in the church or in a university. These regulations too, it must be borne in mind, are not established merely by the church itself, or by a university, or by a particular seminary; they are not of such a character as to be binding only on those who choose to subject themselves to them; as is the case, for instance, with the theological seminaries of our own country, while for those who prefer to take a different course the way is free and open; but they are the results of a system by which the church is joined with, and made subservient to, the state; they are the requisitions of the civil power to which the church is subjected, and of the whole body politic, in which the church constitutes a subordinate department. There is no other way of access to the church, but through the course thus straitly hedged; all other avenues are entirely closed up; and, as has been before remarked, should any one attempt to 'climb up some other way' into the fold; should any one attempt to preach the gospel of salvation, or publicly to arouse the attention of sinners to their spiritual dangers and duties, without having first passed through these years of preparation and this hedge of trials, there is not a spot in Germany where imprisonment or banishment would not be his lot. The power of the government is so decidedly despotic and absolute, and the omnipresence (if the ex-

pression may be allowed) of the police is so entire, that an erratic course of education, or an irregular entry upon the ministry of the Gospel, is impossible; or, at least, if any one chooses to be erratic in his pursuit of learning, it can avail him nothing in future life. He has indeed his labour for his pains, and has the results of his studies; but he gains admission into no profession, and obtains no employment from the government nor with the sanction of the government. This is equivalent to saying that he must remain entirely without employ.

We turn now, in the remainder of this article, to some general considerations and reflections, illustrative of the effects and influence of this system of things both upon the clergy and upon the people at large; adding occasionally such further facts and explanations, as may tend to place the whole subject in a stronger light.

The dependence of the church upon the civil power, or its union with that power in any shape, pregnant as it is with a host of unutterable evils, brings in its train this one solitary advantage, viz. that supported by the state, the church can enforce and render uniform its own recommendations in regard to church polity and religious instruction. It is in this way, no doubt, that the system has been introduced into every German school below the universities, of giving regular instruction on religious subjects. The character of this instruction must necessarily depend in a great measure on the teacher; but here, alas! the dominion of the church ceases, and the instructor is appointed without reference to his qualifications as a religious teacher. The consequence is, that the teaching is very often superficial, and not unfrequently is any thing but religious. In one instance related to the writer, it consisted wholly in illustrating the elements of botany by the exhibition and analysis of flowers, with an occasional reference to the goodness of the Deity in thus adorning the earth. But still, in a course of years, the children acquire in this way at least some knowledge of facts; a foundation is laid, narrow and shallow indeed, in which in future years and under more auspicious circumstances, the Spirit may rear a nobler superstructure. A knowledge of the truth is assuredly the first step in leading men to embrace the truth; and in this point of view, the religious instruction given in the schools of Germany, defective as it is, and often unspiritual, is nevertheless of inestimable importance in the great system of

means and instruments, in connexion with which the Spirit of God usually carries on its operations.

But the knowledge thus acquired, and the religious instruction thus imparted, are small, compared with the regular and systematic instruction which precedes confirmation. This ceremony takes place usually at Easter; and the children are commonly taught by the pastor during the whole of the preceding year. It is indeed not unfrequently the case, that they enter upon this course even two years before confirmation. As a general rule, the pastor meets them twice in each week; but during the four weeks immediately preceding Easter, he usually gives four lessons a week. The instruction comprises the history of the Christian religion; the general historical facts of the Bible, which are usually taught in a biblical catechism; the learning by heart of psalms and hymns; and towards the close, the confession of faith which they are to make in public on the day of confirmation. This is a regular duty of the pastoral office, and one which cannot be neglected. Indeed, the pastors generally regard it as one of the most pleasing and interesting of all their official duties, and engage in it with complacency at least, if not with zeal. Calling one morning on Schleiermacher, the writer found him just dismissing from his study his class of thirty or forty young catechumens; and it was interesting to behold thus employed in training the minds and hearts of children, one who is accustomed, by the profoundness of his speculations, to enlighten and instruct the learned and the wise.

It is moreover not to be denied, that this system of instruction, in the hands of a faithful pastor, affords one of the most powerful means that can be devised, of operating upon the youthful mind, and forming it, under God, to habits and feelings and principles of virtue and religion. The usual time for confirmation is about the age of puberty, or from the thirteenth to the sixteenth year; and custom has ordained, that every one shall take upon himself the solemn obligations imposed by this rite. The youthful mind is at this period in its most susceptible state, and most open to conviction, and to the influence of the thrilling motives and tender remonstrances, which a good shepherd knows how to urge in behalf of him who was 'meek and lowly of heart.' He meets his youthful flock frequently, and has the opportunity, if he does his duty, of becoming thoroughly acquainted with their different characters and dispositions; so that it is his fault alone, if he be not able to apply to

each the instructions and exhortations which the nature of the case requires. In its present shape, this system owes its birth to the pious Spener; and through this institution, that godly man still exerts an amount of influence that is incalculable. Have not the churches of our land reason to blush, when they look upon what is thus done in other lands for the religious education of the young? The Sunday schools and Bible classes, are indeed beginning, within a few years, to supply in some measure our deficiencies; but they do not yet, and probably never can, fully take the place of regular and systematic instruction from the pastor himself. With us indeed they are necessary as the helpers of the pastor. The Sunday schools, by their system of teachers and inspection, bring in many a child, who would otherwise never come in contact with the pastor, and would probably grow up in utter ignorance and vice. Such institutions are then the powerful and indispensable assistants of the pastors in the great work of operating upon the young; but still, would not such a system of direct pastoral instruction be afterwards still more influential and effectual—the key-stone which should bind the whole arch together, and preserve it from again tumbling into ruins?

The ceremony of confirmation too, conducted as it is with the utmost solemnity and in the presence of the whole congregation, produces a powerful effect upon the young mind; and it is not unfrequent to find pious persons looking back upon it, not only as the most solemn act of their lives, but as the time from which they date their sincere and practical devotion of themselves to God. Such individuals regard this act, indeed, in the same light as Christians in our country look upon admission to our churches; and in these particular instances, there is in fact little difference between the two. Perhaps the chief difference then lies in the circumstance, that with us it is a *voluntary* measure, dependent solely on the will of the person himself; while there the custom is so firmly established, that an adult individual of the protestant church who has not been confirmed, is almost, or perhaps quite, unknown.

That the whole system has not been more efficacious in preserving an evangelical spirit in the community at large, must probably be referred to the unfaithfulness of the pastors, and not to the system itself. It is moreover easy to see, that in the hands of such an one, it becomes a tremendous engine of evil; and to this fact must it doubtless be attributed, that rationalism is at present so firmly fixed among the common people.

This system of religious instruction, as has been remarked, is continued, though with less thoroughness and efficiency, in the different schools and gymnasia ; and young men are in this way necessarily subjected to it, until the time of their departure for the university. But here their religious education is at an end. The students of theology indeed have *theological* instruction, but it is mostly of the scientific kind ; and although a pious professor sometimes takes occasion to make an appeal to the hearts and consciences of his pupils, yet this is not customary, and would be generally regarded as travelling out of the way. But the students of the other faculties are left absolutely without any religious instruction whatever, unless they choose to attend public worship on Sundays. In none of the German universities are there any public devotional exercises of any kind ; except that in some, as in Göttingen and Halle, there is a university preacher, and one public service on Sunday, or sometimes the alternate Sundays ; at which the students may or may not attend, as they please ; but at which the professors are rarely seen. In the universities situated in the larger cities, as Berlin and Leipsic, there is no provision of this sort ; inasmuch as the number of regular churches renders it unnecessary. It has been already remarked, that in a few instances it has been required of *theological* students, that they should attend public worship ; but this requisition extends in no case to any other class of students. Indeed, both theoretically and practically, the students of Germany, on entering the universities, seem to be regarded as having finished their pupilage, and as now entering upon the state of manhood and the rights of citizenship ; certain metes and bounds are assigned them within which they must walk ; but it is left to themselves to decide, in what manner and to what extent they will profit by the opportunities afforded them, and by what rules they will regulate their conduct.

The result of this state of things is, that theological students while at the universities, are very much like all other students. Having adopted (at least the majority of them) the study of this profession, without any reference to the high and holy motives which ought to govern all who assume it, and regarding it in no more sacred point of view than if they were pursuing the study of law or medicine or philology, what reason have they to put on an appearance of seriousness to which their hearts are strangers ? or to abstain from practices which they have never felt, and do not now feel, to be incompatible with their future stand-

ing, any more than they are incompatible with the standing of a lawyer or a physician? The consequence is, that all the vices for which German students have been famous, are no less common among the theologians, than among others; and they are as likely as any to be found engaged in gambling, drunkenness, broils, duels, and every species of *renowning*. In looking abroad upon the German churches, and reflecting upon their prospects and destiny, it is melancholy to think that such a character for a time at least, be the character of the great majority of the future pastors and teachers. Among the nine hundred students of theology at Halle, not more than from one hundred to two hundred and fifty can be reckoned as possessing serious religious character in any degree, or as having chosen this profession for any other than the most worldly motives; and of this comparatively small number, not more than one half can be regarded as possessing personal religion, or as actuated in choosing this course by motives of religious duty. And it would be difficult to say, that the proportion of truly pious students among the theologians, small as it is here represented, is much greater at any other university; unless perhaps, from peculiar circumstances, at Berlin.

The only species of strictly religious instruction which students receive at the university, is, as has been said, the services of Sundays and of such other days as are celebrated by the church; (all of which usually have no connexion with the university;) and further, such private instruction and exhortation as pious professors (if there be such) choose to impart in their more familiar intercourse with their pupils. In Halle the houses of several of the professors are open one evening every week, for the purposes of *conversation*, which may be religious or otherwise. A small but very pleasant association of this kind, which had originally been established by good luck while at Berlin, was continued every Saturday evening in the house of a friend, now a teacher in the university. It was properly a meeting for religious intercourse and conversation, and was accompanied by singing, prayer, and the reading of the Scriptures or of a sermon, and sometimes also by a short address. In Halle, Professor Tholuck has pursued this course, and has a number of pious students at his rooms or sometimes twice, a week. At these little meetings there is variously occupied, according to the individuals who are present; sometimes it is religious conversation, assuming

scientific form, and again a practical tendency ; sometimes a chapter of the Bible is read and expounded, followed by a personal application of the subject to the consciences of the hearers ; at another time, some other book is read, and the conversation turns upon any subject thus started. The pious students have also sometimes similar meetings among themselves ; but such assemblies, when no professor is present, are looked upon with a jealous eye by the government ; and they are therefore not recommended by those who wish well to the cause of religion. In some of the states, moreover, the presence of a teacher is rather an aggravation of the offence ; as is shewn in the case at Göttingen, referred to in the former parts of this article.

All such assemblies would be deemed imperfect without singing ; in which the Germans delight, and all take part. Indeed, taken as a nation, the Germans may be said to be more fond of music than even the Italians ; and it is notoriously the fact, that both vocal and instrumental music, and especially the latter, is more generally cultivated there than among their more southern neighbours. In sacred music they take the lead of all other nations ; and in all their seasons of worship, this holds almost an equal place with prayer ; or indeed it is in itself prayer, the pouring out of the soul to God in strains of harmony, as well as tears of contrition. An organ is an essential part of the furniture of a church ; as much so perhaps, in popular opinion and feeling, as the sacramental vessels of the altar. In the ordinary singing of the psalms, the congregation all join ; the music being wholly of the slow choral species ; which admits all to take part, without the need of great skill or practice. In other portions of the service, there is often music from a choir. Some of these choirs are very celebrated. That of St. Thomas' church in Leipsic is deservedly famous ; and the choir attached to the orphan-house in Halle, which goes about the streets of the city and sings before the houses of individuals, is perhaps not inferior to any other. The voices of the boys are sometimes most sweet and delightful. Indeed, every church has a small number of boys, who are instructed in music, and who thus sing around the streets. They are called the *Currende*, probably from *currere* ; and although their singing is generally boyish and wretched enough, yet this has sometimes been the school, in which genius has first gathered strength to mount upwards in long and lofty flights. In such a choir in the cathedral church of Halle, Handel commenced his career in the last

decennium of the seventeenth century.* As a member of a choir, Luther as a boy sung through the streets of Eisleben and amid all the business and turmoil of his future life, he gave up his taste and talent for music. One of the most pleasing prints relating to him, represents him seated at the harpsichord in the midst of his family, consisting of his wife, children and one or two other persons. The harpsichord or piano constitutes an essential part of the furniture in every household which has any pretensions to gentility; and it is rare to find a person of taste or education, who does not to some extent play upon this instrument. This remark applies even to the unlearned, to the profoundest scholars; and this is one of the chief *amusements*, one of the means of unbending the mind, which they daily practise, and to which they owe in a great measure the preservation of their health and constitutional vigour. These things are carried in Germany to an extent which public opinion, founded not on right or wrong, but in a difference of national custom, would not here allow. The writer once mingled with a little party at the house of a truly learned professor of divinity (a doctor of theology, to celebrate the return of his birth-day, a custom universal in Germany,) where in the course of the evening the father seated himself at the piano and played some time, while his little children, from three to ten years of age, danced around him. It is a part of the German national character, that the buoyancy of spirits and gaiety of heart which is felt, should also be expressed; and not, as is often the case with us, suppressed, either through a timid reserve or through the cavillings of others.

But to return from this digression to the graver subjects which claim our notice. In connexion with the residence of the students at the university, there is one topic, which might perhaps have been brought into view in the first part of this article, which may also not unsuitably be touched upon here, as regards more particularly the profession of theology. I refer to the paramount reputation and authority of living writers

* The musical festival mentioned on p. 203 of the present number, where, among other pieces, Handel's oratorio of *Saul* was performed by a choir of more than five hundred musicians, was held in the same church in which, nearly a century and a half before, Handel as a boy had been placed under the instruction of the organist Zuchau.

teachers ; and the comparative oblivion into which they speedily fall after death, or even so soon as they have retired from active life. The rage seems to be for new men and new books ; and the old are laid aside as of less value or as obsolete. It is at first very striking to a foreigner, to see how few books of any antiquity are referred to in the course of a theological education. In some branches, indeed, in which there have been no giants in modern days, reference must be had to the works of older writers ; such as the treasures of rabbinical lore collected by Lightfoot and Schoettgen, the Hebrew Concordance and Chaldee Lexicon of Buxtorf, etc. The writings of Luther are also not unfrequently quoted, as exhibiting the views of the leading champion of the Reformation ; but those of Melancthon and the other reformers, are seldom referred to. With exceptions like these, it is surprising how few standard works in theology and theological literature exist. By the side of Lowth's Lectures on the Poetry of the Hebrews, we may indeed place Herder's work on the same subject, which appeared many years later, and is still read and admired. But there are in Germany no works like Butler's Analogy, or Leslie's Short Method, or Baxter's Call and Saints' Rest, or Doddridge's Rise and Progress, which, having a fixed and permanent value, are perhaps more current and exert a greater influence now, than they did for a long time after their first publication. When a man dies, he and his works are forgotten. Many of the names of German writers, whom we have been accustomed in our own country to venerate and to consider as of the highest authority, are now rarely mentioned in Germany itself. J. D. Michaelis is there no longer regarded as a profound scholar, and his works are rarely quoted. Eichhorn, though just dead, is reckoned as superficial and declamatory. Storr still retains the praise of solidity and accuracy, but his authority has passed away. Jahn is still more rarely heard of ; and Schleusner, though yet alive, has outlived both his influence and his fame. These are but a few of the more prominent examples. It is not meant to be said by all this, that their names are no longer known, or their works no longer purchased. Indeed, you find their works in the library of every theologian of eminence ; but then the *authority* both of the writer and his writings exists no more ; his works are referred to by way of historical illustration ; but they are no longer reprinted, because the public does not call for them.

The reason of this general forgetfulness of theologians who

have passed from the stage, is probably to be sought for chiefly in the system of oral instruction at the universities, by which the pupils are made to depend in a very great degree upon the *dicta* of the teacher before them. This confidence in his oral instruction they transfer also to his writings; and the consequence is a paramount acquaintance with, and attachment to, the works of living authors, whose lectures they have themselves attended, or whom they have learned to admire and repose confidence in, from the reports of friends or the voice of public fame. It is taken for granted that there is a constant progress in every science; and that a learned man of the present day stands on higher ground than one of former days, possessing as he does all the results of the labours and investigations of those who have preceded him, as well as those which his own industry and sagacity may have enabled him to supply. His works are therefore supposed to be, *prima facie*, superior to former works on the same subjects; and hence there arises throughout the German theological world the spirit of the Athenians, the desire in this respect to become acquainted with *τὸ καινότερον*. The writer once, in conversation with a German professor, one of the most distinguished for piety and learning, spoke of Hug's Introduction to the New Testament as being probably the best extant. He assented to the remark as true at that time; but observed that the Introduction of De Wette (which was not then published) would probably be better, because it would be *newer*. The result however, according to his own subsequent acknowledgement, did not in this instance correspond to his expectation.

All these remarks apply chiefly to the period in which a young man is actually engaged in the study of theology; and the amount of them is, that professional knowledge is principally founded upon, and derived from, the instructions and works of learned men now or recently upon the stage of action. These are the teachers, the authoritative standards; while their predecessors, of the last or preceding centuries, are consulted for isolated facts or historical illustration. For this purpose—and this is a mode of study, if not peculiar, yet habitually necessary to the German student—extensive libraries are requisite, in which those books that are the repositories of the learning and labours, the thoughts and feelings and opinions, of by-gone ages, may be laid up for the use of the present and future generations. Hence a library of fifty thousand volumes is accounted but a small one in Germa-

ny. But these public libraries, however extensive and splendid, are not enough for the private student, nor yet for the professor in a university. Every man who will labour to advantage, must have his instruments at hand and within his reach. He cannot break off in the midst of an investigation, in order to go perhaps half a mile to the public library, to examine an author to whom reference is made. He must have his books around him, or at least those which are most important in his own department. It is therefore commonly the case, that a young man begins early in his university course to lay the foundation of a future library; and the facilities for obtaining books in that country are so great, that, by patience and perseverance, he is generally able in a few years, to make an extensive and valuable collection at a comparatively very small price.*

* The regular book trade of Germany is circuitous, but is conducted with the utmost method and fairness. The centre and soul of this trade is Leipsic. Every bookseller, wherever situated, has his commissioner in Leipsic, with whom he keeps a deposit of his publications, and to whom he pays a certain sum annually for taking charge of his business. Out of Leipsic it is not customary to keep books on hand in any quantity; but if you wish to buy, for instance, of a bookseller in Halle a book published at Stuttgart, you will most probably have to wait till he can send to his agent in Leipsic; this agent goes to the agent of the publisher of the book, and if he happens to have it on hand, you get the book in five or six days; if he has not got it, he sends to the publisher in Stuttgart, and you get it perhaps in a month; but always through the two commissioners in Leipsic. The accounts however are kept between the two booksellers in Halle and Stuttgart. Once in every year, at the great Easter fair in Leipsic, all the booksellers of Germany convene there; each opens for the time a shop, and sells as many of his publications as he can, or delivers them out on commission to those who will take them; but the chief business is the settlement among themselves of all the accounts for the preceding year. The booksellers' part of the fair usually continues from three to four weeks.

There is a difference between a book publisher and a bookseller. Tauchnitz of Leipsic and Perthes of Hamburg are two of the largest publishers in Germany; but they are not booksellers. Commonly however the two departments are united in the same person; and there are few booksellers who are not also publishers. The regular discount made by a publisher to the trade is 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. sometimes 40, and very rarely 50 per cent. from the retail price or *Ladenpreis*. Booksellers (other than the publishers) make to one another, on publications not their own, a discount of 25 per cent. and to

Hence it arises, that almost every professor in a university, and every studious man, has a select, valuable, and often

customers generally 16 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. There is also another class of publications called *netto*, because they are sold to customers in general without discount. On these the publisher makes a discount to booksellers of 25 per cent. and booksellers one of 16 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. to one another.

But the dealings of the regular booksellers are confined solely to books which are now in the market; and it is ordinarily impossible to obtain through them any book, of which copies cannot be obtained from the publisher or his commissioner in Leipsic. This is a point of honour among them, and it is adhered to with singular fidelity. Should any one deviate from it, he would at once be denounced by his brethren; and the loss of their confidence, and what to him is more, the loss of their trade, would be the inevitable consequence. There is perhaps more of downright honest, methodical, regular dealing among the booksellers of Germany, than with those of any other country.

To obtain old books, that is, those that are no longer in the hands of the original publishers, and therefore not obtainable through the regular trade, there are two methods, which are both at last resolvable into one. The first is, to have recourse to the *antiquaries*, as they are called, or dealers in old books. It is the business of these persons to deal in those very books which the regular booksellers cannot furnish; and if they adhered strictly to this limit, there could be no ground of collision between them. It is obvious that these antiquaries cannot have any method or regularity in their prices; and generally speaking, they may be said to have a proneness to jockey. By interfering therefore, as they sometimes do, with the regular prices of the booksellers, and underselling them in their own publications, the antiquaries have generally brought themselves into great discredit with the trade at large. This is of course spoken generally; for there are among the antiquaries men of character and dealing strictly honourable, and who are in a high degree civil and obliging. But they cannot, as a general rule, have any regular, fixed prices for their books, buying them as they do at auctions and private sale; and the purchaser must therefore rely solely on his own judgment and experience. The only one who has attempted the system of regular prices, is Weigel of Leipsic, a man of education, who has undertaken to unite the character of a regular bookseller with that of the antiquary. He has a very large and valuable collection of old books, and through his extensive connexions throughout Germany, Holland, and France, he endeavours to keep his list always complete. He must however necessarily fix his regular price so high, as always to be able to procure the same book

extensive library of his own. The clergy in particular are, according to their circumstances, rich in this respect. The libra-

again for a less price; and the consequence is, that his demands are usually much higher than the ordinary prices, for which the same books may be bought in the auctions. To booksellers, however, he makes the same discount on old books as on new ones; while to other customers he makes no allowance, unless they take to the amount of 50 rix dollars.

But the auctions that are constantly occurring, are the great source from which the antiquaries derive their books; and these are just as accessible to every one else as to them. For a person therefore who is collecting a library, it is always better to watch the auctions, than to have recourse to an antiquary and buy his books at an advance. A stranger however cannot well do this; he needs first to become acquainted with the national character and modes of doing business; he must also be familiar with books, and especially those he may wish to purchase, in order to judge of the probable state and condition of the book, and of the price to be offered; for most books will have to be bought without previous examination. On all these points he may gather advice from friends acquainted with the subject; and also very frequently from an antiquary, who usually knows all these things, because they are his trade.

Such auctions occur very frequently. When a professor or any other learned man dies, as is said in the text above, his library comes under the hammer. Public libraries not infrequently dispose of their duplicates in this manner. Bookstores of a hundred years' standing sometimes bring also their old stock into an auction. Three or four quite extensive auctions have been held, of books belonging to the proprietors of the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* in Halle, which had been sent in to be reviewed; and of which an immense quantity had collected since the first establishment of that work in 1785. When an auction is proposed, the books are all numbered and labelled; catalogues are printed, in which the title and date of each book are given in full, and its condition specified, whether in sheets, boards, bound, or otherwise, and whether in good or bad preservation. These catalogues are dispersed all over the country, and agents are appointed in different places, to whom applications may be made. A person therefore who wishes to buy, has only to look through the catalogue, and make a list of the books he wants, marking against each the highest price that he is willing to give. This he can readily fix; as there is a sort of customary auction price, which is easily ascertained. This list is forwarded by himself, or by an agent near him, to an agent on the spot, who regularly attends the auction; and if there be no higher

ry of Gesenius is very select ; that of Schleusner contains not less than five or six thousand volumes. Hengstenberg has bestowed great care and attention in the purchase of books ; and although quite a young man, he has probably one of the best and most extensive private libraries in Germany. The books are almost always purchased at auction, in the manner pointed out in the note below ; and one has only to watch the auctions carefully, in order to buy at a great advantage. There is in this way a constant circulation in Germany of old and valuable books. No sooner does a professor or other learned man die, than his library is almost invariably disposed of at public sale. During the residence of the writer in that country, there were sold in this manner the rich and extensive libraries of Gabler, Eichhorn, Tzschirner, Niemeyer in part, Buttman, Reisig, and many others ; besides two very important auctions of duplicates from the public libraries of Berlin and Heidelberg. A few years at most will bring the noble collection of Schleusner under the hammer. Would that the students of our own country could have access to share in these spoils ! We might in that case truly call them *spoils* ; for the ordinary cost of books purchased in this manner, is probably less than one third of what our scholars are usually compelled to pay for them here.

From all the preceding remarks and illustrations, it is obvious, that we may naturally look in Germany for a *learned*, and also in general for an *able* clergy. This expectation will not be disappointed on a closer examination. In no other

offer than his own on any book, it becomes his of course, and at the lowest price for which the agent can obtain it. The books are then forwarded to his order ; and he pays the actual cost, together with 8½ per cent. on this cost for the agency. As such auctions often continue from three to six weeks, it is obvious, that this system of employing agents is a great relief ; and renders light and facile that which would be intolerable, were one compelled to attend in person.

A stranger, as has been said above, cannot well avail himself of these facilities ; but a person who expects to reside two or three years in the country, might easily do it. It is particularly for such as these, that the foregoing remarks have been written. They are the results of four years of observation and the experience acquired in the purchase of from four to five thousand volumes ; and if the writer can judge from his own feelings, those who go abroad with similar objects in view, will thank him for the information.

country will be found so many professors of theology, (not all of them indeed clergymen,) who are men of distinguished talent and profound learning. What has England, which is the only country that can be named by way of competition, to offer in comparison with the host of learned theologians who now fill the German chairs of instruction? In no other land probably will the clergy at large, both in city and country, be found to be so generally and deeply learned and studious. Go where you will, among the most miserable villages or hamlets, you still find learning and talent; would that it could justly be added, devotedness and zeal! The writer once spent a night with the pastor of a small hamlet about fifteen miles from Magdeburg, a miserable assemblage of mud huts, to which no parallel could probably be found in the United States. The parsonage was in ruins, affording hardly a decent shelter even during the summer months. The whole population were peasants of the lowest class; with the exception of the family of the proprietor, which resided there part of the year, but which held no intercourse with the pastor, because of his so called *mystical* proceedings. The village lay at a distance from any great road, and was accessible only by paths across the fields, (like the greater portion of German villages,) which in spring and autumn, or after continued rain, are almost impassable. In this humble spot you find as pastor a young man, the son of one of the first dignitaries of the church, thoroughly educated and highly intelligent, who had travelled in England and France, and spoke fluently the Latin, English and French languages, in addition to his native German. You find in his wife the daughter of a distinguished professor in one of the most celebrated universities, a lady of polished manners and cultivated mind, conversing also at ease in both English and French. What is more than all, you find in this pastor a humble, faithful, and devoted servant of the cross, willing to spend and be spent in his Master's cause, and esteeming no residence too obscure, and no service too humble, 'if so be he may win souls to Christ.'

This is perhaps an extreme case; but similar instances are to be found in every part of the country; indeed, one might almost say, in every village. The preacher in a small village near Halle, is the editor of Euclid in the original Greek; and the instances are numerous, in which pastors of country parishes have brought out able editions of the various Greek and

Roman writers. Wahl, when he published the first edition of his *Clavis*, was the pastor of a small and retired city among the mountains of Saxony; and although since then promoted to be superintendent at Oschatz, yet this scarcely brings him into a more cultivated circle. As a very general fact, we may aver, that out of the larger cities, the clergy, educated as they are, and often possessing polished manners and accustomed to cultivated society, have opportunity to associate only with a rough and illiterate peasantry. It is true that even the peasants in general can read and write; but they are not a reading people; they have neither newspapers nor books adapted to their wants; nor, if they had the means, have they the taste or inclination to improve them. A peasant is usually content to sit down at ease in the same station which his father occupied before him, and it is difficult to rouse him from his apathy. Let him labour and toil and strive as much as he will, such is the constitution of society, such the tardiness and stagnation of trade, and such the monopolies and requisitions of the government, that a peasant can never hope by his industry to acquire property, so as to raise himself to a different footing in society. There are indeed occasional exceptions, but this is notoriously the general fact. How different from our own land, where every one, even the most needy, may hope in a few years, by enterprise and industry, to acquire competence and even comparative wealth!

Such being the general character of the population in the villages of Germany, and such the condition of the pastors, we do not need to look any farther for the original cause of that almost *non-intercourse* which subsists between the pastor and his people. What probably arose by degrees, has now become habitual; and that species of intercourse with his flock, which an American clergyman justly deems so essential, and which not unfrequently is of more effect than all his other ministrations, viz. the visiting from house to house, and an intimate and familiar acquaintance with families and individuals, is in Germany almost unknown. The pastor feels that he has done his duty, (and public opinion and universal practice sanction this belief,) when he has gone through with the public services of Sunday and the catechising of the children; and has attended the funerals, baptisms, and weddings, that occur. In the cities, although the same reason did not originally exist, yet the same habits have grown up; so that it is now just as rare to find a

city clergyman visiting his people *as their pastor*, as it is to see it in the country.

It is in this way that the pastors find time to apply themselves to study. Some become editors of classic authors; others write books on theology; some cultivate botany or mineralogy; and others again become farmers. It is in this way also that distinguished professors in the universities can, at the same time, be pastors of churches. They have time for all these things; because they do not 'give themselves wholly to their ministry.' This is a general feature of the German church; and individuals therefore are not to be made objects of particular censure; but we may lament the circumstances which have brought about this state of things; and have reason to offer earnest prayers to God, that light may shine upon their way and guide them in the path of duty.

As there is little intercourse between the pastors and their people, so also the clergy have little professional intercourse among themselves. Associations of ministers for the purposes of friendly intercourse or mutual improvement, or to devise means for promoting the great objects to which their lives are professedly devoted, are almost unknown. Within a few years, a meeting of this kind has been set on foot by the evangelical clergy within a wide circle around Halle, which has sometimes been attended by twenty persons or more; some of whom have travelled fifty miles in order to be present. Whether it will prove permanent, remains to be seen. But this was the only thing of the kind, which the writer heard of in Germany; although he made much inquiry on the subject. There may not improbably, however, be other similar meetings established in other parts of the country among the evangelical clergy; certainly not among the rationalists; but it is obviously so rare an occurrence, that a knowledge of it is not generally diffused.

The character of German preaching is such as would naturally arise out of the circumstances and character of the clergy. Among the great body it is of course merely moral preaching, in which the *gospel* occupies a very inferior part. But even among the evangelical clergy, the preaching is rather of the general, hortatory, declamatory kind; not direct and pointed, nor calculated to arouse sinners, and make them feel their dangers and wants, and the necessity of flying to a Saviour's cross. In all this, however, it only resembles much of the English preaching of the present day.

The stipends of the German clergy are in general small; they

will not probably average *more* than about 500 rix dollars, or \$350 per annum. But it must be recollected, that the expenses of living are there less than here. This income is paid in different ways ; there being no tithes except in the catholic parts of the country. In the Lutheran churches, the church fees make out no small portion of the pastor's revenue. These are fixed by custom or law ; but custom has also established the rule, that those who are in good circumstances, or who make pretensions to gentility, shall pay much more than the regular fees. The latter however are in most cases sufficiently high. The funeral of a person of consideration cannot well bring in less than forty or fifty rix dollars to the church. A wedding, with the previous publication of the banns, costs from twenty to thirty rix dollars.* On the birth of a child, it is the duty of the midwife to give notice to the pastor of the church, who offers public prayers for the mother and child, and expects to receive, for this service, a rix dollar from the parents ; who sometimes know nothing of what has thus taken place till long afterwards. The solemn preparation for the communion brings also, by custom, a present of money to the pastor ; and there are those who receive such an offering even from the poorest communicants. It is usually sent to the pastor before the communion ; but sometimes he takes his station in the church, while the communicants pass along before him and drop their gifts into his cap, which he holds out to receive them. This money is for his own private use. Indeed, every thing must be paid for, and it would be regarded as discredita-

* The obstacles laid in the way of marriage, in most if not all the German states, are not only such as to preclude the possibility of the stolen matches which are so common in England and America, but are also exceedingly onerous and expensive to the common people. In Prussia, (and in Saxony it is still worse,) before the banns can be published, each of the parties, and their parents if living, must sign a *protocol* before the pastor, signifying their purpose and assent. If the parents or any of them are dead, the parties must produce the regular church certificate of the decease of each ; and such a certificate costs one rix dollar. If either party has been before married, he or she must produce a similar certificate of the death of the former wife or husband ; and also a certificate from the magistracy of the place, if there are children by the former marriage, that they have no objection on the score of ability to support these children. Should any clergyman publish the banns before all these formalities are complied with, he is liable to be, and would be, deposed from his office, and cast out of employment for life. The banns are published three times.

ble not to give more than can be legally demanded. In the reformed or Calvinistic church, the stipends of the clergy are nominally higher, and they have no direct benefit from the fees; which there go into the treasury of the church.

The civil power has made the church its minister, in all that relates to the registry of births and deaths, and to the celebration of marriage. In catholic countries, this is a thing of course; because marriage is there regarded as a sacrament of the church. In Germany the same practice is continued, under the authority of the government, which makes all the laws and regulations appertaining to these subjects, and gives to the church the exclusive power to exercise them. This therefore forms one branch of revenue to the church or pastor. The registry of all these events is to be paid for; and they must all be entered; because the sufficient and only admissible evidence of the birth, marriage, or death of any person, is the certificate of the pastor of the church, founded upon this record. The evidence of the birth or identity of a person depends on the record of his baptism, in which the date of the birth is mentioned. The baptism usually takes place within three or four weeks after birth; in Saxony it *must* be within one week. Of course an unbaptized person is a novelty in Germany, unless he be a Jew or heathen; and it was with marks of astonishment, that intelligent persons there first learned the fact, that perhaps one half of the citizens of the United States had never received the rite of baptism.—As those certificates are the only evidence in regard to these matters in all the courts of justice, they are very often called for; and thus afford to the church no inconsiderable income.

After the preceding remarks upon the general character and want of personal activity in the clergy, it cannot be anticipated that the church itself, as a body, would exhibit any great degree of activity and energy. This however is not for want of ministers; for there are no waste places, in the sense in which we apply this expression; that is, there are no permanently vacant churches. The host of young men who every year, from motives good or bad, devote themselves to the ministry of the gospel, are sufficient and more than sufficient to supply the ravages made by death and other causes in the clerical ranks.* Every impor-

* From the statements made in Part I. it appears that there are usually about 4,000 protestant theological students pursuing their studies at the universities.

tant church in the cities, and sometimes in the country, has at least two, and more commonly three ministers, viz. a pastor and two *diaconi* or sub-pastors, who all officiate regularly in turn ; so that it is rare for the same individual to preach more than once on the same day. There is therefore no lack of preachers either in town or country ; it is the want of spiritual-minded, devoted pastors, that is felt throughout all the churches and throughout the land.

There are however two circumstances, connected with the church itself, especially in cities, which would present important obstacles to the exertions even of the most devoted servant of God, who might in other respects act under the most favourable auspices and be animated by the warmest zeal. The one arises from the fact, that the present protestant churches of Germany, having been with very few exceptions already in existence before the Reformation, still remain in very nearly the same state in which they passed from catholic into protestant hands. The buildings have indeed received the necessary repairs and alterations ; and in some few instances have been rebuilt ; but their number *has not been increased*, except in a very few places. The consequence is, that the increase of population in some parts of the country has rendered the present churches entirely insufficient to accommodate the people, were they disposed to attend ; while in other parts, where the population has remained stationary or has diminished, the churches have been sometimes shut up. In Halle, with a population of 26,000 inhabitants, there are only six churches, exclusive of a small catholic church and a synagogue ; and yet another church has been within a few years broken up, and first assigned to the university as its chapel, then converted into a theatre, and finally demolished, to make room for the projected university buildings. In Berlin, with a population of 220,000, the number of churches is much less than in New York or Philadelphia. A new church has recently been erected by, or under the direction of, the government ; because the astounding fact had become apparent, that the number of souls within the jurisdiction of one of the churches and belonging to it, was not less than *fifty thousand* ! The case is the same in almost or quite all the large cities. It is obvious, therefore, that a minister cannot act with efficiency upon this mass of population. Neither could the clergy, if they were so disposed, easily bring about a change in this respect. We in this country can have no idea of the difficulty

of establishing a new church in Germany. In the first place, the power to do so rests solely with the government, who are usually jealous of all such proposals, and totally disinclined to furnish money to erect an edifice, which would otherwise never be built. In the next place, the present churches and parishes have come down from the Reformation, and have all the venerable authority and sanction of usage and long established custom, and are surrounded by throngs of historical associations. To us, who have comparatively no history, and who are accustomed one year to pull down the buildings which we have erected the preceding year, in order to please the eye or gratify the taste, it is impossible to estimate the hold which all these things have upon the feelings of the German people, or the influence which they exert upon their national character and movements.

The other circumstance alluded to above, as tending to limit the influence and exertions of a minister, is the fact that all the public services of the church are regularly fixed by law or by established custom, and may not be changed nor departed from. The minister is bound to observe these, and these only; he may do neither more nor less. In most churches in the country there are two services on Sunday, as with us; or where there is a chapel of ease in a different part of the parish, as is often the case, the afternoon worship is frequently held there. In the cities there is often in addition an early service on Sunday, at 6 o'clock in the morning. In many churches too there are services, long since established, on the week days. In one church in Halle there was always preaching on Monday afternoon; but the whole audience was usually composed of a few poor females; and the preacher, although a man of lax views, felt himself bound to officiate, provided there were *two* persons present. Other services of a similar kind are not much better attended. The laws require also that all baptisms and marriages shall be celebrated in a church; but a license from the pastor or magistracy, as the case may be, may at any time be purchased for a specific sum; and this is the course usually pursued.

Were now a clergyman to attempt to institute a weekly lecture, or a course of meetings at any time apart from the fixed and legal services, he would not only be frowned upon and probably subjected to punishment by the government; but by thus making innovations on established usages, would probably have to encounter the prejudices and opposition of the people at large.

Even Spener and Francke, with all their zeal and wide-spread influence, did not venture to throw off the trammels of law and custom in this respect ; they confined themselves strictly within these bounds ; and operated, the latter especially when he acted beyond the pale of usage, more through the medium of private instruction and exhortation, through schools and the distribution of tracts, and by a personal example of 'simplicity and godly sincerity.' Could other men like Francke arise, they might in like manner accomplish very much even within the restraints of the government upon the church. But on the great body of the clergy, let their own personal feelings and wishes be what they may, it is obvious that these things present obstacles which few, however zealous, have sufficient energy properly tempered with discretion, cautiously and successfully to surmount.

If then it might naturally be anticipated, even in the case of a zealous and evangelical ministry, that they would feel themselves in this manner restrained and shackled, and thus their exertions be rendered fruitless and unavailing ; what must we not expect, when, as has been said above, the great majority of the actual clergy have entered upon their sacred office without feeling any interest in its holy duties, and without even the pretence of possessing love to God, or any special regard to the eternal welfare of the souls of their fellow-men ? when they deny the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and instead of making them 'the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice,' degrade them, practically at least, to a level with the Koran and the Zend-Avesta ? The result is precisely what might have been apprehended. Preachers of this class have first poisoned the minds of their hearers ; and then the latter, following out the spirit of the precepts and (often) the example of their teachers, have left them to preach to empty walls. To an American it is a striking and painful sight to enter the house of God, and find it almost uniformly destitute of worshippers. The preacher is there ; the services are there ; the voice of song rises from the choir and organ ; but a worshipping *assembly* can hardly be said to be there ! Go where you will, in every part of the country, and you find the same neglect of public worship ; or at most, you will find the churches thronged on particular occasions, as on Christmas or Good Friday. There are however some exceptions. Many of the churches in Berlin are always well filled. When Strauss or Schleirmacher preach, they are sure to draw a crowded audience ; as is also the case with most of the evan-

gical preachers. In one small church, where the gospel is literally 'preached to the poor,' there is always such a throng, that it is almost impossible to obtain admission. At other times the churches of Berlin are not more filled than others. At Wittemberg, under the ministrations of Heubner and other pious pastors, the principal church is filled to overflowing. The other church, on whose door Luther posted up his celebrated theses, and in which he and Melancthon lie buried, has been assigned to the use of the theological seminary; and the students preach there to empty pews.

The same neglect of public worship in general, which keeps so many wholly away from the church, induces most of those who profess to attend, to limit their presence to the time occupied by the sermon. It is the common practice to arrive just before the preacher commences, and to leave immediately or soon after he has closed.

Whether or not this general disregard of the institutions of public worship, especially upon the Sabbath, is in any important degree to be referred to the light in which the Sabbath is regarded by the whole German church, is a question worthy of deep and serious consideration. It is well known, and needs not to be repeated here, that the views of the protestant churches generally on the continent, in regard to the first day of the week, coincide in the main points with those of the Roman catholic church. They suppose the Jewish Sabbath to have been abrogated under the New Testament dispensation; and that the first day of the week, instead of coming into the place of the Jewish Sabbath, is to be kept simply as a religious festival in commemoration of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and is recommended, only as such, by the practice of the apostles and Christians of the earliest ages. The protestants of the continent therefore, while they hold that a portion of the day should be devoted to the duties of public and private worship and meditation, do not suppose it necessary, during the remaining portion, to withdraw from the cares and duties of the world. But although they hold that labour and the occupations of business are not unlawful, yet they more generally spend the afternoon in walking abroad in the fields or public gardens, in riding or dining out, or generally in the pleasures of social intercourse.

Now in this state of things we might reasonably draw the conclusion,—and it is difficult to see why it would not be a

correct one,—that to persons holding this view of the Sabbath, the stated exercises of that day would become an object of less interest and of less importance, and would naturally in a course of years come to be entirely disregarded and neglected. So far as we can see, this must be the inevitable tendency and consequence of such a belief; and the present state of the German churches might properly be adduced as an illustration, were it not for a single circumstance. This is the fact, that the same view of the Sabbath was held and taught by the reformers themselves, and has been taught throughout the protestant church ever since. It has been universally held and practised upon even in the times of the greatest religious excitement, and by the most pious, devoted, and active Christians, both of former days and of the present time; by Luther and Melancthon, by Spener and Francke, and by many others of a standing little inferior to theirs. So far then as this fact goes, it would seem to shew, that the frequenting of the public institutions of religion depends more on the state of religious feeling among a people, than on any particular views in regard to holy time.

The view of the Sabbath above alluded to, is not only the prevailing one in Germany, but perhaps the universal one. It is taught in all the catechisms; and the child is educated in it there, as much as he is trained up in the opposite view here. Indeed the first day of the week, although held as a religious festival, is yet regarded as less solemn and important than some of the other great festivals. During a conversation on this subject, the question was put, in the writer's presence, to a pious and intelligent young lady, Whether the whole course of her education did not lead her spontaneously to feel, that Christmas and Good Friday were more important and sacred days than Sunday? After a moment's hesitation she replied frankly and decidedly in the affirmative. To her mind it had never before been suggested, that the Sabbath was to be sanctified and kept in the manner practised by the American churches.

Where public worship is disregarded in the manner above described, we cannot suppose that the private worship of families will be found to flourish in vigour or be widely practised. It does not indeed follow, that where the churches are thronged at the public services, family worship is of course habitually attended at home; but the converse of this proposition may be assumed as perhaps universally true, viz. that the latter cannot flourish when the former is neglected. The extent to which family

worship had been laid aside in Germany, until a recent period, will hardly be believed in this country. The writer himself could not at first yield credit to the statements that were made to him ; but supposed that they must refer to peculiar cases, from which no general inference could be drawn ; until he found them repeated and confirmed by unquestionable testimony in every part of the country. As a general fact, then, throughout the whole of Germany, or at least the whole northern division of it, family worship is entirely *obsolete and unknown*, except among the evangelical Christians, or *mystics* as they are there called ; and even among them it is only within the last fifteen years, that the custom of morning and evening prayers has again been introduced. An instructor in one of the leading universities, himself a pious man and the son of a pastor near one of the principal cities, had never either witnessed nor heard of family prayers, (except as an historical fact,) until he visited England after he had completed his university education. In that country he was casually present at a family scene of this kind, and the impression made upon him was such as he could never forget, he said, until his dying day. To another professor, among the most eminent of the land for piety and learning, the practice was not so entirely unknown ; he remembered that when a child his father held morning and evening prayers, but afterwards left them off ; and since that time, until he had grown up and mingled in Christian intercourse, he had heard nothing further of the custom. Judging from the facts collected by observation and frequent and long continued inquiries, it would not perhaps be too much to say, that of the families of northern Germany, in not more than *one in a hundred* does the voice of morning and evening supplication ascend to God as incense from a family altar.

Of course, meetings for social prayer are almost unknown. A few families in Berlin, and some of them of rank, have a private circle in their houses every week, for the purposes of religious conversation and social worship. To these circles however none are admitted but invited guests. In Halle there was regularly a religious meeting every Saturday evening, at the house of a mechanic, where students sometimes attended. This meeting was ever a subject of ridicule among the greater part of the citizens, and of jealousy to the magistracy ; and several attempts were made to bring home upon it charges of disorder and irregularity, in order to have a pretext for putting it

down. These attempts however failed; and every investigation only resulted in shewing, not only that the meeting was the occasion of no disorders, but that it was quietly and regularly conducted, and had for its sole object to make those who attended better men and better citizens.—Under circumstances like the above, it hardly needs to be added here, that the monthly concert of prayer for missionary objects is attended only in a few of the cities; where it is sometimes treated with great reproach and contempt.

After dwelling thus long on the darker shades of the picture which it has been attempted to draw of the German churches, it would be both unjust and ungenerous not to turn for a moment to one or two of the brighter traits by which it is illuminated.

Among these we may reckon that frankness and sincerity, that open-heartedness and candour, which characterize the Christians of Germany. One might almost say, that they carry their hearts in their hands; they rush to meet a Christian brother with a full and overflowing tide of Christian affection, and pour out all their feelings and their whole hearts before him, unchecked by the embarrassments of English or American reserve, or the calculations of a cold and wary prudence. We have seen and admired in our own land, the exhibitions of religious character among the Moravian Christians. These are here mostly Germans; and it is in fact the *national* character that we have admired, and not the peculiarities engrafted upon them by their religious faith and discipline. The same purity and unaffected piety, the same zeal and self-devotedness, the same 'simplicity and godly sincerity,' constitute the distinguishing traits of the great body of German believers. It is the national frankness and affectionate open-hearted kindness, purified and elevated and ennobled by the influence of the religion of Christ, and pouring itself out in the habitual and ardent practice of 'whatsoever things are pure and lovely and of good report.'

We may also notice, as a happy trait in the character of German Christians, the absence of a censorious spirit. There are indeed in that country, as well as in others, those who esteem it their right and their duty to watch over the spiritual, as well as temporal concerns of their neighbours; and to make their own views and opinions the standard to which all others should conform. But as a general fact, this is not the character of the Christians of Germany. If a brother agrees with them in essen-

tials, they are willing to bear and to forbear with him in regard to other matters ; and by the exhibition of meekness and gentleness seek rather to win him over upon minor points, than by disapprobation and censure drive him to a greater distance from them. They abstain from 'judging one another, remembering that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' Indeed this would seem to be the true spirit of religious tolerance.*

We might here go on to speak at large of the humility, the patience, the zeal, and other virtues of the Christians of Germany. The whole however may be summed up in a few words by saying,—and it is a testimony which is deserved, and which the writer rejoices with his whole heart at being permitted thus publicly to pay,—that in no nation under heaven is the gospel, when received into good and honest hearts, more fully and faithfully carried out in practice ; no where is the spirit of the gospel more fully exemplified, or 'every thought and deed brought more into captivity to the obedience of Christ.' Would that this testimony could apply to the nation at large !

But with all their excellencies of private character, our German brethren in Christ have not yet learned the grand secret of producing great public effects. They do not act in concert. They have not yet learned that *united* action is *powerful* action. There are indeed Bible societies, and missionary societies, and tract societies, some of which have long existed, and have individually done much good. The Bible institute of Canstein and the missionary society of the orphan-house in Halle, have been in being since the days of Francke. But the effects produced by all these, have been the result rather of individual effort,

* This may also be styled a *national* characteristic. In no country, when disputes *do* arise, are they conducted with more violence and bitterness than in Germany ; because from the very frankness of the people, they speak out all they think and feel. But on the other hand, there is no country where a scholar of any kind may lay his views before the world, with the certainty of having them more calmly examined and more liberally estimated. Every one possesses, in fact as well as in name, the right of thinking and speaking as he pleases, without being held accountable to public opinion ; nor if his views run counter to those generally received, is he therefore thrown out of the pale of fellowship or friendly feeling. Indeed, in no country is a learned man, in this respect, more unshackled. These remarks do not apply, of course, to political subjects.

either of some single director or particular missionaries. Combined effort there has been none ; nor have the public at large, or even the great body of orthodox Christians, interested themselves at all in the subject, or even been made acquainted with the facts.* They would seem almost to have gone upon the principle of not letting 'the left hand know what the right hand doeth;' one society having known little or nothing of the proceedings of the others. Nor in the present time of awakening excitement, has there been hitherto any great improvement in this respect. Societies have been established and have become individually more active ; but they have as yet no united plan of action. The missionary society of Berlin, for instance, which one would suppose might naturally extend its branches, at least throughout the north of Germany, has no branches. So also of Leipsic and other cities. The nearest approach to union is in the south of Germany ; where the Missionary Seminary of Basle forms a *nucleus*, around which cluster the affections and the exertions of Christians in the neighbouring states of Baden and Würtemberg. Here is published a quarterly Missionary Journal, and weekly Missionary Reports, which obtain a wide circulation and excite a deep interest in the missionary cause.

The reason of all this want of concert, and of this comparative public inefficiency of Christian effort in Germany, is not difficult to be discovered. Broken up as they are into fifty or more different sovereignties, without a common capital either of literature or commerce, there is no one central point, towards which either religious feeling or religious effort could easily be directed. There is moreover always a sort of jealousy of feeling between the inhabitants of different states, which, not being merged, as here, in any more powerful *national* feeling, prevents them in some degree from acting heartily in concert. Perhaps however we may, with more reason, ascribe this public inactivity to that want of practical efficiency and energy, which must be regarded as constituting a feature of the national character. The Germans are the subjects of despotic govern-

* At the present day also, the German public at large are very little acquainted with the missionary and other benevolent operations of the age, even of their own country ; much less with those of other countries. *Here* an ignorance of these things implies an utter indifference, if not hostility, to the cause itself ; *there* it would be unjust and harsh to draw at once such a conclusion.

ments ; they are unused to plans of public improvement ; since these are there the business of the governments, and not of individuals. There is nothing to awaken what we call *public spirit* ; and this therefore is a thing unknown among the body of the nation, except in great emergencies. Such was the war of 1813, when the whole of Prussia rose up as one man, and drove the relentless oppressor of their country to his distant and desolate rock of the ocean. But in matters which depend on long continued activity ; where there is no external pressure, but the impulse must come from within ; they are prone to remain in the same state in which their fathers were. The same want of an enterprising spirit in practical affairs, which characterizes the people in their worldly business, spreads also its composing influence over their religious efforts. The spirit of tranquillity and dislike of change pervades their conduct throughout. In New England, a congregation becomes too large to be longer able to meet within its church ; a new one is erected almost of course, and the congregation divides. A society separates from any other cause, and builds a second place of worship at once. A church is burned down, or is far decayed, or is old and out of good taste ; another is immediately erected ; and all this, usually, solely from the funds of the society or congregation itself. How many instances, or perhaps hundreds of instances, of this kind, might be pointed out in New England within the last ten years ? In Germany, as has been said above, the present churches, almost without exception, have come down from a period before the Reformation. They are many of them in a state of great dilapidation ; and often seem ready to tumble in and bury the worshippers beneath their ruins. Yet no one even thinks of rebuilding them ; and if an absolute necessity arises, if a church be burned down, or itself crumbles to ruins, it is first the government that must bestow the funds ; and if these be not sufficient, subscriptions are set on foot throughout the land. It is not perhaps too much to say, that if the churches in Germany were by any event to be destroyed, they could not in the present state of feeling be rebuilt. An emergency of such a kind might indeed kindle the latent spark of public spirit to a high effort in behalf of religion ; and once enkindled, by whatever means, it might burn on with a flame ever brighter and holier, until the whole land were filled with its brightness, and all be led to walk and act together in the light thereof.

The remarks in this and the two preceding numbers, upon the subject of theological education in Germany, and upon the general character of the clergy and of the church at large, have been extended to a length far greater than was at first anticipated; and still many topics connected with these subjects are left untouched, in regard to which the writer is well aware that the Christian public would gladly receive information. But enough has been crowded into the consideration of the present topic; and it depends chiefly on circumstances beyond human control, whether the writer will be able to treat of subjects of a similar kind in future numbers of this work. It must depend also, in some measure, on the taste and wishes of the public; for it would be useless to deal out food which no one relishes or desires.

If now we cast our eyes over the remarks and illustrations which have been offered, two reflections seem to present themselves spontaneously to our notice. The first is, that they all go to exemplify and confirm a remark made at the very outset (p. 1), that 'the Germans are a nation of little practical energy, but of vast intellectual exertion and activity.' We do not need to dwell upon this point; because this feature may be, and is, properly assumed as nationally characteristic; and all the remarks hitherto made, afford an incidental, though not intentional, elucidation of it.

The second reflection above alluded to is this; that we have in the case of the German churches, a practical exhibition of all the benefits which can ever be expected to arise from a dependence of the church on the state; with perhaps only those evils which are inseparable from such a connexion. We see the church armed with the power, which in this country she can never possess, of authoritatively regulating the qualifications of her pastors; and furnished with all the apparatus of schools and universities and able and learned teachers, to carry her requisitions into complete effect. We see the civil power lending its aid to enforce all these requisitions; to erect and repair churches; to augment the income of the clergy; to recommend attendance on public worship and the practice of virtue and religious duty. What more, it may be asked, can a church need, in order to go on and prosper, and grow every day in strength and influence and usefulness? Alas! these things are but the frame-work, the naked skeleton strung together with wires, which an external hand moves and regulates at

will! Unless the flesh and blood, the warm vigour of life, the all pervading and directing soul, be there, then is all power and authority, all talent and learning however profound, of no avail whatever. In Germany the governments give to the church all the aid which human power can afford; but still they are but the external hand that manages the wires. Nor can it be otherwise. How can laws infuse religious life and spirit into a body politic? How can they render this pastor orthodox, or that one pious? They may make indeed such a requisition; but how can they enforce it? Laws can do no more than establish a creed; and this creed may demand of all those who take it, the fullest orthodoxy and the holiest feelings. But can it excite or produce them? Can it reach the heart and conscience and bring them into subjection? The example of every nation where a creed is thus enforced, proclaims the negative; and proclaims, moreover, that wherever law thus undertakes to regulate religion and religious belief, there the latter droops and dies; and that wherever religion has flourished and shone with the greatest splendour, it has been in spite of such laws, and often against the influence and power of civil government. Indeed the history of the church establishes this as a universal fact. Christianity arose at first and gathered strength in defiance of civil power. She has ever sunk when this power has taken her under its protection. Let the American churches then rejoice, that here the arm of the civil government cannot be raised to proffer them help, and to demand in return the sacrifice of their independence. Let but the spirit of love dwell in their hearts, and the spirit of active devotion animate their bosoms, and then, if God vouchsafe his Spirit, the churches of this land will need no human aid; trusting in God and Christ their Head, they may go fearlessly onward; and while they find, as they will find, their own strength to be weakness, they will also learn that in this very weakness lies their greatest strength.

ART. II. ON SIMPLICITY IN THE INTERPRETATION OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

By J. A. H. Tittmann, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Translated from the Latin by the Editor.*

THAT the church of Christ is governed not by the will of man, but by the Spirit of God, we are admonished by the approach of the holy festival, on which we are to celebrate the remembrance of that Pentecost, when the apostles were first divinely imbued with this same Spirit; in accordance with the promise which our Lord had given them at his departure from the world. At that time, indeed, it was the case, as often happens to those who seek the hope of safety or the cause of fear in the external vicissitudes of things, that the full import of the high benefit which the apostles then received, was understood by very few. Nor was it entirely comprehended at a later period, when the church had become corrupted by the lust of power and the authority of mere human opinions. But in this our day, when we behold all things governed by an external power, and the laws of right reason haughtily contemned, it is very seldom that men raise their minds to the contemplation of the holy, pure, divine, internal, and eternal kingdom of God; but borne down under the sense of present evils, they either acquiesce through torpor in those things which they see and feel to be inevitable, or are compelled, however unwillingly, to yield to them the service of their whole lives.† There are also not a few, so forgetful of the promise of our Lord that he will bestow τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας upon his church, as to regard the church of Christ as little other than a human institution. But this opinion is refuted by the voice of time; for never has the Spirit of God wholly deserted the church, even in the periods

* See the Introductory Notice in No. I. p. 160. The present article appeared originally in 1811, as a *Programm* or invitation to the celebration of the festival of Pentecost or Whitsuntide. This circumstance will account for the manner in which the subject is introduced. The introduction, as well as the conclusion, is here retained as a specimen of this mode of writing.—Ed.

† There would seem to be in this sentence a general allusion to the political thralldom and despondent feeling of Germany, at the period when the article was written.—Ed.

of her greatest danger ; and never will the same Spirit cease to direct and govern her in future ; but will preserve her, though surrounded with imminent perils, until the final consummation of all human things.

It is however the duty of all, especially in these our days, to watch and see how the influence and power of the divine Spirit may be preserved and augmented among Christians. It is incumbent particularly on those who have consecrated their lives to learning, to beware, lest through their fault this light of human life should be obscured or extinguished. This may happen, it is to be feared, chiefly through the neglect of those, by whose erudition and zeal the word of God, that instrument through which the Holy Spirit operates, ought to be daily more thoroughly understood and made to illuminate more and more strongly the life of man ; that thus the Gospel may be preserved in its purity in the church forever. For if the Spirit of God operates through the power which is inherent in the word of God, it is obvious, that this divine gift can neither be preserved, nor the church remain secure, unless the sacred Scriptures correctly interpreted by men of real learning, are open and accessible to all Christians ; so that they may draw from this pure fountain the precepts and principles that are necessary, in order to the right discharge of all their duties towards God and man.

This subject of the interpretation of the New Testament, however, although exceedingly ample, has yet been so often treated of by learned writers, that there seems scarcely a remaining topic, on which to make suggestions relative to the true method of interpretation. Inasmuch however as the most useful precepts can avail nothing, unless the interpreter possess that disposition and those qualities which enable him rightly to employ them ; we therefore do not fear that we shall lose our labour, should we dwell for a few moments on some of those qualities of which an interpreter must not be destitute ; and thus attempt either to excite the learned or instruct the ignorant. Other writers, and especially Ernesti, have spoken of the manner in which the judgment of the interpreter is to be exercised and formed. But in regard to the general qualities, character, and disposition of mind, which are required for the proper interpretation of the New Testament, there seems yet to be room for other remarks ; especially on that *simplicity* which all recommend in interpreting the New Testament, but which very few understand, and to which still fewer have attained. This topic, therefore, we will now briefly discuss.

It will first be necessary to define and determine in what simplicity in the interpretation of the New Testament consists. It differs from that *facility*, which when conjoined with simplicity, Ernesti does not hesitate to call the chief excellence of an interpreter.* This facility, which requires an interpretation to be such as to present itself spontaneously to the mind, has indeed thus much in common with simplicity, viz. that the interpretation must not be sought with art and subtilty, but must as it were voluntarily offer itself to the mind. It is however possible, that an interpretation which is difficult to be made out, may at the same time be extremely simple; while others, less simple, may put on the appearance of facility. Indeed an interpretation in itself simple, often requires great skill and study in order to arrive at it. The facility of an interpretation moreover consists not only in the circumstance, that it may seem to be found without labour; but also therein, that it presents a facile sense, i. e. a sense which connects itself easily with the views, object, and character of the writer. In this view also simplicity is connected with facility; and both are opposed to every thing that is subtile and forced.† Indeed the term *simple* implies that which is perfect and consistent in all its parts; just as we speak of simplicity of character in a person, in whom the different virtues are exhibited in completeness and harmony. The Greeks, who were much more exact in marking the distinctions of ideas than the Romans, appear to have designated that quality of simplicity which thus consists in completeness, by the term τὸ ὁλοκληρῆς, and the other by τὸ ἀφέλεις, *evenness*, and metaphorically, *that which gives no occasion for censure*. And simplicity may properly be called ἀφέλεια, in so far as there is nothing plain and certain, which does not accord with that from which it arose or to which it is to be referred, i. e. with its source or with its object; just as we call men uncertain and insincere, whose words and actions do not correspond with their views and purposes, but are often inconsistent one with another, and repugnant to those very things on account of which they appear to have been spoken and done.

But since nothing is or can be entire and consistent in all its parts, which comes from any improper source; it follows that

* Institut. Interp. N. T. P. II. c. I. § 22. ed. Ammon. [Omitted in the English Translation.]

† See the next following article.

simplicity is to be sought in the circumstance, that every thing springs from the source from which it ought to be derived, while nothing is engrafted as it were from any other quarter, which is not in itself inherent in the nature of the person or thing in question. A necessary adjunct also is, and this is a principal mark of simplicity, that nothing be found present, except what could not possibly be absent. Art and subtilty, on the other hand, are easily detected, when any thing is introduced, the necessity of which is not apparent. It is thus that simplicity is so pleasing in the fine arts; when we see each and every part essential to the completeness of the whole, and find nothing which is superfluous, or that could be spared. So also we applaud the simple elegance of a poem or other work, when it exhibits nothing which does not seem to belong to it. In the same manner, then, must we form a judgment respecting the simplicity of an interpretation. For that interpretation only can be called simple, which gives to the words of a writer such a sense as seems to be the necessary one; so that when this sense is presented to us, we are immediately conscious, that the author could not have meant any thing else.

It will perhaps be said, that such an interpretation is to be called *necessary* rather than simple. Indeed the simplicity lies in the very circumstance, that nothing extraneous is intermixed, but all is necessarily consistent and accordant with the nature of the thing itself; and therefore just as we term the words of a person simple, when they are the necessary signs of that which he has in his mind, so also may we properly call that a *simple* interpretation, which derives {from the words of a writer that sense which appears to be the *necessary* one.

This necessity, however, requires some further illustration. When we say that simplicity of interpretation is manifested in the circumstance, that it proposes no other sense than what seems to be the necessary one, it may be thought that our definition is more obscure than the thing itself which is to be explained; inasmuch as this necessity would seem to be something *ambiguous* and uncertain in all writings, and especially in the New Testament. The whole subject is indeed much embarrassed, and requires very great caution, as we shall afterwards see; but still it may be easily disentangled and developed in a twofold method; of which those who either do not know, or do not well weigh the nature and importance of the duties of a grammarian, appear not to be at all aware.

In the first place, if words be the signs of ideas, and that not arbitrarily, but have become fixed through the *usus loquendi* and by a sort of necessity, it is obvious that we can have no doubt in regard to that which is *necessarily* signified, or that of which the necessary signs are exhibited to us; provided we are acquainted with the *usus loquendi*, (the extent and influence of which is much greater than is usually apprehended,) and with that necessity which, inasmuch as it depends on and consists in reason, the inventress of all languages, may be properly termed the *logical* necessity. There are however not a few interpreters, who after having read a few books, and got by rote the common rules of the grammarians, and turned over the lexicons, which in this respect are for the most part miserably written, suppose themselves to have imbibed treasures of philological learning; and being accustomed without consideration to regard all languages, both ancient and modern and especially the former, as the result of chance, they pay of course no regard to that necessity which lies in the essential and universal laws of language, such as every where necessarily regulate the manner of expressing ideas by words. Such persons therefore pronounce that to be the simplest interpretation, which is most easily confirmed by the meagre authority of the lexicons. To us however those persons, above all others, seem to be ignorant of the true character of language, who are accustomed to refer every thing, of which they cannot explain the cause, to the mere will or custom of the people among whom this or that language was vernacular. And although we can scarcely hope, ever to be able to perceive fully the logical grounds and causes of all languages; still we ought to make it the object of zealous and unremitting exertion, that these causes, so far as they are necessary and essential, and have sprung up not by accident, but from the laws of human reason itself, should be detected and developed.

In the second place, it is an instinctive quality of the human mind, always to employ the means nearest at hand, and to seek for nothing at a greater distance than is necessary. This indeed is the surest mark of simplicity and integrity even of personal character. We are naturally impelled, not to art, but to seek and to communicate the truth by the shortest and simplest means possible; and the use of art may be said to arise rather from some obliquity of life or perverseness of mind. Hence, inasmuch as the same law prevails in the use of lan-

guage, and we express our thoughts and feelings by those signs which make known our meaning in the shortest and surest manner, it is therefore an essential characteristic of simplicity (i. e. of completeness and necessity) in interpretation, that we attribute to the words of a writer that sense, of which these words seem to be the nearest and most direct, or the shortest and most certain, signs. And here all who undertake to interpret the New Testament are to be admonished and exhorted, to prescribe to themselves as a rule this quality of simplicity; and not to recede, except for grave reasons, from that sense which seems to be the nearest and most direct. For although all the writers of the New Testament were not destitute of a certain degree of learning and subtilty of talent; yet they all were exceedingly remote from those arts by which language, that gift of God, is misused in order to conceal depravity of mind or purpose, and to deceive others by words of double meaning. Indeed no one will interpret the writings of these sacred authors with more felicity, than he who is best able to estimate correctly their simplicity.

It seems proper here to dwell more particularly, for a moment, on this quality of simplicity in an interpreter himself; a subject which has commonly been passed over in silence, even by those who have written with most acuteness upon the qualities and disposition necessary to a good interpreter. There is doubtless a certain simplicity of mind, which is amiable in all men, and which is particularly desirable in an interpreter of the New Testament. It is manifested especially in that integrity and rectitude of mind, which perceives clearly and at a glance every thing that is appropriate and necessary to a particular person or thing. It differs from the disposition of those who, by the employment of art, or in consequence of a mode of life not conformed to right reason, have lost this natural power of perception; and who are therefore no longer affected by that simplicity in which the highest beauty is said to consist, nor are able to perceive any thing in its true light or without doubt and ambiguity. But in that simple character of a mind which seeks no subterfuge or ambiguity, but is apt and prompt to comprehend all that is appropriate and necessary, we see an ornament of human life, and have the surest pledge and safeguard of a love of truth. Hence it may be regarded as essential to every interpreter, and especially to the interpreter of the New Testament. For whoever is destitute of this quality, and cannot com-

prehend what is appropriate or necessary to the nature of any person or thing, will not surely be able to attain to the right sense of words; but inasmuch as every thing in his own mind is distorted and perverted, he will naturally be on the lookout for ambiguity and quibbles in the language of others.

There is moreover cause of apprehension, that this simplicity of character may become impaired at an earlier period than theologians in general come to the interpretation of the New Testament. We ought therefore to be much on our guard lest this happen through our own fault. For in this simplicity is required, first, a certain natural integrity of disposition; secondly, rectitude of intention; and lastly, purity and constancy of mind; from all of which, at the present day, there is usually some falling off. That integrity of disposition which affects us so pleasantly in children, is apt to disappear among the innumerable arts by which human life is encompassed, and drops away like childhood's earliest flower; so that those who are trained with the greatest care, are not seldom found to have swerved the furthest toward the opposite extreme. Whether this arises from the character of human life in general, which cannot be passed without the employment of art and deception; or from the fault of our mode of education, which is perhaps too far removed from the simple laws of nature; we must in any case regard it as an evil of very great magnitude; and if all our treasures of learning, on which we so gormandize, have been necessarily purchased at this price, there is reason to fear that we have exchanged gold for brass. It is particularly in this respect that the works of the ancient classic writers may be recommended to be studied by an interpreter; because in them, and more especially the Greeks, e. g. Thucydides and Xenophon, although they were devoted to letters and occupied with important affairs, there is yet exhibited that natural integrity of disposition and feeling, i. e. that simplicity of character, which it has happened to few in our days to preserve.

In regard to rectitude of mind and intention, which is wholly lost in the pursuits of an artificial and complicated life, how can we expect to find it among the multiplied questions, opinions, and distinctions, which distract theologians—in short, among the innumerable thorns with which theology in these days is overgrown—except in a suffocated and corrupted state? There are few indeed, who approach the interpretation of the New Testament with minds uncorrupted and unprejudiced. The greater

part have already imbibed certain opinions. Some have become habituated to the ancient formulas of theologians; others have learned to cast off all restraints, and are wonderfully delighted in the exercise of their own ingenuity. One party are led astray by the authority of some theological system; the other by the most recent form of philosophy. All in short forsake the plain and simple path, and have recourse to art in searching after truth. That rectitude of purpose, therefore, which sees and comprehends the truth directly and without evasion, is exhibited by few in the interpretation of the New Testament. And hence it naturally happens, that as such interpreters are themselves wanting in simplicity, this virtue is also not found in their interpretations.

Lastly, purity and constancy of mind are in the highest degree necessary to simplicity, inasmuch as a mind that is corrupt and wavering is neither adapted to perceive the truth, nor to understand what is necessary or appropriate to any thing. We must here particularly guard against the opinion of those, who believe themselves sufficiently furnished for the explication of the sacred books, when they have heaped together stores of erudition derived from every quarter; but who regard it as a matter of indifference in what way the mind and heart are formed and affected. For although the error of those who think that piety alone, without learning, is sufficient for interpreting the sacred books, is very pernicious; still it cannot be denied, that the more pure, chaste, uniform, and constant the mind, the better it is adapted to understand and expound the word of God. *Τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. Ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ.* 'The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. The natural man comprehendeth not the things of the Spirit of God.' 1 Cor. 2: 11, 14.

More especially, however, there is required for the simplicity which we are discussing, that virtue or quality of mind which may enable the interpreter always to control his own genius and imagination; so as to indulge himself in nothing, and to avoid constantly every sport and sally of the fancy. This is truly more difficult than is commonly believed; especially with those who possess a richness of genius and take pleasure in a figurative style, and who therefore err through natural abundance; a species of error in which others, men of inferior capacity, so much delight, that they endeavour to cover up their poverty of

genius by a ridiculous hunting after similar figures. There is however nothing of greater moment to the interpreter, than to avoid all sallies and arts of this kind; and he should prescribe it as a law to himself, that the more acuteness and skill any interpretation may seem to display, the more cautious should he be in proving it. We are indeed deceived by nothing more easily than by the adulation of our own self-complacency; and it is often the case, that an interpretation which exhibits great ingenuity, although it be demonstrably false, is scarcely, and perhaps never, laid aside, inasmuch as no one willingly resigns the praise of ingenuity and acuteness. Others again are seduced by such examples; and they too strive to bring forth something acute and splendid. For since there is in simplicity a certain elegant poverty and an appearance of facility; many interpreters seem to fear lest they should be contemned on account of this poverty; and therefore they prefer to show off in the use of false aids, rather than unpretendingly follow after the plain and simple truth.

This simplicity in the interpretation of the New Testament is also so much the more necessary, because of the great simplicity in the thoughts and teaching both of the sacred writers and of our Lord himself. In regard to our Lord, who in all his human character exhibited the highest perfection, no one can be ignorant of the simplicity of heart and mind which reigned in him, unless he himself be wholly destitute of any sense or perception of this virtue. There was in Christ not only that perfect integrity of morals and of practice, by which we so easily distinguish men of simplicity and uprightness from those who are artificial and insincere; but he exhibited also such admirable purity and truth of character, that his whole life is the most delightful image of the highest and most perfect simplicity. And this was exhibited not in any poverty of mind nor in low views of things; but consisted in the simple and true conception of the loftiest subjects, and was chiefly conspicuous in the entire direction of his mind to heavenly things; a virtue which constitutes the essence of true religion. It is therefore an error to suppose with some, that a man devoid of this simplicity is adapted to comprehend divine things. It is on the other hand no doubt true, that through the arts with which we are accustomed to embellish, or rather to corrupt human life, we bring loss and damage to the prevalence of true religion. But the more simplicity of mind and heart, so much the more prompt and prone, as it

were, is a person to embrace religious truth. He then only can comprehend the simplicity of our Lord, so conspicuous even in the loftiest sublimity, who is endowed in some degree with the same quality. Theologians, on the contrary, in searching for sublimity in a certain artificial obscurity, have transformed the teaching and doctrines of Christ, so heavenly, simple, and appropriate, and so admirably accordant with the eternal relations of the human race, into a system which is artificial, arbitrary [positive], and more correspondent to human opinions. This might be demonstrated by many examples; especially of such passages as are said to contain mysteries. Interpreters have indeed not seldom found difficulties, because they have not followed the simple method of the divine Master; but have sought in his words the occasions of doctrinal and metaphysical discussions. More particularly is the perception of this simplicity necessary in those passages, where our Lord has pointed out the necessary and eternal relations of human and divine things; in the comprehending, observing, and following out of which consists essentially all true religion and piety; and which he has brought forth, as it were, from the sacred recesses of his own mind in such a way, that he has often signified them by a word or by language simple indeed, yet significant and forcible in the highest degree. These relations, it is true, are of such a nature, that they are to be comprehended and felt in the mind, rather than expressed in words; and they are therefore little understood by those who are accustomed to embody divine i. e. eternal and infinite things in the resemblances of words and reasonings. Hence there have been at all times few, who could justly estimate the piety of the most excellent men; as the example of our Lord himself clearly demonstrates.

But the apostles also possessed the highest simplicity; and it is therefore to be feared, that he who is not capable of perceiving and imitating this quality in them, will be found altogether unqualified for the interpretation of the sacred books. There are indeed some who suppose, that Paul presents to us a more learned, animated, and subtile mode of discussion and writing; and even Ammon* does not hesitate to affirm, that in the epistles of Paul the more difficult interpretation is not seldom to be preferred. But although it be conceded, that Paul has sometimes disputed artificially; yet he always exhibits that simplicity

* Nota ad Ernesti Institut. Interp. N. T. P. II. c. I. § 22.

which, as we have said above, consists not in facility, or rather in an appearance of facility, but in integrity, verity, consistency, and necessity. And those arts which are charged on this writer, have often arisen not from the meaning of Paul, but from the imagination of interpreters. They have taken it for granted, that a man deeply imbued with Jewish erudition, has of course instituted subtle disputations in letters written in the language of familiar intercourse; and therefore in the simplest discourse of the apostle, they have sought for artifices τῶν λόγων. How inconsiderately some have done this, Paul has himself shewn in 1 Cor. 2: 4 seq. In this passage the ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως, which is opposed to τοῖς πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, signifies that simple power of divine truth which the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται; and they are λόγοι διδακτοὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, which coming with that divine power, produce certain and real persuasion; verse 5. And although it was not always in the apostle's power πνευματικοῖς πνευματικᾶ συγκρίνειν, to compare spiritual things with spiritual (verse 13), but he must also sometimes dispute with his countrymen κατ' ἄνθρωπον or κατὰ σάρκα; nevertheless even in discussions of this sort, however subtle, he has still preserved a great simplicity; i. e. he has managed these discussions in such a way, as that all the parts and circumstances are consistent and coherent and tend to one great end, as if by a natural completeness and necessity. But where theologians can justly attribute to Paul any thing of that subtilty which is found in the schools, I am not aware. They would seem rather to be striving to secure the authority of the holy apostle for their own opinions, by making him the author of them; and hence they have not unfrequently been compelled to have recourse to forced or subtle interpretations.

Errors of this kind have been committed the more frequently in regard to the writings of Paul, because interpreters have not sufficiently regarded the nature of that species of language which is commonly employed for the purposes of familiar intercourse; but have expected rather in his epistles an accurate distribution and arrangement of topics, and a continued and uniform discussion, just as if they were regular theological treatises. Indeed, the interpreter should above all things fix his mind on that simplicity, which men who employ the language of daily life and are unacquainted with the more learned and artificial style of books, are accustomed to preserve in writings of this sort. This is found in all the writers of the New Testament;

so that no interpreter can attain to their true meaning, nor feel the beauty and sublimity of their language, unless his own mind be imbued with the same simplicity which constitutes the characteristic of those ingenuous and uncorrupted men.

This subject, however, of the simplicity so characteristic of the writers of the New Testament and so conspicuous in their language, is too extensive, and requires a discussion too protracted, for the brief limits of the present essay. I add therefore only this one reflection. How greatly is it to be desired, that in declaring the divine doctrines, in preaching the word of God, we may imitate the simplicity of those holy men; and that in explaining the sacred Scriptures, we may employ also that simplicity which has been above described; and especially preserve as much as possible that simplicity of mind, which is manifested in an aptness to perceive the truth and to comprehend and embrace the doctrines taught from heaven. Thus may not only the teachers in the church, but also all Christians, hope to perceive and experience more and more the power of that divine Spirit, by which the church is governed.

Come then, fellow citizens, and celebrate the approaching festival; in order that thus your minds, elevated above the vicissitudes of human affairs and purified from every unworthy purpose, may be nourished and strengthened in their simplicity and integrity by a grateful remembrance of the divine benefits; so that by the aid of that Spirit which is not of this world, you may be enabled both to persevere in the true faith, and to sustain and augment the faith of others. And being assured that you will gladly do this of your own accord, we willingly indulge the hope that you will be present at the sacred solemnities, which are to be celebrated in the manner of our ancestors, in the university hall, on the first day of Pentecost.

ART. III. ON THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF FORCED INTERPRETATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By J. A. H. Tittmann, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Translated from the Latin by the Editor.*

THERE has been much discussion among theologians in our day, and those too men of learning and deeply imbued with a knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin literature, respecting those forced† interpretations of the New Testament, by which, as is supposed, the true and genuine sense of the sacred writings has been corrupted by many recent interpreters. Although this complaint is not without foundation, yet the causes of the evil seem to be more extensive than has been commonly supposed, and are not to be sought only in an ignorance of languages, or in the neglect of grammatical interpretation. For those even who have most closely followed the grammatical method, have been some of the first to offend in this respect, by proposing interpretations of the most distorted kind. Such, for instance, was Origen himself, the celebrated author of grammatical interpretation; who, as is well known, has extracted from the Scriptures, through his superstition and still more through his imagination, an innumerable multitude of things, which in the opinion of those best able to judge, are not contained in them.

Indeed, as a general principle, the grammatical method of interpretation, although the only one which is or can be true, is

* See the Introductory Notice in No. I. p. 160. The present essay was prepared on the occasion of the author's becoming Professor Extraordinary of Theology in 1803; and was republished with a single additional note in 1829. He remarks on that occasion, that although several things perhaps need further definition and illustration, he yet chooses to leave them in their present state, lest he should seem desirous of embellishing a more youthful performance with the fruits gathered in riper years.—This article is here published, as being in some sort introductory to the celebrated essay of H. Planck *De Indole, etc.* which it is intended to give in the next number.—Ed.

† The epithet in the original is *contorta*, to which the nearest corresponding English words, as to form, are *contorted*, *distorted*; but these would here be too strong. The idea of the Latin is commonly expressed in English by the words *forced*, *strained*, etc.—Ed.

nevertheless to be employed with great caution, in explaining the sacred Scriptures. It is certainly a correct precept, that the same rules are to be followed in interpreting the sacred volume, which are applied to works of mere human origin; but yet this precept is not true in any such sense, as would imply that the meaning of the New Testament is to be sought in precisely the same manner, as the meaning of the words and phrases of Thucydides and Polybius. As every one has his own peculiar habit of speaking, so there is not in all cases the same use and application of the same rules (*non est idem apud eundem earundem regularum usus*); and an interpretation of a word or phrase in Polybius and Xenophon may be perfectly correct and facile, while the same applied to one of the sacred writers would be as forced as possible. Hence it arises, that those authors who have applied the forms and phrases of the more elegant Greek writers to the explication of the New Testament, have not always been able to escape the charge of proposing forced interpretations; and there are many things of this kind extant in the works of that fine Greek scholar Raphel, of Elsner, Alberti, and the truly learned Palairer. And although J. A. Ernesti, the celebrated restorer of grammatical interpretation in our times, has given many excellent precepts on this subject, still (it would seem) they have not always been observed, even by those who profess to follow most closely the grammatical method. Hence, the causes of such forced interpretations must be sought, not so much in the neglect of grammatical exegesis, as elsewhere. It is therefore proposed to offer, on this occasion, some remarks on this subject, tending to unfold briefly some of the chief causes of the interpretations in question.

First of all, however, it is necessary to define the nature of forced interpretation, in regard to which there is some ambiguity. Many call that a forced interpretation, which gives to a passage a sense foreign to the intention of the writer, and which is not contained in his words. Others give this name to every explanation which is not grammatical. But it is obvious, that an interpretation which is foreign to the words, and even repugnant to them, is to be termed *false*, rather than *forced*; and also that an interpretation may be entirely grammatical, and yet forced. This will be evident to the good sense of every one. There are indeed many interpretations, which the *usus loquendi* and the power of words will admit; but which nevertheless are not satisfactory, and even give offence, by seeming to

interrupt the progress of the discourse and imparting to it a sort of foreign colouring. These no one would call false; nor yet would any one hold them to be true, i. e. appropriate to the passages to which they are applied; and they may therefore properly be termed *forced*. To such interpretations Ernesti was accustomed to oppose the very suitable term *facile*.* Thus in James 3: 1, the words *μη πολλοι διδασκαλοι γινεσθε*, are sometimes rendered thus: *do not too eagerly desire the office of a teacher*. This sense the words indeed admit; though it seems somewhat harsh to understand *γινεσθε* as being put here for *μη θελετε γενεσθαι πολλοι διδασκαλοι*; but the context rejects this sense; to which such an admonition against an ambitious spirit is utterly foreign. If now we should say that *διδασκαλος* here means a person who carps at and reproves others; no one probably would readily concede that this sense necessarily lies in the word itself; and yet it suits admirably to the succeeding clauses. We may perhaps compare the German word *meistern*, which plainly answers to *την διδασκειν* and *διδασκαλον ειναι*. [So also, in some degree, the English verb *to tutor*.] Nor should I hesitate to explain Rom. 2: 21, *εαυρον ου διδασκεις*, in this manner: *thou who censures the faults of others, dost thou not censure thine own faults?* In nearly the same sense, I think, is *διδασκειν* found in Ecclus. 9: 1. In like manner, the word *οργη*, James 1: 19, cannot signify *wrath*, which is a notion entirely foreign to the subject there under discussion; but it denotes undoubtedly the *indignation* or *indignant feeling* of a man who is irritable and fretful under the calamities to which, like arrows, the whole of human life is exposed.† At the same time, the idiom in this passage as

* *Institutio Interpretis N. Test. P. II. Cap. I. § 22. ed. Ammon. Leip. 1809.* [Omitted in the English translation.]

† That *οργη* signified among the Greeks not only *anger* and *wrath*, but also the feeling of a man offended or provoked, is not necessary to be shewn to those acquainted with the Greek language. Nor are there wanting in the New Testament examples of the same signification; e. g. Mark 3: 5. Rom. 9: 22. Heb. 3: 11. It may also be observed in passing, that when this word is employed in the New Testament to denote punishment, chastisement, etc. this is not in consequence of any Hebrew idiom; but it is so found also in the best Greek writers. So Demosthenes *adv. Mid. p. 528 ed. Reisk. τῷ δρασαντι δ' οὐκ ἴσην τὴν ὀργὴν, ἂν δ' ἐκῶν,*

to form is not Hebrew, but good Greek ; since an *Auctor incert.* in Poet. Gnom. has this sentence : *γίγνου δ' εἰς ὄργην μὴ ταχύς ἀλλὰ βραδύς.*—From these examples it will easily be seen, that the nature of the interpretations under discussion will be very much obscured, if they are to be defined in the usual way above pointed out, i. e. if we merely say they are such as are not grammatical.

To interpret grammatically is surely not merely, by the help of a lexicon, to explain simply the verbal meaning and render word for word ; but, as the most distinguished interpreters have long taught, it is to ascertain the proper sense of the words, and the idea attached to a particular word in any particular place, by a diligent attention to the *usus loquendi*, the object of the writer, and the logical connexion of the whole context. Neither is the grammatical interpretation a different thing from the historical one ; there is not one grammatical sense, and another historical. Under that which earlier interpreters, as Sixtus Senensis, formerly called the historical sense, they understood nothing more than the grammatical one ; and they called it the historical, merely because it is deduced from a proper observation of times and events.* And that which certain later writers have begun to call the historical sense, viz. that which a passage expresses when explained with reference to the time in which the author lived, or that which the words appear to have expressed at that time and place and among those persons for whom he wrote ; this is nothing else than what the earlier interpreters called the grammatical sense. Indeed, according to their views, and those of every correct interpreter, the grammatical interpretation has and ought to have for its highest object, to shew what sense the words of a passage *can* bear, *ought* to bear, and actually *do* bear ; and it requires not only an accurate acquaintance with words and the *usus loquendi* of them, but also with many other things. It is not enough to investigate *what* is said ; but we must also inquire *by whom* and *to whom* it is said, at what *time*, on what *occasion*, what *precedes*, what *follows*, etc.† For to interpret, is to point out what

ἂν τ' ἄκων, ἔταξεν ὁ νόμος, just as Paul says Rom. 4: 15, *ὁ νόμος ὄργην κατεργάζεται.* Other examples may be seen in the Index Dem. Reisk. v. *ὄργή*, p. 540.

* See Ernesti, Opp. Phil. crit. p. 221.

† So Erasmus, Ratio et Meth. verae Theologiae, p. 51 ed. Semler.

ideas are implied in the language; or it is to excite in another the same thoughts that the writer had in his own mind. But the power of doing this does not depend alone on a knowledge of words and of the *usus loquendi*; but demands an acquaintance with many other things, as was said above. All writers do not follow the same *usus loquendi*; Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus have each a different kind of language; Thucydides and Xenophon have little resemblance of style; although the two former were nearly contemporary, and the latter were natives of the same country. We ourselves write differently to learned men and to our familiar acquaintance; and our habit and manner of speaking or writing depends very much upon the talent, disposition, and personal habits of the individual. Practice also effects very much. Besides all these, there is required, in order to become a skilful interpreter, a certain intellectual sagacity and a native tact, such as the Greeks call *εὐφροσύνη*, the want of which cannot be compensated by any degree of art or erudition. Hence it happens, that those who are destitute of this natural talent, however extensively they may possess a knowledge of languages and of the whole construction of style and discourse, very often propose interpretations as foreign as possible to the meaning and purpose of the writer.*

Since then that must be regarded as the true interpretation, which accurately gives the true sense contained in the words of a writer, and presents in a legitimate way to the mind of another the same thoughts which the writer had, and must have had, in his own mind at such a time and in such a place; it follows therefore that we must call that a *forced* interpretation, which does violence in any way to the true meaning of an author; so as to make him express by his words a different sense from that which he, in *this* discourse, and at *that* time and place, intended to connect with those words.

By the common consent of the ablest interpreters, the proper meaning of any writer is to be discovered, first, from the *usus loquendi* which is familiar to him; then, from an observation of the persons and times and places in and for which he wrote; and lastly, from the context, in which is also comprehended the object of the writer, which some make a separate head. Hence there arise three characteristics, by which to distinguish a forced

* Compare this whole discussion with the article by Prof. Hahn, in No. I. of this work.—ED.

interpretation; viz. first, if it be contrary to the ordinary *usus loquendi* of the writer; secondly, if it be at variance with a due regard to the persons, times, and places, in and for which he wrote; and thirdly, if it be incongruous to the series of discourse. We therefore call that a forced interpretation, *which, although it may be contained in the words taken by themselves, nevertheless expresses a sense foreign to the intention of the writer; inasmuch as it is repugnant either to the USUS LOQUENDI of the writer, or to TIME and PLACE, or finally to the CONTEXT.*

There are two species of interpretations of this sort. The one by a certain violence put upon the words, is calculated to displease the learned; while the other, by a certain appearance of art and refinement, allures the unlearned. The former species may be termed *inept*, and is exhibited when a sentiment is obtruded upon a writer, which is alike foreign both to his constant manner of thinking and speaking, and to his intention and object.* As if one should say that Paul in Eph. 1: 7 had in mind the system of Christian doctrine; and he should go on to interpret *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων*, of a deliverance from sin, which is effected by this doctrine, confirmed by the death of Christ. Such an interpretation is supported neither by the manner in which the apostle is accustomed to speak of the death of Christ, nor by the object of the writer and the method of the whole discussion, nor by the mode of thinking among the Christians to whom the apostle wrote; unless the utmost violence be put upon the words.—The other species is usually called the *subtile*. These are such as by a sort of art extract from the words a sentiment, good indeed in itself, but foreign to the intention of the writer, and particularly so to the proper force and significance of the words. A great many examples of this kind have been collected by F. F. Gräfenhain, in his *Dissert. de Interpret. N. T. argutis magis, quam veris*, Lips. 1774.

* Those interpretations are *inept*, which give a sense not appropriate to the passage, the writer, or the time. Indeed all forced interpretations may be called *inept*, inasmuch as they are inappropriate to the passages from which they are extracted; but since some offend more the judgment, while others by an appearance of refinement please the unlearned, I have preferred to distinguish them into *inept* and *subtile*. The nature of interpretations of this sort has been well treated of by E. A. Frommann, in his proslusion entitled: *Facilitas bonae interpretationis nota*, § X. Opp. Phil. Hist. p. 387 seq.

Since then every true interpretation rests upon the *usus loquendi*, the accurate knowledge of persons and places and times, and the comparison of the context; so all instances of forced interpretation must arise either from ignorance, or neglect, of these same things. There are therefore *three* principal causes of such interpretations; of which we now proceed to treat.

I. The first cause lies in the want of a proper knowledge and correct understanding of the *usus loquendi*. The style of the New Testament, as is now generally admitted, is not pure Greek; but is mixed and made up of words and idioms borrowed from several languages, and particularly from the Hebrew. This has been the judgment of the most learned Greek scholars, as well as of the most erudite interpreters of the New Testament.* And although this opinion is admitted in our day by all, yet there seems to be an ambiguity hanging around it, which gives occasion to very many forced interpretations.

In the first place, those who, after the example of Daniel Heinsius, have presupposed in the New Testament a peculiar *Hebraizing* dialect, have no doubt, by the common consent of the learned, been in an error; and have thus rendered the whole discussion respecting the *usus loquendi* found in the books of the New Testament, and the interpretation of the New Testament itself, uncertain.† For, in the first place, single forms and idioms cannot con-

* See Hemsterhusius ad Lucian. Tom. I. p. 309. G. J. Planck, Einleit. in die theol. Wissenschaften, Bd. II. p. 42 sq.

† It was formerly customary to call the language of the New Testament and of the Alexandrine interpreters, the *Hellenistic*, as if it were a dialect appropriate and peculiar to them; and to regard it, I know not how, as *Ἑβραϊζούσαν*. This opinion is most learnedly refuted by Claud. Salmasius in his *Comm. de Lingua Hellenistica*, Lugd. Bat. 1643, (compare also his *Funus Ling. Hellenisticae* and *Ossilegium*.) against D. Heinsius, who had defended it in his *Aristarchus Sacer*, his *Exercitatio Sacrae in N. T.* (in the preface,) and his *Exercitatio de Lingua Hellenistica*. L. B. 1643. But although no one who is in any degree acquainted with the Greek language, can assent to the opinion of those who defend the purity of the New Testament Greek; yet nevertheless the position seems also incapable of defence, which makes the language, or rather the style of the New Testament, a peculiar and proper *διαλεκτον*, the so called *τὴν Ἑλληνιστικὴν*. For it is one thing, to employ a certain common and unpolished (*ιδιωτικόν*) manner of

stitute a peculiar dialect; nor are those things of course Hebraisms, which have some resemblance to the Hebrew language; but all such appearances may be referred to the general feelings and opinions of the writers of the New Testament and to their mode of teaching, rather than to single words and forms of phrases, which are of uncertain origin and are often common to many languages. And, in the second place, there was no dialect peculiar to the writers of the New Testament; for a dialect belongs to a people, not to a few individuals. It is, as Gregory Corinthus defines it, λέξις ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα τόπου ἐμφαίνουσα,*

speaking, mixed with foreign idioms, and with Latin and other newly coined words, νεοχμοίς (as Phrynicius calls them) and ἀδοκίμοις; and it is quite another thing to make use of a particular and peculiar dialect. The position of Salmasius (and in my judgment the correct one) is, that the sacred writers had no such peculiar dialect; while, at the same time, he is as far removed as possible from the opinion of those who boast of the purity of the style of the New Testament.—But if it be said that it is mere verbal trifling, not to admit the name of *dialect*, where it cannot be denied that these writers have employed a kind of writing mixed, ἀδοκίμον, τῶν οὐ πεπαιδευμένων, and therefore filled with many Hebraisms; I answer, that these things we certainly do not deny; since no one not entirely ignorant of the Greek language can do this; but we deny that these appearances constitute what it is proper to call a peculiar dialect, Ἑλληνιστικὴν or Ἑβραϊζούσαν. We would not indeed be difficult about words, but we prefer not to use the term *dialect*, because, through the opinion which the use of this word would imply, the interpretation of the New Testament is rendered uncertain; inasmuch as it is impossible to form a right judgment respecting the *origin* and *sources* of the language which the sacred writers have employed, unless that ambiguity be removed, which seems to have been introduced into the interpretation of the sacred books by those authors, who talk about a peculiar dialect, without appearing to know or to determine any thing certain respecting it. I merely touch upon this subject here and in the text; proposing hereafter to treat of it more fully on another occasion. I have mentioned it here in order to vindicate the real opinions of Salmasius; since some appear to consider him as differing very little from the error of Piochen. See G. J. Planck, l. c. p. 44.

* Greg. Corinth. De Dialectis, p. 9. ed. Schaefer. Compare Phavorin. Varin. Thes. (Venet. 1496.) fol. 236. 248. Maittaire de Graecae Linguae Dialectis, p. 1 seq. Clem. Alex. Strom. VI.

‘a mode of speaking which exhibits [bears] the character of the place.’ But when all the dialects of the Greeks had become mingled together, and the several tribes had no longer each a separate and peculiar mode of speaking, the grammarians changed also the signification of the term *dialect*, and called this intermixture or farrago of dialects *τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον*.* The Jews then who spoke Greek, had not a peculiar dialect of their own, but used this common one, *τὴν βαρβαρίζουσαν*; which was also employed by all the Asiatic tribes and nations that then spoke Greek. Paul, moreover, a native of Tarsus, had learned Greek in his own country, long before he came to the school of Gamaliel; as was also the case with Luke, who exhibits few traces of a Jewish education.

Nor do those authors appear to have judged more correctly, who have wished to call the diction of the New Testament the *Alexandrine* dialect,† and have regarded the dialect of Alexandria as the source of the style of the New Testament. This opinion is supported, neither by a comparison of the New Testament with this dialect nor by history. For the writers of the New Testament were not citizens of Alexandria; nor simply because they have sometimes followed the Alexandrine version, can it be concluded that they have imitated the Alexandrine di-

p. 678. B. Scholiast. ad Aristoph. Nubb. 317.—The editions of Greg. Corinth. whose definition is given above, have *λέξεις ἰδίων χαρακτῆρα τύπου ἐμφαίνουσα*. Salmasius (p. 450) ingeniously conjectured, that it ought to be written *τόπου*; although he hesitated to adopt this reading, sufficiently confirmed as it is by the words of other grammarians and writers. Thus Clemens Alex. (Strom. Lib. I. p. 404.) says in like manner: *διάλεκτός ἐστι λέξεις ἰδ. χαρ. τόπου ἐμφαίνουσα, ἢ λέξεις ἰδίων ἢ κοινὸν ἔθνους ἐμφαίνουσα χαρακτῆρα*. Salmasius supposes, that the grammarians perhaps changed *τόπου* into *τύπου*, because in their times there was no longer any Greek dialect peculiar to any place or tribe. He has also very clearly demonstrated in his book *de Hellenistica*, that a dialect can only belong to a tribe or people, *ἔχουσαν φωνῆς χαρακτῆρα ἐθνικόν*, as says the Schol. in Aristoph. quoted above. The grammarians themselves also do not seem always to have used the term *dialect* very accurately; but have often employed it for *γλώσσα, ἰδίωμα, λέξις*, etc.

* Salmasius, l. c.

† This name was first proposed by J. E. Grabe in his *Prolegom. ad V. T. ex vers. Sept. Interpretum*, Tom. II. c. I. § 49.

lect; any more than those who follow the version of Luther, are accustomed to imitate his style in other respects. The dialect of Alexandria was not a language peculiar and appropriate to the citizens of that place alone, but was a kind of speech mixed and corrupted by the confluence of many nations, as Greeks, Macedonians, Africans, Carthaginians, Syrians, East Indians, Sicilians, Italians, and others.* After the Macedonians had brought the whole of Greece under subjection, and extended their dominion also into Asia and Africa, the refined and elegant Attic began to decline; and all the dialects being by degrees mixed together, there arose a certain peculiar language called the *common*,† and also the *Helle-*

* See on this whole subject Sturz de Dialecto Alexandrina, Leips. 1808. Compare Fischer, Animadv. ad Welleri Gramm. I. p. 46. [See also the essay of H. Planck de Indole etc. in the next number of this work.]

† Κοινή διάλεκτος, Gramm. Leid. p. 640 ed. Schaefer. Schol. Venet. Hom. ad Il. α'. 85. Eustath. ad Il. α'. p. 22. Clem. Alex. Strom. L. I. p. 404. B. See Kirchmeier de Dialecto Graecor. communi, Viteb. 1709. Those who used this dialect were called κοῖνοι, Schol. Aristoph. ad Plut. 983. Suidas v. ἀθάρα. Phryniscus calls them οἱ νῦν, οἱ πολλοί. On the subject of this dialect Salmasius has a long discussion, in the work so often quoted above. He was of opinion that it ought not to be called a *dialect*, but rather γλώσσαν κοινήν, a tongue common to all, who in speaking the Greek language, Ἑλληνίζοντες, did not follow any one of the ancient dialects. The grammarians, on the contrary, chose to employ for this purpose the name κοινή διάλεκτος, to designate a kind of speech mixed up from all the forms of Greek idioms, and common to all those who spoke Greek in the later ages. Whoever therefore did not follow one of the four dialects, viz. the Attic, Ionic, Doric, or Aeolic, but employed a diction composed from all these idioms, was said to have τὴν κοινήν διάλεκτον; as for instance Pindar himself; see Salmasius l. c. p. 28, 29. But we must also distinguish different periods or ages; for the grammarians give also to that γλώσσα, which was current among all Greeks before the rise and distinction of the four dialects, the epithet κοινή. This is apparent from the fragment of the so called Grammaticus Meermanianus, (which with Gregory Cor. and the Grammat. Leidensis was published by Schaefer, Leips. 1811,) where it is said: *διαλέκτοι δὲ εἶσι πέντε ἰσὶς Ἀιθίς Δωρίς Ἀιολὶς καὶ κοινή ἢ γὰρ πέμπτη, ἴδιον οὐκ ἔχουσα χαρακτῆρα, κοινή ὠνομάσθη, διότι ἐκ ταυτῆς ἀρχονται πάσαι ληπτέον δὲ ταύτην μὲν πρὸς*
No. III. 60

nic;* but more especially, since the empire of the Macedonians was the chief cause of its introduction into general use from the

κανόνα, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς πρὸς ἰδιότητα. 'The dialects are five, the Ionic, Attic, Doric, Aeolic, and the common. The fifth, having no peculiar character of its own, is called common, because all the others have sprung from it. This one is to be learned by general rule; the others, each in its own particular manner;' p. 642. But Gregory Corinthus (p. 12) gives the name κοινή to that, ἡ πάντες χρῶμεθα, ἧγουν ἢ ἐκ τῶν δ' συνεσιῶσα, 'which we all use, viz. that which is composed from all the four.' With him also coincides the Gramm. Leid. (l. c.) and John Grammaticus. The inconsistency of these grammarians is chastised by Salmasius, l. c. p. 12 sq. But it seems to me that the discrepancy is to be reconciled in this manner, viz. by making a distinction between this ancient γλῶσσα, the common source or mother of all the four dialects, which the Gramm. Meerm. calls κοινή, and that later mixed kind of diction common to all the nations that used the Greek language, and formed by the mixture not only of all the dialects, but also of the idioms of every people that spoke Greek ('Ελληνίζόντων), or that mingled with the Greeks; and which was also commonly called ἡ κοινή, and is termed by Phrynicus the dialect τῶν νεωτέρων and τῶν οὐ πεπαιδευμένων. The grammarians indeed, having no rule but their own taste and judgment, seem very often to have been rash and inconsistent both in their precepts and censures.

* *Hellenic* rather than *Hellenistic*; since the former is recognised by the grammarians and other writers of that age, while the latter never existed; see Salmasius l. c. But in relation also to the words 'Ελληνικός and 'Ελληνίζειν, the grammarians do not seem to have been of one accord. On the one hand, these words are very often employed in a laudatory sense, when all who spoke Greek are termed 'Ελληνισταί and 'Ελληνίζοντες. This is proved by Salmasius with many arguments; and is also sufficiently manifest from the passage in Athenaeus (Lib. III. c. 84), where οἱ σφόδρα 'Ελληνίζοντες are those *who speak Greek well*. On the other hand, at a later period they applied the epithet 'Ελληνικός to a kind of speech less elegant, and composed of words and phrases common, obsolete, newly coined, or also foreign; see Moeris sub v. γέλοισιν. Schol. Aristoph. ad Ran. 6. Hence it arose that τὸ 'Ελληνικῶς λέγειν was opposed to τὸ Ἀττικῶς. The grammarians distinguished in this common language, between such things as were less elegant, which they called ἀδόκιμα, 'Ελληνικά, as being common τοῖς Ἕλλησι; (see Moeris sub v. ἐξίλλων, ξυμφάνως;) and such other things as were more recent, and among these also foreign idioms, all which they called κοινά, i. e. obsolete, ἰδιωτικά;

time of Alexander onwards, it was called the *Macedonic*.* This dialect was composed from almost all the dialects of Greece, together with very many foreign words† borrowed from the Persians, Syrians, Hebrews, and other nations, who became connected with the Macedonian people after the age of Alexander.‡ Now of this Macedonian dialect, the dialect of Alexandria was a degenerate progeny, far more corrupt than the common τὴν *Μακεδονίζοντων γλῶσσα*, or common Macedonian dialect. It was the current language of all the inhabitants of that city, even of the learned in whom the celebrated school of Alexandria was so fertile, and also of the Jews; for the latter, whom Alexander had permitted to dwell in that city on the same footing as to rights and privileges with the Macedonians, used not a peculiar dialect of their own, but the common language of the city. What Josephus relates, that the Jews had a certain portion of the city allotted to them, ὅπως καθαρώτεραν ἔχοιεν τὴν διαί-

which is done by Moeris, as is shewn by Pierson ad Moerid. sub v. *φειδωλοί*. But all the grammarians very frequently confounded τὸ κοινόν and κοινῶς with τὸ Ἑλληνικόν and Ἑλληνικῶς; a circumstance deserving the attention of modern grammarians. Compare Salmasius, l. c. p. 55 sq.

* Not the *ancient* Macedonic, which we know to have been very similar to the Doric; but the *later*, adopted by the Macedonians about the time of Philip, and especially of Alexander. This came to be employed by all the Greeks, learned and unlearned, in common life and in their writings; nor was there any longer a distinction of dialects. It is very often mentioned as the *common*, e. g. by Phrynichus; but is also called *Μακεδόνων διάλεκτος*, Heraclid. ap. Eustath. ad Od. κ'. p. 1654; and *Μακεδόνων γλῶσσα*, Eudaem. Pelus. ap. eund. ad Od. γ'. p. 1457.

† Examples are given in Spanheim ad Callim. H. in Del. 150. Compare Hemsterhus. ad Polluc. 10, 16. Heysch. et Phavor. v. *ἰζελά*, coll. Selden de Diis Syr. lib. 1. Etym. Mag. v. *ἄττα*, coll. Heinsius Prol. in Aristarch. Sac. p. 665. [Arist. Sac. p. 446?] Spanheim ad Callim. H. in Dian. 6.

‡ Compare Ernesti's Prolusion de *Difficultate N. T. recte interp.* in Opp. Phil. crit. p. 212. See also Diod. Ascalonites ap. Athen. XIV. p. 102. C. Athenaeus himself says, III. 222. A. *Μακεδονίζοντας οἶδα πολλοὺς τῶν Ἀπικῶν διὰ τὴν ἐπιμιξίαν*, coll. IX. p. 102. C. Phrynichus de Menandro Athen. p. 415—418. ed. Lobeck. Eustath. ad Od. ε'. p. 1854.

ταν, ἤττον ἐπιμισγομένων τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, 'in order that they might live in greater purity and have less intercourse with strangers,' certainly does not of necessity imply, that they had a separate and peculiar speech of their own, which they preserved in the midst of constant intercourse with the multitude of colonists from other nations, Egyptians, Macedonians, Sicilians, and others. Nor were they called Alexandrians for any other cause, as Josephus also relates,* than that, as Jews dwelling at Alexandria, they might be distinguished from the other Jews. This Alexandrine dialect also, thus mixed up from the idioms (*ιδιώματα*) of many nations, was the language employed by the Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, whoever they were; and of this language it is not enough to say, that it has a *Hebraizing* tendency. It cannot indeed be denied, that the Jews must naturally have adopted into their Alexandrine language many Hebrew words and forms; yet it is apparent that the Alexandrine interpreters have not always accurately followed the words of the Hebrew text; but have very often departed from them, and sometimes also even corrupted the sense of them. Indeed, they might themselves not improperly be styled, interpreters of seventy tongues.† The writers of the New Testament, on the other hand, have made use of that common language which prevailed throughout Judea, Syria, and Asia Minor, not less than in the whole of Greece; and have not employed this Alexandrine dialect. This fact is established not only historically, as we have just shewn; but is also proved from the nature of the circumstances themselves.

In the first place, the writers of the New Testament have very many things, which belong to the Macedonic dialect. The examples of this are indeed almost innumerable; but the few fol-

* Antiq. Jud. XIX. 5. 2.

† They were Jews no doubt; a people which, among every nation where they are born or sojourn, employ a certain peculiar dialect of that language which is vernacular to them. It could not therefore well be, but that the Alexandrine interpreters, educated as Jews, should write a kind of Greek less pure, than even the other Alexandrine writers. These latter, so far as their writings have come down to us, were men of cultivated minds, and therefore employed τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον indeed, but in a less impure form than those learned Jews, who have translated into Greek the books of the Old Testament.

lowing may here suffice. The word *παρεμβολή* in the New Testament denotes *camp*, e. g. Acts 21: 34. Heb. 13: 11; of which there is no example in pure Greek. But Phrynicius says (p. 377 ed. Lob.) that it is *δεινῶς Μακεδονικόν*, 'very Macedonic;' and the Seventy have employed it likewise in this sense for *רַחֲמָה*, e. g. Gen. 32: 2.* Further, *ὄρμη*, which among the Attics denoted *ὄρμην*, *onset*, was used in the Macedonic language for *στενωπὸν*, *a lane, alley*, Luke 14: 21; and then for *πλατεία*, *a wide street*, Matt. 6: 2.† So also *προσοπή*, 2 Cor. 6: 3, coll. Phrynicius p. 20 ed. De Pauw; (p. 85 ed. Lobeck?) *ὄραπισμα*, id. 175 ed. Lob. coll. Fischer de Vit. Lex. N. T. p. 61, 71; *γεννήματα* Phryn. 286; *αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι*, id. 442; *πανδοκεύς*, id. 307; *φάγεσθαι, βάρβαρον*, id. 327; and many others. But at the same time, many words have been condemned by the grammarians unjustly; as *ἀκμήν* for *ἔτι*, Matt. 15: 16, which Phrynicius (p. 125) and Moeris (sub voce) censure without reason; since the use of it seems to be only a little more nice and uncommon.

In the second place, the writers of the New Testament have abstained from employing many forms of speech, and many unusual and evidently corrupted words, which are found in the Alexandrine interpreters; although these latter do not appear to have all been equally in fault in the use of such words. Of this kind are *ἤλθοσαν*, Ex. 15: 27. *ἐφάγοσαν*, Ps. 77: 29. *ψηλαφῆσαι*, Job 5: 14, coll. Acts 17: 27. *τεθελημα*, Ps. 40: 11, and many others; to collect and review which would be a matter of infinite and thankless labour; see Sturz. l. c. § 9. It will be enough to mention the word *δικαίος* and its cognates, by which they have expressed the Hebrew *רַשָׁדַּי*, *רַשָׁדַּי*, *רַשָׁדַּי*, *רַשָׁדַּי*; and also *רַשָׁדַּי*, Prov. 11: 7. *לַרַשָׁדַּי*, Job. 34: 10. The concordance of Tromm is full of similar examples. Indeed, the levity, negligence, and inconsistency of these translators in the use of Greek words, is almost incredible; nor would it be easy to find any thing ever uttered in Greek, more barbarous than their dic-

* Compare Jos. Ant. Jud. VI. 6. Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. p. 521. D.

† Phrynicius p. 404. Pollux, Onom. IX. § 38, says: *τάχα δ' ἂν εὐροις καὶ ὄρμην εἰρημένην τὴν πλατείαν, ὡς οἱ νῦν λέγουσι*, 'perhaps you may find *ὄρμη* employed to denote *a wide street*, according to present usage;' where he quotes Philippides *ὁ Μακεδονίζων*.

tion; although in some of the books, more elegance is exhibited. In this way and to such a degree, on the other hand, the writers of the New Testament have not erred against the nature and elegance of the Greek language; and although their style is not pure, yet they have at least written Greek, and not barbarisms.*

This ambiguity and inconstancy in the judgments formed respecting the Greek style of the New Testament, to which we have above referred, has operated as the cause of forced interpretations chiefly in three ways, which we now proceed to exhibit.

1. It has thus operated, first, because that which is good Greek has not been sufficiently distinguished from that which is bad Greek, and *vice versa*; and the same words and phrases have been explained now according to the more elegant Greek idiom, and then again from the corrupted language. Thus the word *δικαιος* and its cognates have been understood by interpreters, sometimes in the pure Greek sense, and at other times in the Hebrew sense; and hence it cannot be otherwise, than that many passages should be exceedingly tortured. We see also many words explained by a reference to foreign sources, when the force and signification of them can be illustrated and fixed by domestic examples. Thus the name *λόγος* in John many suppose to be borrowed from the philosophy of Plato, or of Philo *ὁ Πλατωνίζων*; others, that it signifies the divine wisdom personified in the Jewish manner, or the divine interpreter, *τὸν λέγοντα*, and they dispute largely here respecting the adversaries whom John intended to refute. But it is perfectly evident, that it here denotes a certain *οὐσίαν, ὁήματι θεοῦ γεγονότα πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως, πρωτότοκον, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν*; and that this word, which is used by John as well known to those to whom he wrote, i. e. not to learned men but to unlearned Christians, is not to be explained in a manner new and unusual among Jews and Christians; but so that it would be easily understood by all those accustomed to speak of the Messiah in the same manner. They however were wont *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, to call the Messiah *τὸν λεγόμενον, the promised of God, ἐρχόμενον, him who is to come*, the first and most excellent of all created things in his origin, nature, and power; so that the

* Ernesti Opusc. Philol. Crit. p. 209 sq. Institut. Interp. N. T. Pt. III. c. 7. ed. Ammon. [Omitted in the English translation.] Planck, Einl. in d. theol. Wissensch. II. p. 46 sq.

word is to be explained in the same manner, in which all at that time spoke of the Messiah.* But from this uncertain interpretation of the word *λόγος*, there have not only arisen many forced interpretations, but the whole purpose of the apostle seems to be perverted.

2. There have also been others, in the second place, who have every where sought to find Hebraisms; and these, while they have attempted to explain from the Hebrew language words and phrases which ought to be interpreted according to Greek usage, have in various ways tortured the sense of the sacred writers. Thus they have given it as a precept, that the use of the abstract for the concrete (as we say in the schools) is a Hebraism. But this is done in all languages, and especially among the Greeks, in whose language are extant some of the most elegant examples of this figure.† The Seventy also have often placed abstract words, where the Hebrew text has concrete ones; e. g. Ex. 19: 6, where they have *ιεράτευμα* instead of *ιερείς*, for the Hebrew *אֲרָבִּיבִּי*, as in 1 Pet. 2: 5, 9.—So when the prepositions *ἐν* and *εἰς* are interchanged, these writers have referred it to a Hebraism. But this permutation was exceedingly common among the Greeks. The phrase *εἰς τὸ φανερόν* instead of *ἐν τῷ φανερῷ*, is well known; and Thucydides very often puts *ἐν* with the dative for *εἰς* with the accusative.‡ Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Lib. IV. p. 276) also says: *καταλείφθεις εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον*, for *ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ*. The form *εἰς ἄδου* moreover is plainly Attic, for *ἐν ἄδου*; but in Euripides we read: *ἐκεῖ δ' ἐν ἄδου κείσομαι χωρὶς σέθεν*. But it cannot be denied, that the words *εἰς* and *ἐν* in the New Testament are often employed according to Hebrew usage, when they express the Hebrew *בְּ* and *לְ*;§ e. g. where *ἐν* signifies *propter*, or *per*; although examples of this usage occur in the most

* See Keil de Doctoribus Ecclesiae a culpa corruptae per Plat. rec. Doctr. Comm. II. [The author is here describing the manner in which the Jews spoke of the Messiah, in order to illustrate the proper sense in which the word *λόγος* is to be understood. The apostle on the other hand declares to the Jews, that *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*.—ED.]

† Casaubon ad Athen. I. 9. D'Orville ad Chariton. V. 5.

‡ Duker ad Thuc. Lib. VII. c. 16.

§ Vorstius de Hebr. N. T. p. 213, 219. Gataker de Stilo N. T. p. 180 sq.

elegant of the Greek writers. So Demosthenes de Corona p. 308, *ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν παρ' ἐμοῦ γεγονυῖαν τὴν ἥτταν εὐρήσετε*; and Andocides de Mysteriis p. 79, *ἐν τούτῳ σώζεσθαι ὑμᾶς, for διὰ τούτου κ. τ. λ.* and so in the other passages.

Hebraisms are strictly forms of speech appropriate and peculiar to those who spoke the Hebrew language; or they are *ιδιωτισμοὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων*. For although even in classical Greek there are found many things, which have a great similitude in words and forms to the Hebrew language;* nevertheless these and all other things which are not wholly peculiar to the Hebrews, but are also found among other nations and current in their usage and language, are not to be regarded as Hebraisms, but as general forms common to every language; even though they may particularly occur in Hebrew writers. Indeed, as every language has its own *ιδιώματα* or peculiar forms of speech, of which the Greek participles are an example; so also there are other constructions and forms which are of universal prevalence in all languages. When therefore these are found in a writer, they are to be regarded as employed by common right and usage, and not as peculiar to the particular language in which he writes. Thus many expressions in the New Testament have been stamped with the name of Hebraisms for no other reason whatever, than because it was taken for granted, that the writers of the New Testament have imitated the Hebrew mode of speaking; just as if they could not have derived those forms from the like usage of the Greek language which they were writing. Many Hebraisms have thus been pointed out by Vorstius, Leusden, and others, which might be just as properly called *Hellenisms*. Because, forsooth, they occur in the New Testament, in writers *Ἑβραϊζοῦντες*, they are Hebraisms; while the same things, when found in Demosthenes, Thucydides, Xenophon, or Polybius, are pronounced to be good and elegant Greek. Thus in the New Testament, the use of the demonstrative pronoun without apparent necessity after a noun or relative pronoun, has been regarded as a Hebraism; inasmuch as the Hebrews do indeed use this construction, as also the Arabs, Syrians, Greeks, and Romans. Still that cannot surely be reckoned as a *Hebrew* idiom, which is also employed by the best writers of other nations. Casaubon in com-

* This is shewn by J. A. Ernesti in his *Prolusio de vestigiis linguae Hebraicae in lingua Graeca*, Opusc. Philol. Crit. L. B. 1776.

menting on a passage of Apuleius, who makes frequent use of this pleonasm, says: "Est Ἑλληνισμός, familiaris huic scriptori, apud quem saepe reperias eam dictionem παρέλκουσαν.— Ita autem Graeci, Herodotus praesertim atque Pausanias, atque e recentioribus Agathias." 'It is a Hellenism familiar to this writer, in whom you often find this pleonastic construction.— So also the Greeks, and especially Herodotus, Pausanias, and of later writers, Agathias.' But when he adds, *etsi id proprie Hebraeorum dialecti esse, certum est*, 'although this belongs peculiarly to the dialect of the Hebrews;' it is impossible to understand by what right the learned writer makes this assertion. Who would consider Cicero as employing a Hebraism, when he says (Orat. pro Coel. c. 4): "Illud tempus aetatis, quod, ipsum sua sponte infirmum, aliorum lubricine infestum est, id hoc loco defendo?" or in writing to Sulpicius (ad Div. XVIII. 28): "Illud quod supra scripsi, id tibi confirmo?" Compare pro Lege Man. c. 10. So also Sallust (Bell. Catil. c. 37): "Sed urbana plebes, ea vero praeceps ierat." Moreover in Thucydides, ὁ Ἀττικώτατος, the most Attic of all Greek writers, we find the same construction; e. g. IV. 93 τῷ δὲ Ἰπποκράτει ὄντι περὶ τὸ Ἀήλιον, ὡς αὐτῷ ἠγγέλθη. In Demosthenes also οὗτος is elegantly pleonastic (παρέλκει) in his Oratt. (ed. Reisk.) adv. Mid. p. 522. adv. Aristog. A. p. 775. de Corona, p. 280. So in Xenophon, Cyrop. Lib. II. p. 51, τοῖς μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς προστάττειν ἐκπονεῖν τὰγαθὰ (ὁ θεὸς) ἄλλους αὐτοῖς ἐπιτακτῆρας δίδωσι. The construction in all these passages is evidently the same as in Matt. 4: 16. 8: 5. John 15: 2. 18: 11.

We turn now to some examples of forced interpretation, which have sprung from this source. In Matt. 12: 36, many understand ῥῆμα ἄργόν to mean *wicked and injurious words*; as if ἄργόν were the same as *πονηρόν*, which is found as a gloss in Cod. 126. They think the sense to be this: 'Believe me, that for every wicked and injurious word shall men hereafter render an account.' They suppose the Lord intended in these words to reprehend the Pharisees, who had impiously spoken against him, and to threaten them with the severest punishments; inasmuch as every one of their injurious and impious words should one day be punished. The supporters of this interpretation of the word ἄργός endeavour to confirm it by comparing רֵבָבָה, (from the Heb. רֵבָבָה,) which they suppose to be used of vain, useless, and also injurious words. They are not indeed able to bring forward

examples from the Hebrew language itself; but they adduce two passages from the Chaldee version, viz. Ex. 5: 9, where Onkelos expresses דְּבַרֵי שֶׁקָרָה by פְּרוֹמְיִן בְּטִיִּילִין, and Ecc. 5: 2. They appeal also to the Hebrew version of the New Testament published by Münster, which here renders ῥῆμα ἀργόν by דְּבַר בִּיטוּל; and to the Syriac, which has ܘܟܠܐ ܘܟܠܐ; compare the same versions on Matt. 25: 30. But, so far as I can see, these examples prove only, that ἀργόν might be expressed in Chaldee by בְּטִיִּיל, and denotes *idle, otiosus*, and then *useless, slothful*; but not that the writers of the New Testament, when they said ἀργόντι, imitated the usage of the Chaldee tongue. Nor in the Hebrew text are there any examples, that the expression *idle or vain* words is used to denote *injurious, mischievous* words. In short, it cannot be proved from these passages, that those translators employed the word בְּטִיִּיל in the sense of *πονηρόν*. For the ἀχρεῖος δούλος in Matt. 25: 30, is one who is *useless, unprofitable*, i. e. who brings his master no advantage; not necessarily one who is *wicked*. And שֶׁקָרָה also often denotes that which is *vain, empty*, as Jer. 8: 8. 16: 18; where שֶׁקָרָה is rendered in the Septuagint by εἰς μάτην; and very frequently too it signifies *falsehood*, as Ex. 25: 15, and especially Prov. 12: 22. 17: 7; where the Seventy have rightly translated שֶׁקָרָה-שֶׁתִּתִּי by χεῖλη ψευδῆ.* This interpretation moreover would not be in accordance with what precedes in verses 33—35, nor with what follows in verse 37. For it is not any *wicked* discourse that is there reprehended; but the feigned piety of the Pharisees, and their affected zeal for the public welfare. In order to avoid the charge of levity and indifference, they demanded (verse 38) a sign, σημεῖον; as if desirous, that both they and others might know whether Jesus was truly the Messiah. Against this dissimulation in those who uttered nothing sincerely and from the heart, Jesus had inveighed in severe and appropriate terms in verses 33—35, using the comparison of a tree, which no one judges to be good and useful, unless it bears good fruit; and from which, if it be bad, no one expects good fruit.† But if now the sense of verse 36 is such

* Compare Drusius in Animadv. ad. h. l. Vorstius de Hebr. N. T. p. 80. Fischer de Vit. Lex. N. T. Diss. XXV. p. 569 sq.

† Πρωτῶν signifies here *to judge, consider, regard*; of which sense Raphel (on this passage) has collected many examples from

as these interpreters would make it, there is added in it a sentiment altogether foreign to what precedes, frigid, and *ἀργός*, i. e. wholly destitute of effect and force; and also not congruous to the sentiment of verse 37. For where the Lord says (verse 37) that every one shall hereafter be judged by his words, he cannot be understood as meaning, that every one will be capable of proving his integrity and goodness merely by his words alone; a sentiment surely as far as possible from the intention of our divine Master. We must therefore necessarily understand a certain kind of words or discourse, which, under the appearance of sincerity and integrity, is often the worst possible, and *καταδικάζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον*, 'condemns a man,' because it is uttered with an evil purpose. If then we interpret *ἀργόν* according to established Greek usage, there arises a facile and very appropriate sense; namely, *ἀργός* is the same as *ἄεργος*, *otiosus*, *vain*, *idle*; then, *void of effect, without result, followed by no corresponding event*.* Therefore *ῥῆμα ἀργόν* is *empty and vain words or discourse*, i. e. void of truth, and to which the event does not correspond; *μάταιος λόγος, πράξεων ἄμοιρος γινόμενος*, as Demosthenes expresses it.† In short, it is the empty, inconsiderate, insincere language of a man who says one thing and means another; and in this sense *ἀργός* is very frequently employed by the Greeks. Thus in Stobæus (Serm. c. 34) we find *αἰρετώτερόν σοι ἔστω λίθον εἰκῆ βαλεῖν, ἢ λόγον ἀργόν*; which words, as it seems to me, Palairret and Kypke (on this verse) have incorrectly understood as meaning *wicked, injurious* language, when they ought to be explained of *empty discourse*, uttered inconsiderately and without sincerity; as is shewn by the comparison of a stone thrown *εἰκῆ*, *in vain, without effect*. Hierocles also, in speaking of vain prayers,‡ *ἀνεπέρρητον εὐχὴν*, calls them *τὸ ἀργόν*, i. e. *inefficacious*, since they result

Herodotus. Such examples however are frequent in Greek; see e. g. Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. IV. 211. Sallust. Philos. c. 9. Stobæus Serm. 247.—See on the other hand Glass in Philol. Sac. Lib. I. p. 226 ed. Dathe. But such modes of speech are surely not to be reckoned as belonging to any peculiar usage of the sacred writers, when they are found in almost every language.

* Compare Demosth. *κατὰ Ἀρόβου λόγ. α'*. p. 815. ed. Reisk.

† In Orat. ad Philippi Epist.

‡ In Carm. aur. Pythagor.

in nothing, being made *ψιλῆς τῆς εὐχῆς τοῖς λογισμοῖς, μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν κτήσιν τῶν αἰτηθέντων προσφέροντας*, 'with merely thoughts of prayer, profiting nothing for the acquisition of the things sought.' The same writer in another passage opposes *τὴν ἀργίαν τοῦ καλοῦ τοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ κακοῦ*, 'the inefficiency of good to the energy of evil.' The sophism of the ancients, called the *ἀργὸς λόγος, ignava ratio*,* is also well known. Chrysostom therefore says correctly : † *ἀργὸν δὲ τὸ μὴ κατὰ πράγματος κείμενον, τὸ ψευδές, τὸ συκοφαντικὸν ἔχον*, 'the word *ἀργὸν* signifies that which is not according to fact, false, delusive.' Hence it would appear that the following is the sense of the passage under consideration : 'Believe me, he who uses false and insincere language, shall suffer grievous punishment ; your words, if uttered with sincerity and ingenuousness, shall be approved ; but if they are dissembled, although they may bear the strongest appearance of integrity, they shall be condemned. ‡

* So called by Cicero de Fato c. 12. Facciolatus has treated of this sophism in his *Acroas. V.* [The following is the passage of Cicero above referred to. "Nec nos impedit illa ignava ratio, quae dicitur ; appellatur enim quidam a philosophis *ἀργὸς λόγος*, cui si pareamus, nihil omnino agamus in vita. Sic enim interrogant : Si fatum tibi est, ex hoc morbo convalescere ; sive medicum adhibueris, sive non, convalesces. Item, si fatum tibi est, ex hoc morbo non convalescere ; sive tu medicum adhibueris, sive non, non convalesces ; et alterutrum fatum est. Medicum ergo adhibere nihil attinet. Recte genus hoc interrogationis *ignavum* atque *iners* nominatum est, quod eadem ratione omnis e vita tolletur actio."]

† Homil. XLIII. in Matt.

‡ We have dwelt somewhat longer on this passage, for the purpose of shewing, with how much uncertainty and indefiniteness the comparison of the oriental tongues has hitherto been applied to the interpretation of the New Testament. Although it is by no means our opinion, that nothing is to be gained by referring to the analogy of those languages ; and while we believe, on the contrary, that this is productive of very great utility ; still it would seem to be necessary to apply this principle with very great caution. Those interpreters certainly act most considerately, who prefer to explain the words of a writer from the *usus loquendi* of his own language, rather than by the uncertain analogy or similarity of a foreign tongue. The study of such analogies is no doubt very attractive ; but they have also given occasion to many forced interpretations. For want of due caution, such interpreters have been exposed *columbae collo commoveri*, as Cicero says, *Academ. IV. 25.*

3. Other interpreters, in the third place, misled by that ambiguity above described, have either neglected all grammatical laws, or have too strenuously observed them. Although the writers of the New Testament have not indeed always followed the rules of the Greek language; yet it cannot be said that they have wholly neglected them. It will suffice to give an example of each kind. On the one hand, interpreters would have spared themselves much pains, and done less violence to many passages of the New Testament, had they recollected the rule of Greek syntax, that *futures* often have the force of aorists;* as James 2: 18 *καὶ γὰρ δεῖξω*, which is to be rendered, *as I also am accustomed to shew you*; and further, that *aorists* often signify the continuance of the action which the verb expresses; as James 5: 6, *καταδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον*, i. e. *ye are accustomed to condemn and murder the innocent*; and so in the passage cited above from Matthew (12: 33), *ποιήσατε* is to be translated *judge or regard habitually*, etc. I conjecture also, in the very difficult passage in 1 Pet. 3: 20, that *ὅτε* is put elliptically for *ὡς ὅτε*, the *ὡς* being here left out, as is often done in comparisons;† and this being admitted, a remedy perhaps can be applied to the passage.—On the other hand, in James 3: 6, *ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, interpreters have been troubled by the article *ὁ* before the predicate, as if they expected in this writer an entire grammatical accuracy, *ἀκρίβεια*; comp. John 1: 1. It is here the article *ἐξηγητικός*, as it is called, or as used *δεικτικῶς*,‡ and was familiar to the Hebrews, who not unfrequently employed their *וְ* to connect the subject with the predicate.§—It would be indeed a very great merit in regard to sacred interpretation, if some one would ascertain and illustrate the *analogies* of the Greek style of the New Testament with more diligence and accuracy, than has yet been done by those who thus wander in uncertainty and ambiguity; and would in this way establish some certain principles and rules in regard to

* See Lennep, *Analog. Ling. Graecae*, p. 354.

† See Bos, *Ellips. Graec.* p. 392. Noldius, *Concord. Part.* p. 379. Gataker *Advers. Misc.* II. 20. p. 382. Compare Eustath. ad II. *ὦ*. 258, *δεῖ πάνταυθα προσπακούειν συνήθως ὡς*. Compare also 2 Pet. 3: 4.

‡ See Vigerus de *Idiotism. Ling. Graecae*, p. 19. ed. Hermann. 1822.

§ Gesenius *Lehrgeb.* p. 708. Stuart's *Heb. Gramm.* § 447.

this diction. It would then be easy to avoid a multitude of forced interpretations.*

II. We come now to the second cause mentioned above. We have said that a multitude of forced interpretations have had their origin in this circumstance, that the interpreters have not accurately understood or regarded the genius of the writer,† and the times and persons for whom he wrote. We will speak of these in succession.

1. There is evidently a diversity of style and manner among the different writers of the New Testament, corresponding to their diversity of talent and disposition, which must be diligently observed by those who wish to avoid a forced mode of interpretation. The style of John is placid, but marked nevertheless occasionally by more difficult words and phrases. The language of Paul is fervid, often involved; throwing aside all else for the sake of some easy similitude, pouring itself out in figures, tropes, comparisons, antitheses of members, parallelisms of

* Inasmuch as those who are ignorant of the analogies of an ancient language, can employ no certain method in explaining the monuments of that language, but must be governed by the authority of uncertain usage or the hints of grammarians; so also the interpretation of the New Testament must necessarily be destitute of any certain laws, so long as the analogies of the language which the sacred writers employed, shall not be defined in as accurate and certain a manner as possible. These analogies consist, to use the language of I. D. Lennep, "in the constant and uniform likeness and correspondence (*similitudo et convenientia*) of all the words which compose a language, distributed into certain classes; of the significations attached to them; and lastly of the phrases and whole construction;" and they are exhibited not only in the laws which regulate the formation of words, but also and chiefly investigate the sources of the significations and the proper method of defining them, as well as the various laws of construction. See L. C. Valcknaer and J. C. Lennep, *Observatt. de Analogia Ling. Graecae*, ed. Ev. Scheid. Traj. ad R. 1790. Whether there are, in the Greek language of the New Testament, any certain and distinct analogical relations, may be questioned by others; for ourselves we are persuaded, that unless these be discovered and established, the interpretation of the New Testament must be given over to the caprice of every interpreter.

† The author has not hitherto directly included this particular topic among the causes of forced interpretation; although he has more than once referred to it indirectly; see p. 468 seq.—ED.

words ; yet not wholly destitute of rhetorical art. Peter's mind is rapid and impetuous, scarcely bearing the restraints of continued discourse ; his language is inelegant, often interrupted, obscured by new words, vehement, yet variable. Of the other writers also the genius is different and the style various. The diction of Matthew is unlike that of Luke. In the former you find a mode of writing somewhat harsh and inelegant, indicating an unpractised writer ; in the latter there is more polish, and a certain degree of elegance and ornament. The characteristic of Mark is conciseness in the highest degree. But in each we find certain words and phrases, which are in a manner their own ; and which either do not occur in the others, or are found in a different sense. Now since it is impossible to ascertain the sense of any writer without an accurate knowledge of the particular usage and manner which are familiar and appropriate to that writer ; it is easy to perceive, and the experience of all ages demonstrates the fact, that those who are ignorant of or neglect these things, have proposed interpretations in the highest degree forced. This is done especially in regard to metaphors and comparisons, which every one employs more or less. And the same thing often takes place, when language which in one writer ought to be interpreted metaphorically, requires in another to be explained literally ; or when words which one author uses in their proper sense, are therefore understood in the same manner in another writer.—But to have suggested this point is sufficient ; as our object in this discussion is not to speak of particular passages or writers, but of interpretation in general.

2. In order properly to understand and explain any writer, an acquaintance with the times in which he lived and for which he wrote, must evidently be of the highest advantage. In this indeed lies almost the whole sum and essence of the so called *historical* interpretation, from which however the grammatical can in no way be separated.* Had now very many interpreters

* The necessity of the union of both these modes, is demonstrated by Keil in his *Commentat. de historica Lib. sacrar. interpretatione ejusque necessitate*, Leip. 1788. There is in fact no grammatical interpretation, and cannot be, unless joined with the historical. There are indeed some who wish to separate the two ; but while they pass an unfavourable judgment on the former, they change the latter into an unbridled license of conjecture in regard to words.—Comp. G. L. Bauer in *Philol. Glassii his temporibus accommodata*, T. II. Sect. II. p. 256 seq.

held to this principle, and paid due regard to the circumstances of time and place, there is no doubt that they would have experienced far less difficulty in judging of very many passages of the New Testament. Since however they neglected to do this, it was not possible but that they should often distort the true sense of the sacred writers into one entirely different, and thus pervert the doctrine of Jesus and the apostles; or at least should introduce into theology and therefore into religion itself, things which were written only for those particular times; (e. g. from the Epistle to the Hebrews;) or more especially, from the misapprehension of tropical language, should forge new dogmas foreign to the mind and purpose of the sacred writers. Examples of this kind are too common to require to be exhibited here.

3. If also it be of the highest utility in respect to right interpretation, to have regard to the *men* of those times, to their characters, manners and customs, opinions, vices, etc. then have interpreters been guilty in this respect of a twofold error, and have thus been led to give many a distorted interpretation.

On the one hand, there have been those, (and they are probably the greater number,) who suppose that the apostles spoke and wrote according to the preconceived opinions of that age; and that our Lord himself in like manner *accommodated* himself to their feelings and prejudices. This supposition is doubtless in a certain degree true, as has long since been conceded by the most learned interpreters; but it also cannot be denied, that many in applying it have gone quite too far, and done violence to the sense and intention of the sacred writers. Examples of this are almost innumerable; but none is perhaps clearer and more striking, than that of miracles and prophecy. It is evidently not the part of an interpreter, to attempt to shew how far that which is said may be true in itself; but simply to explain the meaning of the writer, and shew what he thought. The former indeed is not to *interpret*, but to *philosophize*; as Ernesti has well demonstrated.* Now that the opinion of the apostles and of our Lord himself in regard to miracles and prophecy, has been altogether changed and distorted by disputations of this sort, must be conceded; especially by those who are persuaded, that these things (miracles and prophecy) exerted their highest

* Prolus. de Vanitate philosophantium in Religione, in Opp. Philol. Crit.

influence precisely upon those, among whom they were performed and exercised. If the apostles were eye-witnesses, who could not be deceived, and have narrated all events and circumstances just as they occurred; and if our Lord was such as he is described in the New Testament, and such as adversaries themselves concede him to have been; then those interpreters surely act without consideration, who explain their language in such a way, as to make them subject either to reproach on account of fraud, or to correction on account of error; who make Jesus either a juggler, deceiving the people by his arts, (for no fraud can derive an excuse from the *intention* with which it is committed,) or else a vain-glorious man who boasts that this and that which the prophets have uttered without meaning (*εἰκῆ*), has not only been fulfilled in himself, but was also primarily spoken in reference to him alone. Whether such interpretation as this is to be tolerated, does not need to be discussed. But if the apostles were deceived, and have narrated many things which they indeed believed to be true, but which in fact are not true, still the interpreter is not permitted to doubt respecting their real opinion. Nor, on the contrary, when the things which they relate, appear not to be true, is he allowed so to explain or rather distort their words, as to give them a greater appearance of truth. Such license no one would think of employing in regard to profane writers; nor do the laws of just interpretation in any degree tolerate it.

On the other hand, there have been those, especially in former times, who have had no regard whatever to the contemporaries of the sacred writers; nor have observed for what persons, or against what opinions or customs of that age, this or that passage was written; as for instance, in regard to those subjects which Paul discusses in the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. Hence they have neither properly understood the sacred books nor rightly explained them; or rather, they have extorted from them doctrines and opinions evidently foreign to the meaning of the writers. In the explanation of single words also, we see many fall into similar errors from the same cause; they have acquired no distinct knowledge of the persons for whom the apostles wrote, and have therefore advanced many things which these writers, addressing those persons, seem never to have thought of. Thus many have formerly supposed that the use of the words *φῶς*, *φωτίζειν*, *ζωή*, *πλήρωμα*, was to be deduced from the philosophy of the Gnostics; although the use of them

with reference to the Messiah was already familiar to the Jews. So R. Chaia explains $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, אור, Gen. 1: 3, allegorically of the Messiah; and R. Bechai also applies the words ריאמה לְרַמְזוֹ עַל יְמוֹת דְּמָשִׁיחַ, אור to the days of the Messiah, אור. So in the *Pesikta Rabba* it is said that when God hid the light, אור, Satan came to him and asked to look at it; and having seen it he said: בְּרָאִי הוּא מָשִׁיחַ שֶׁנִּתְחַר לְהַשִּׁיל לִי וּלְכָל שָׂרֵי אֱוִמּוֹת הָעָלָם בְּגֵיהֶנָּם, 'verily this is the Messiah who is to come, and to cast me and all the princes of the nations forever into Gehenna;' compare Is. 25: 8. R. Bechai says further (fol. 5. col. 4) that this same light, the Messiah, existed before all ages, and was present בְּרֵאשִׁית, at the creation; that this is the beginning of all things, the light of wisdom, טָבוּ בְּרֵא רַבָּל, $\delta\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$, as the apostle says, John 1: 3. Bechai in Leg. fol. 125. In *Beresh. Rabba all.* R. Samuel Bar Nachman says, that this light was with God; but R. Bechai (fol. 89. 4) teaches, that the same becomes incarnate through the will of God. Hence we should prefer, were it necessary, to illustrate such words as these from the writings of the Jews, rather than from the Gnostic philosophy. In like manner a very recent interpreter of John's Gospel has explained the words $\pi\alpha\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, John 4: 24, in the sense in which the word spirit would be defined by philosophers at the present day: "God is a spirit, i. e. his whole being is intellectual and moral perfection."* Is it then credible, that our Lord should have taught these philosophical precepts to the Samaritan woman? Indeed, the word was never employed by the Jews in this philosophical sense; nor does it so occur in any Greek writer.

III. There remains now the third cause of forced interpretations, which we have indicated above, and which we may dispatch in few words. The *context*, namely, as is in itself evident, is an important auxiliary in ascertaining the true sense of a passage; especially where there is any ambiguity in the words or forms of construction, any obscurity or novelty in the circumstances, or any neglect of the *usus loquendi*. Still, this principle requires unquestionably very great caution in the application of it; particularly in regard to writers who have not been trained in the rules of the schools, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\iota\delta\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\phi\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$; and more than all, in

* "Sein ganzes Wesen ist Geistigkeit und Moralität."

epistolary writing, where often an argument is not carried out in such a way, that all its parts are entirely coherent. This indeed is not usual in epistles of any kind. There is commonly in a letter a great variety of topics, some of which are treated in one way, and some in another. When therefore interpreters have trusted too much, or indeed wholly, to this principle; and have been contented to make out a sense in some degree suitable to the context, and to seek every where a dialectic congruity and a sort of logical arrangement; it could not be otherwise than that they should often advance empty conjectures instead of true interpretations, and torture passages of Scripture until they could elicit from them some similitude with the general series of discourse. This however is of itself obvious; and therefore requires here no further illustration.

We come then to the conclusion, for the sake of which this discussion was instituted.

ART. IV. THE CLAIMS OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

IN THREE LECTURES DELIVERED IN COLUMBIA COLLEGE, 1831.

By Samuel H. Turner, D. D. Prof. of Bibl. Learning and Interpr. of Script. in the Episc. Theol. Seminary; and Prof. of the Hebrew Lang. and Lit. in Columbia Col. New-York.

LECTURE I.

IN venturing to appear in this place in the character of Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature, I feel that an apology, or at least an explanation, is necessary. I am aware, that to perform the duties of the office, with an ability in some degree proportioned to the character of the age, would require the undivided attention of a thorough scholar. Feeling my own insufficiency, and recollecting the various duties that demand my time in another institution, which has and ought to have the strongest claims on my attention, I ought perhaps to have shrunk from any additional responsibility. But since Columbia College has shown her readiness to meet the wishes of the public, by

enlarging her system of instruction, and adapting it to the wants of the community ; I feel it to be obligatory on me to show a willingness, at least, to perform the duties of the appointment with which this highly respected seat of learning has honoured me.

Another motive no less influential, is a desire to aid in advancing the cause of Hebrew literature. This department of learning has been much neglected in academical and collegiate courses of education, both in this country and in England.* Not many years ago it was impossible to secure the advantage of instruction in Hebrew. The proper books were not readily attainable, and it was very difficult to procure the assistance of a teacher. Was a young man sufficiently adventurous to aspire after any acquaintance with this very ancient and venerable language ? He was obliged to pursue his extraordinary enterprise alone. He had to grope his way in the dark ; to advance with caution and hesitancy, without a guide to direct him where to fix his eye upon one ray of light, or where to plant his foot with security. As an unavoidable consequence, he was often going wrong, or falling back into darkness and confusion ; he was subjected to loss of time, to dissatisfaction with his acquisitions, to indefinite and uncertain perceptions, not to say to many errors, which nothing but experience can effectually guard against or disperse. At present the case is different.† The necessary aids for acquiring an acquaintance with the dialect spoken by the patriarchs, are now within the reach of every one. Suitable books in the English language may easily be procured ; and in various parts of the country, able instructors, laymen as well as clergymen, are ready to facilitate its acquisition. The most re-

* "Time was," says Prof. Lee of Cambridge, Eng. "when the student of oriental literature was almost a singularity in our universities." See his *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism*, Preface, p. ii.

† To quote the language of the indefatigable scholar just named, "a student may now commence the study of Hebrew without the fear of being cited as a monstrous singularity ; or of being met at every turn with the appalling maxim, that Hebrew roots thrive best on barren ground."—A maxim, let me remark by the way, in the use of which those who employ it contrive to compliment themselves ; as it will be generally allowed, that the soil of its advocates is not 'arid' enough to make the said roots vegetate, and produce fruit either useful or agreeable.

spectable of our colleges have established Hebrew professorships; thereby calling the attention of students to a department of learning, which has heretofore been too much undervalued.

An advocate for the study of Hebrew as a part of theological education, and even as an exceedingly useful auxiliary to any one who wishes to cultivate an acquaintance with the inspired writings of antiquity, might reasonably hope that his subject would ensure respect; but should he rise in his demands, and advance the claims of Hebrew literature so far as to require a place for it in a collegiate course of study, it is very probable that not a few would think him unreasonable, if not presumptuous. This is conceived to be an unfounded prejudice, the examination of which may prepare the way for the subject of the two following lectures.

There was a time when almost all classes of Christians united in expressing their abhorrence of the Hebrew people; and the name of Jew was associated with whatever is mean and contemptible. And long since the general spread of literature, and the elevation of character produced by religious toleration and civil improvement, writers of the first respectability have not hesitated to represent the Hebrew nation as sunk in ignorance. Will it be believed, that in adducing the words of an author who affirms, that "before the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great, the Jews were entirely unacquainted with letters," I quote a writer of such extensive research and general reputation as Dr. Mosheim?* It were to be wished, that such loose and inaccurate views of Hebrew literature could be charged on no other respectable author than this distinguished ecclesiastical historian. But the same want of acquaintance with the literature of the Hebrews, mingled with an unusual degree of contempt, shows itself in a remark of a finished scholar and elegant poet of the fifteenth century, the Italian Politian, who despises the lyre of David in comparison with that of Horace, and does not scruple to say, that the study of Hebrew obstructs or corrupts the acquisition of eloquence in Latin.† I shall endeavour to point out some of the causes of these and other mistakes of the same sort with respect to Hebrew literature, and to show that they are altogether unfounded.

* Eccles. Hist. Cent. I. Part I. Chap. II. § 15.

† See Wahl's *Allgemeine Geschichte der morgenländischen Sprachen und Litteratur*, Leipzig 1784. p. 495.

Many have disregarded the claims of the Hebrew language and literature to general attention, because they imagine both to be poor and unsatisfactory.* The author of the beautiful, very imaginative, and, in its views, somewhat loose book on the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, puts into the mouth of his Alciphron a sentiment by no means uncommon, when he makes him introduce the subject of the work by declaring how thoroughly he despises the "poor and barbarous language" of the Hebrews. He makes him ask in a tone of unqualified contempt, "What kind of poetry" is theirs? "and in what a language! How imperfect is it! how poor in proper terms and definitely expressed relations! how unfix'd and uncertain are the tenses of the verbs! We cannot tell whether the time referred to, be to-day or yesterday, a thousand years ago or a thousand years to come."† But no one who has read this production of the glowing Herder, who seems to have felt the intellectual and impassioned poetry that he describes, can fail to perceive, that the obloquy which has been cast on the sacred literature of the patriarchal nation, is the result of pitiable ignorance and mean injustice, ever ready to frown or to sneer at what they are incompetent to understand and appreciate.—I do not mean to sound the praises of the Hebrew tongue, to eulogize it for its softness, its adaptation to convey the meaning by means of the sound, although in this respect its claims are by no means contemptible; I do not intend to compare it with the dulcet melody of the language of Metastasio; with the sonorous fulness of that in which the Roman orator carried away all hearers, and the poet of Mantua all hearts; with the Proteus-like diversity with which the language of Homer and Demosthenes was made to adapt itself to every varied shape and colouring of thought and imagination. The Hebrew, as now subsisting, is imperfect, and it were manifestly unfair to judge of it by the small remains which have survived the ravages of time. And yet these remains are sufficient to show, that for communicating thought and produc-

* See Wahl, *ubi sup.* He says, that most philologists have been too ready to do this. p. 460.

† Herder, *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*. In this and a few other quotations, I have availed myself of Prof. Hodge's *Biblical Repertory*, which contains a correct and accurate translation of a part of Herder's work, by President Marsh of Burlington. See Vol. II. No. 3. pp. 326, 327.

ing impression, no language is more vividly poetic. Whether the old system of deriving the nouns from the verbs be the true one, which is also adopted by the author just named, who says, that "in a certain sense they are still verbs;" or whether the view of the learned English professor* be more correct, that the noun is the primitive form, and that many forms of the verbs are really nouns,—is a question which could hardly be expected to interest a general audience, and I shall not undertake to discuss its merits. In either case, the result as to the prevailing characteristic of the language will be the same. It has been "said of Homer, that in him all is bustle and motion, and that in this the life, the influence, the very essence of all poetry consists."† The remark may be applied to the Hebrew language. It abounds with forms of speech strongly expressive of action, and thus it gives life, animation, and feeling to every thing.

It is generally allowed that the Hebrew language is radically the same with the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic, the last of which has become polished and copious in proportion to the growth and improvement of the nations that employ it. In order therefore to form a correct estimate of the ancient Hebrew, it ought to be considered as a part of that extensive language which has come down to us in these kindred dialects. Yet we must not judge of it by our own associations. "There are many names of things which this language has not, because the people themselves neither had nor knew the things; and on the other hand, it has many others which we have not. In abstract terms it is barren." In the patriarchal ages, metaphysical niceties were unknown, and phraseology to express them unnecessary. "But in representations affecting the senses it is rich." It is said that "more than 250 botanical terms occur in the writings" of the ancient Hebrews contained in the Old Testament; and it ought to be recollected, that these writings are very uniform in character, and that a large proportion of them consist of brief history and of poetry adapted to the use of the temple. "How rich then would the language be, had it been handed down to us in the poetry of common life with all its diversity of scenes, or even in the writings which were actually composed." "We possess but few remains of the most

* Lee; see his Hebrew Grammar.

† Herder; see *Bib. Repert.* ubi sup. p. 328.

blooming periods of Hebrew poetry ; only those that escaped the shipwreck of the captivity in consequence of their connexion with the royalty, religion, and history of the nation. The voice of the bridegroom and of the bride, the joyous songs of vintage and harvest, so often referred to by the prophets, are lost. The daughters of song are laid in the dust. The joy of rural festivals is gone. No more is heard the shouting of the vintager, treading out the grape-harvest." How unreasonable is it, to compare throughout the poetry of this people with that of others, when we have only two or three branches remaining. The harsh voice of time long ago commanded, "Hew down the tree, cut off its branches, shake off its leaves, and scatter its fruits."* Too well has the mandate been obeyed. The lapse of ages and the changes of all earthly things have been the dread executioners. But 'the stump' of this noble monarch of the forest still remains 'in the earth' with roots that penetrate to Sheol. A few of its branches still stretch their lofty arms to heaven, and like Lebanon's tall cedars wave their magnificent tops among the clouds. "It fared with the Hebrews as with most nations of antiquity ;" to borrow the appropriate allusion of the writer from whom the above quotations are taken, "the flood of ages has passed over them, and only a small remnant, like the eight souls of the human family preserved in the ark, has escaped."†

It is almost impossible to imagine any thing too extraordinary to be adopted and defended by a mind bent upon supporting an hypothesis. It has been objected to the literature of the Hebrews that it wants originality ; it is borrowed.

If indeed, in order to entitle a people to the name of primitive and to a literature properly original, it be necessary that they should have raised themselves from the lowest degree of intellectual character through their own native power, should have instituted their own laws, and never have interrupted the gradual progress of their own knowledge by drawing upon foreign resources ; then indeed it must be admitted, that the Hebrews are not a primitive people, and do not possess an original literature. In order to be indebted to themselves alone, they would have been obliged, from the very origin of their intellec-

* Dan. 4: 14.

† See Herder, *Geist der Heb. Poesie* Th. I. Gespr. 1. Th. II xii. Compare *Bib. Repert.* ib. p. 329.

tual development as a people, to have confined themselves to their own limited extent of country, and to have lived without any intercourse with other nations. But it cannot be doubted, that even their residence in Egypt, although it subjected them to hardships and difficulties, inseparable from slavery even in its mildest form and much more from the bondage by which they were oppressed, had a favourable influence on their advancement in arts and cultivation. A sojourn of about four hundred years, as appears most probable, or, as many chronologists think, of two hundred and fifteen, among a people more distinguished for science and learning than any other in the world, must have exerted a powerful influence on native Hebrew talent, which in many instances would rise superior to the oppressions it was subject to, and become strengthened by the very labours it was compelled to perform. The influence of extraneous causes of this kind on the manners and habits of the Hebrew nation, might be traced without any extraordinary difficulty; an influence very often deleterious, as their prevailing dispositions led them to adopt idolatrous and immoral usages from the people in their vicinity; but sometimes beneficial, as it enlarged their views of the true state of other nations, and afforded them additional motives for satisfaction and thankfulness under the peculiar advantages which Divine Providence had granted them.*

In this view then, it must be allowed, that the Hebrew nation did not possess an original literature. But it may be asked, where is the nation that did? No nation whose history is at all known, is in this view original in its literature. What people can boast of customs, laws, usages, science, and arts, which are all its own; all independent of foreign influence; all of native origin and growth? Such an idea of a literature absolutely independent, is preposterous; it is not warranted by the analogy of things. Men are associated together for good in every respect; and intellectual effort, in whatever it may develop itself and whatever may be its result, is lawful prize for any one who will take the trouble to follow it up and to make it his own.

To constitute originality, it is sufficient not to be slavishly imitative, to have commingled with the foreign and borrowed idea one's own thoughts, the property of one's own mind, so as to incorporate the native and the exotic into one homogeneous

* Compare Eichhorn's *Einleitung* ins A. T. Bd. I. § 1.

and beautiful plant, adapted to the soil in which it is to flourish, and to the air by which it is to be vivified and brought to maturity. And in this sense were the Hebrews, in the whole compass of their literature, so far as we are able to judge, highly original. Their thoughts are their own, or at least the legitimate legacy bequeathed to them by the patriarchs, their ancestors; the language in which they are expressed is theirs in common with some neighbouring tribes; the figures by which they are illustrated and made prominent are peculiarly their own, being borrowed, in general, from their beautiful and varied scenery, their history, their occupations, and their laws and usages both political and religious.

Another objection to the cultivation of Hebrew literature has arisen from its limited extent. But this ought to be viewed in connexion with other circumstances.

The Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phenicians, and Hebrews, the four most ancient of cultivated nations, have performed important parts on the theatre of the world, and have left to their descendants many monuments of industrious talent. None of them has been obliged to run through a circuit of greater and more destructive changes than the Hebrews; and yet, while almost all traces of the literature of the others have been corroded by the tooth of time, that gnaws and devours all things, this nation has preserved a collection of writings, transmitted them with extraordinary care, and by the good providence of God bequeathed them to us their posterity, according to the spirit of their law, if not in its letter.

The works of the Hebrews are, in some respects, comparable to those of any other people, while in some others they are very far superior. Extensive literature, indeed, is not to be expected from a nation situated like the Hebrews. Originally a migratory family, they were driven to Egypt in order to avoid perishing by famine. The Egyptians, regardless of the advantages the country had received from a distinguished man of their race, subjected them to slavery, and held them for a long period in hard and disgraceful durance. The disposition to censure and distrust their leader, together with the utter want of spirit to face dangers, and fortitude to bear hardships, which shows itself on a variety of occasions during their journey through the desert, is a plain proof of the degraded state to which the bulk of the people had been reduced, and at the same time a striking illustration of the wisdom of Providence,

in subjecting this people to a series of difficulties and toils in a rude and uncultivated wilderness nearly forty years, in order to fit them for engaging with powerful and exasperated foes, whom they were about to expel from their country, or extirpate as enemies of God, and abandoned to all sorts of wickedness. After they had become settled in the land promised to their ancestors, they were subjected to repeated subjugations, because they would not obey the law interdicting all idolatrous connexion with the neighbouring nations. The books of Judges and Samuel detail a lamentable series of tyrannical oppressions, which must have involved the newly settled tribes in deep distress, and present also some pictures of desolation and wickedness, from which the philanthropist, unable to lighten their deep dark shadows, would gladly turn aside, to view some more favourable exhibition. In the time of Solomon, luxury and voluptuousness overspread the court, and, as is always the case, must have affected the character of the nation. His successor could have possessed but little of his father's wisdom, when he adopted the advice of the young courtiers in opposition to that of his graver counsellors, and began his administration by announcing to his subjects, in the insolent style of oriental despotism, that he intended to make the government far more burdensome and oppressive than it had been before. The revolt and separate government which followed, gave rise to other circumstances tending to constitutional and permanent hostility between the two nations, and ruinous to the advancement of taste, literature, and science. The Hebrews, enfeebled by intestine divisions, were the better fitted to become the prey of the surrounding spoilers. The Egyptians on the one side, and the Syrians and other ancient and inveterate foes on the other, invaded and plundered their territories. Upon the rise and establishment of the later Assyrian, and afterwards of the Babylonian empires, new scourges were employed by God, though unsuccessfully, to reduce his people to an obedience which would have been attended by a correspondent degree of national prosperity. To use the language of a Hebrew prophet and poet,* beautifully expressive and strikingly appropriate from its originating in the country of the very army whose march it characterizes, the enemy rolled on like a mighty flood 'reaching up to the neck,' reducing the nation to the brink of ruin, and menacing utter desola-

* Is. 8: 8.

tion. At last, after many and rapidly successive changes in the government, the Israelitish kingdom fell before its plunderers. The empire of Judah continued to survive the dissolution of its sister, with various fortunes, as it submitted to the divine authority that instituted and protected it, or set this authority at defiance by idolatry and crime; until the Chaldean power, making rapid strides to universal dominion, added the circumscribed territory of Judah to its extensive acquisitions, and completed the downfall of the Hebrew monarchy by the conquest of the country, the burning of its capital, the deportation of the inhabitants, and the capture of its king.

From a nation whose origin and history are such as those of the Hebrews are represented to have been, whose intercourse with foreign countries was, until the later periods of their political existence, exceedingly circumscribed, it would be unreasonable to expect a diversified and extended literature. With respect to intellectual energy, whole nations, during the earlier times of its duration, were slumbering in a state of infancy; and Herodotus does not distinguish himself among the Greeks as the father of history, until about two hundred years after the Hebrew nation had been desolated and destroyed by the Babylonians. While on the one hand the literature of the Hebrews—I speak of it without any reference to its character as embodying a system of revealed truth—is not to be extravagantly eulogized as more comprehensive and more intellectual than all other literature; yet, on the other, it is not to be despised for its poverty, nor does it merit the contemptuous sneer of the self-conceited sciolist. Instead of censuring certain deficiencies in the character of its history or poetry, we ought to receive with gratitude the venerable monuments of remotest antiquity which it has preserved to us; the notices, however brief, of nations and communities and laws of earliest times, of which no other sources of information are extant; the sublime truths, whether civil or moral or religious, which it teaches us, and to which it is not rash to say, that nothing in all antiquity is comparable; and that poetry, melting the very soul, touching as the strains in unison with which unaffected nature vibrates, or sublime and elevated as the lofty subject whose operations and blessings it commemorates, or awful and dignified in its simplicity as the tremendous majesty of *HIM*, whose infinity it strives to adore.

Notwithstanding the misconceptions and erroneous views, which it has thus far been my object to examine, there have

been persons in all ages, who have devoted much time and attention to Hebrew learning, and have thought themselves richly compensated. Yet it must be acknowledged, that very many, after pursuing the study of it for a time, have abandoned the attempt in vexation and disgust.

Still it must not be assumed, that this is necessarily to be imputed to the language. It cannot be denied, that the same result has often taken place in relation to Latin and Greek. Perhaps some share of it may justly fall to the lot of the learner, and probably, in not a few cases, more to that of the teacher. In this branch of literature, as in a multitude of others, incalculable mischief has been done by pursuing an erroneous method of instruction. 'The crooked must be made straight and the rough places plain. The mountains of rabbinical difficulties must be levelled for the pupil, and the hills made smooth. The Hebrew is undoubtedly the primitive, original tongue, and it must certainly be the simplest, and at all periods and under all circumstances very easy of acquisition.' This kind of *a priori* reasoning, and other arguments of the same sort, lie at the bottom of the systems of Masclef, Parkhurst, and some other grammarians, which beguile the student by leading him to imagine that he is making rapid progress at the outset, when the fact is, his acquisitions are not secured to him. It were foreign to the purpose of my present lecture, to give an account of the principles of these writers. Anxious to facilitate the acquisition of the Hebrew language, they have made it the most indefinite of all languages. The student may perhaps conjecture the right meaning of a word out of the vast number that it bears, but he has no means of arriving at certainty except the context, which is too often inadequate to enlighten his darkness. Let him read—I speak from experience—let him read a large proportion of the Hebrew Bible according to this system, and he will find on reviewing it, that his knowledge is gone almost as soon as it is acquired, and that all is confusion and uncertainty. No wonder then that the student, finding he cannot secure the prize which he supposed himself to have nearly won, grows weary of the effort, and abandons the pursuit.

Let me remark again, that in Hebrew as well as in other languages, a judicious learner will be content with an improvement continually progressive, even if every day's experience should not mark a very distinct and rapid advance. To acquire any language is a work of time. All expectations of speedily ac-

quiring a foreign tongue, and especially one not living, are idle and delusive. Simple persons have never been wanting to listen to promises, which a small degree of reflection would convince any one cannot possibly be realized. And suitable instructors have never been wanting to satisfy such persons of the exceedingly great facility of acquiring any thing and every thing. "Blæsilla, the daughter of Paula, conquered (we are told) the difficulties of the sacred language, in a few days." For this important piece of information, we are indebted to St. Jerome, Ep. 25. If it be very accurate, I am afraid that the difficulties of the Hebrew language have considerably increased since the age of this holy father, or that the ability and application of its learners have lamentably diminished.* The truth is, that such mistaken views and unfounded representations are always injurious. Like grammars at one view and on half a sheet, or like pretences to communicate a complete knowledge of a language in a few lessons, they raise hopes which are never realized; and the pupil, finding by experience that he has been deceived, is too soon induced to devote his time and talents to other studies. Enthusiastic admiration of any thing not unfrequently leads its advocates to represent its attainment as the easiest matter imaginable. An accurate and fundamental acquaintance with the Hebrew tongue is a work of time and patient examination. But it brings along with it an ample reward, in enabling the interpreter to judge for himself, without placing implicit reliance on the decisions of others.

But on the other hand, let it not be supposed from what has been said, that it requires more than ordinary application to acquire a competent knowledge of Hebrew. If the student can make up his mind to proceed deliberately at first, to secure a thorough acquaintance with the leading forms and principal inflexions of the language; although indeed in the commencement his progress may be slow, yet he will soon find that the perplexities in which he seemed to be involved are gradually and surprizingly unravelled, and that what originally seemed to be impenetrable darkness and confusion, assumes the appearance of clearness and order. Such an application, continued three

* About 200 years ago, William Schickard published a Grammar, which he called a *Horologium*. He offered to teach Hebrew in twenty-four hours, and therefore divided his work into as many parts, which he called *horæ*.

or four hours a day for six or eight months, is sufficient to enable a learner of tolerable capacity to read the historical parts of the Bible with occasional reference to his grammar and lexicon, and to furnish him with materials for an extensive acquaintance with the sacred literature of God's ancient people.

In the next lecture, I shall endeavour to present the claims of the Hebrew language and literature on the scholar and the Christian. And should sufficient attention to this subject be awakened, to enable me to form a class for private instruction, it is my design to deliver a few lectures every year, free to any who may feel disposed to favour me with a hearing. Some persons may indeed be found, whose prejudices will not permit them to devote much time and attention to a department of learning which has the Bible alone for its object. But it is to be hoped that the number of such is diminishing, and that public feeling is becoming more favourable to a subject which has been greatly neglected. Since such men as Newton and Locke thought the hours profitably spent which they devoted to the study of the Bible, no votary of philosophy need blush to imitate the example of men before whose capacious intellect nature and universal history lay open. And while it stands on record, that a scholar so elegant and profound as Sir William Jones, could discover nothing in the whole compass of human eloquence or poetry comparable to the contents of the Bible; it cannot be thought enthusiastic to coincide with an author more than once referred to in this lecture,* when he says, that "the inspired writings of the Hebrews would be universally read and appreciated, if it were only known what treasures they contain."

LECTURE II.

It is the design of my present lecture, and also of the next, agreeably to what was proposed in the former, to lay before you some of the grounds on which the claims of Hebrew literature to the attention of scholars are conceived to rest. In the first place, I shall attempt to state its claims on intelligent youth in general, and then particularly on those who are especially interested in advancing a correct knowledge of the sacred Scriptures.

I must be permitted to assume as a conceded point, that it is

* Herder.

incomparably better to study a work in its own language than in any translation, however great may be its merits. To undertake to prove this point for the satisfaction of an intelligent audience, would be to pay a poor compliment to their good sense; and it might seem impertinent to occupy your time in this place by such an unnecessary effort. If therefore it should be thought, that any of the remarks to be made apply to the Scriptures of the Old Testament in the English version; I trust it will be borne in mind, that they will be felt to be the more applicable to the original text, just in proportion as this principle is allowed to be true.

1. The Hebrew language claims attention on the very same grounds that the study of any ancient language is defended. Early and persevering attention to a grammatical study of languages can hardly be too highly valued. It necessarily produces habits of close and patient attention; a faculty which has done more to form great minds than all the concentrated splendour of imagination and genius. It teaches the student to digest, combine, and methodize his thoughts; thus (if the expression be allowed me) systematizing the furniture of his mind, and giving him such a perception of beauty, as leads him, by what may be called a sort of acquired instinct, to arrange his conceptions in lucid order. It puts him in possession of an unlimited command of language, enabling him to express his sentiments with perspicuity, purity, and force; and opens before him an immense treasure of ideas and illustrations, of which, when combined with his own reflections, he may avail himself at his pleasure, to delight and instruct. Now if this be true of the languages of ancient Greece and Rome, I know no reason why it should not be true of the language of Israel. If it be not, the cause must be sought in the poverty and imperfection of its literature. But this is a view, which it is hoped has already been shown to be erroneous.

2. The Hebrew Scriptures are a collection of valuable relics of antiquity; a large proportion of them much older than any writings which former ages have transmitted to us. In this view they present a field of research at once unbounded in extent, and luxuriant in its productions. 'Not to know what has transpired before our own times, is to be always children.' Thus says the great Roman orator and philosopher; and men of industry and intellect have in all ages inquired into the nature, habits, and history of those, who in remote periods have been

distinguished for character and enterprise. Various nations have boasted of the extraordinary antiquity of their writings, and however well founded may be the claim of some, it would be difficult to prove that the venerable nation of the Hebrews ought to yield precedence to any other. To the antiquarian, who would carry back his researches into the most distant ages, the books of Scripture are a treasure; for without the light which they throw along his path, he would soon be obliged to grope in obscurity, and before advancing far would find himself involved in utter darkness.

I am well aware that this statement has been denied by some writers. The philosopher of Fernay, whose learning and research, to say the least, were more commendable than his talent for sarcasm and his bitter opposition to Christianity, has attempted to disprove the truth of the Pentateuch; and has said that in the time of Moses no other writing was in use but hieroglyphic, and consequently that the work ascribed to the Hebrew lawgiver could not have been deposited in the side of the ark. But this assertion, like many others of his sect, is not founded on sufficient evidence; and the truth of it is completely disproved by the learned labours of that most indefatigable French antiquarian and traveller, Champollion. He has shown, to use his own expression, that "two centuries at least before the time when Moses wrote the Pentateuch," (and I would add he might have said in all probability two centuries more,) "the use of papyrus, as a material to write on, can be inferred from the acts still extant of an Egyptian monarch."*

The consideration of their antiquity then, very greatly enhances the value of those remains of Hebrew literature, which are preserved in the Bible. The greater part of them have descended from ages of which we have scarcely any other monuments. The oldest Hebrew historian is some centuries more ancient than the earliest traces of writing among the Greeks; and the most modern writer of the Old Testament was contemporaneous or nearly so with Herodotus. Besides, the historical and poetic books of the Hebrews are ancient works of mind belonging to Asia, and therefore most valuable documents to assist in developing the primitive history of man,

* See Essay on the Hieroglyphic System of M. Champollion jun. By J. G. H. Greppo. Translated from the French by Isaac Stuart. Boston, 1830. p. 166.

who was originally settled in that part of the world, as may be shown on grounds quite independent of the inspired records. These remains then are not limited to the history of the Hebrews and an outline of their intellectual culture; they comprise materials for delineating the early history of the human race. What other books are there, which have preserved to us such pure accounts of the primitive condition of mankind, a subject so soon lost in the mists of hoary age? What monuments exhibit so beautiful and philosophic a sketch of the origin of the world? What substitute can be adopted to supply the place of the Hebrew writings? Annihilate the records originating in Hebrew industry and preserved by Hebrew care, and what a blank will appear in the history of ancient states and nations! The historian is obliged to avail himself of these venerated documents in giving an account of the early state of man, even if his prejudices should have led him to reject the system of religion which they were intended to introduce.

3. The subjects comprised within the sacred volume of the Hebrew Scriptures strengthen its claims to attention in a degree almost incalculable.

a) It contains a large portion of useful and interesting history. Its object indeed is not to elevate national or individual character, but so to delineate manners and to exhibit facts as to afford practical instruction to all succeeding ages. Who that wishes to be taught the lessons of wisdom, can fail to learn them from the models there presented, or from the salutary warnings which speak with irresistible effect in the accounts of crime and of punishment therein contained? It is impossible to reflect on the narratives of Abraham, of Joseph, of Moses, of David, and of many others—whose names are embalmed, I trust, in your memories—without feeling the value of practical dependence on God in difficulties; without admiring the circuitous mazes of providential agency, accomplishing its own purposes by methods apparently irregular and adverse; without perceiving that the natural tendency of oppression is to bring down ruin on the oppressor, to awaken deliverers, and rouse the spirit of vengeance; without learning the necessity of discipline, and the important truth, that it is only by difficulties and trials that the energy of the character can be elicited, and the man be fully formed for practical usefulness.

b) It is universally admitted, that the Hebrew Scriptures contain most admirable lessons of moral wisdom. Sometimes they are taught by plain and serious declaration, recommending

themselves to every honest man's understanding by their evident truth and necessity, and coming home to his conscience by their correspondence with his feelings and perceptions of what is right. In various parts of the Old Testament, moral and religious duty is laid down in a simple, didactic form. Sometimes it is communicated in beautiful and touching parables; of which it may be said without any fear of contradiction, that in the whole range of classic compositions of this kind, nothing superior if indeed equal can any where be found. That of Jotham in the book of Judges* is the oldest upon record; and is not to be exceeded for the keenness which lies at the bottom of its merited reproof, and the truth of the lesson which in one word it conveys to the simple Israelites, and the worthless and inefficient usurper. And nothing but that utter incapacity of forming a right estimate of one's own character, with which sin blinds the eyes of the understanding, could have hindered the Hebrew monarch from recognizing himself in the ungrateful and hard-hearted oppressor, who had 'taken the poor man's lamb and dressed it for the wayfaring man,' even before Nathan made the pointed application of his parable in the ever memorable words, "Thou art the man!"†

c) By the lover of poetry the Hebrew Scriptures must ever be cherished with a fond enthusiasm. I have not in view every one who is looking out for whatever may appear in the world under the garb of verse. I mean the man who has understanding to appreciate, soul to feel, and taste to enjoy compositions, which, whether they be written in measured lines or not, are expressive of deep and impassioned feeling, of exquisite sensibility, proving beyond the possibility of doubt that they embody none other perceptions and emotions but such as come warm from the bosom of the writer, none but what he has thought and experienced himself in the inmost recesses of his soul. Such compositions are to be found in the remains of Hebrew literature which have come down to us; and he who would attain the most exalted excellence in a species of writing consecrated by the very earliest of human records and by the universal feeling of mankind, cannot neglect them without loss, even though he may have become imbued with the fragrance and animated by the power of the great master spirits of the world.

It will not, I presume, appear strange to any of my hearers, that the Hebrew Bible should be spoken of as containing the

* Judges 9: 8—15.

† 2 Sam. 12: 1—4.

finest strains of poetry. The very conformation of the sentences might suggest the suspicion to an attentive reader, that they do not belong to plain prose; even if the fact did not break forth in the loftiness of sentiment, the splendour of imagery, and the richness of colouring, which in many parts abound. And the poetic effusions of the sacred muse are not confined to one class of poems. The Hebrew Scriptures, and particularly the Psalms, contain a number of lyric odes, compositions of unrivalled sweetness and sublimity. They are not destitute of elegiac poetry, full of exquisite tenderness, of deep and affecting feeling. They abound with didactic poems, which give rules for the regulation of life, and exhibit much observation of mankind, keen discrimination, and sound practical wisdom. The scholar and the man of taste will appreciate their worth.

Let us direct our view for a few moments to the character of Hebrew poetry,* although at present we can take but a hasty and limited glance.

At an early period, it had risen to an elevated standing, which it boldly maintained as long as the people breathed the atmosphere of the country inhabited by their ancestors. Various circumstances contributed to form the Hebrews into a people distinguished for poetic feeling. Before their descent into Egypt, their pastoral life and their entire political freedom became the cradle of their poetry. After their establishment in Canaan, various circumstances concurred to foster and cherish the sentiment. Among these may be mentioned, first and principally, the stirring example of Moses, whose person and character were venerated by every one, whose writings every one studied, forming his own language upon the noble model of the inspired lawgiver. This was the fact, in no small degree, during the whole period of the Hebrew commonwealth.

Subsequent writers employed figurative language taken from the services that were performed in the tabernacle. The history of the *exodus* from Egypt, comprehending the miracles that accompanied it; the march through the desert and into the promised land, with the victories and wonders by which it was signalized, were eagerly seized on to describe or illustrate later events. Sometimes the language and figures used by Moses are amplified by those who followed him. Paradise, the tree of life, the catastrophe of the deluge, the burning of Sodom

* See Wahl's Geschichte, p. 172 seq.

—and a multitude of other particulars—afford materials to be employed by Hebrew writers as convenience might suggest or necessity require. And while this fact affords assistance in illustrating the history of Hebrew literature, it is a standing argument in favour of the truth of the facts, renewing its force on the mind with every repeated study of the sacred volume.—To the example of Moses must be added, the influence of the constant succession of prophets, giving effect to their sacred ministrations and divinely guided instructions by the energies of poesy; the general taste for music, the enthusiasm with which this most delightful talent was cultivated, and the dignity to which it was raised by its connexion with the service of Jehovah; the majestic splendour with which this sublime service was conducted; and beside these causes, the varied history of the nation, abounding with so many wonders, and the beautiful country, ‘flowing,’ as it is poetically said, ‘with milk and honey,’ and deservedly called ‘the glory of all lands.’

Let us give a passing look at some of the records of Hebrew poetry which have come down to us entire.—How great is the poetic merit of the book of Job! What a splendid judgment of the monarch of the universe does it contain! What magnificent preparations for this judgment! What a display of victory! What sublimity in the charge of the Almighty One! What dignity in his challenge! Not a reader of taste and feeling can fail to recognize the Divinity. The sorrows and lamentations of the sufferer prepare the way to vindicate the Creator’s honour. Doubts upon doubts are suggested against the government of an all-wise and gracious and powerful Providence. Infidelity raises her towering structure. But no sooner is the building finished than it crumbles into ruins. The invention, the materials, the finish of this poem, are all exquisite. The book of Job, if we except the first two chapters and the last, is pure, unadulterated poetry. It describes things as they are, nature as it looks, manners as they rise and float. Man—man it describes; in the friends of the sufferer, as we too often see him, selfish, cold, censorious, not altogether dissatisfied perhaps with the evils of those for whom he cherishes some degree of friendship; in the sufferer himself, what every man ought to be, a criminal, downcast, prostrate before his God, submission itself, total and entire concession in the hands of his Maker and lawful owner, when he feels how overwhelming to the creature is the infinite perfection of the Creator.

God it represents—I will not say in all the sublimity of poetic imagery, much less will I say in the abstract and unfeeling definitions of a self-conceited philosophy, which has no conception of the object it presumes to portray—but I will say, it represents him as no mortal genius ever could, as no human intellect, unblessed by the inspiration whose source it dares to point to, ever did or can. Hell is naked before him—heaven is unfolded—all things are like nothing, all things are nothing, when compared with the infinite Maker! In no other composition extant is there so much of the true sublime and of magnificent simplicity, as reign through the latter part of the book of Job. A judge, competent to determine the comparative merits of the literature of various countries, has given his decided opinion in favour of this work. It is “a piece of writing,” says the accomplished Frederic Schlegel,* “which, considered merely as such, is without doubt one of the most characteristic and sublime, which has come down to us from the ancient world.”

Until the time of Samuel, the remains of Hebrew poetry are chiefly confined to songs of war and triumph; as, for example, the joyous song of Deborah, animated by a bold heroic energy. But Samuel superintended, and perhaps founded, the schools of the prophets, which exerted so happy an influence on the character of the nation. Tending the flocks of his father, the son of Jesse cultivated a taste for the refinements of sacred music and divine poesy. And the harp, which had been his companion in the deserts of Judea, and the constant solace of his sadness in the long hours of his adversity, which had learned to express the grief of his soul at the distresses he sustained, and the spiritual enjoyments from which he was driven by his relentless persecutor, was not cast aside when he sat upon the throne of Israel. Then it was tuned to loftier strains, and its chords were swept by the hand of a master, in honour of his mighty Deliverer. Others caught the spirit of the monarch, and during this golden age of literature among the Hebrews, nothing can be more divine than their lyric poetry. David himself is equally happy in ode, in song of praise, and in elegy; and all his compositions are characterized by sweetness and beauty. The spirit that breathes in the works of Asaph is instructive. The poems of the sons of Korah are often of great force, rich in sentiment, and not unfrequently overpowering.

* Lectures on Literature, Vol. II.

They melt the heart, and comprise some of the most beautiful elegies and most expressive odes.*

In the prophet who has so justly been styled "the evangelical," elegance and propriety are striking characteristics. In some parts he rises in sublimity almost to a level with the songs of Moses and the poem of Job. His compositions are distinguished for boldness of thought, devotion of sentiment, and earnestness of manner. He is remarkable for strength of expression, happy choice of language, and elegance of arrangement. His images are delineated with great accuracy; and although the same figures are of frequent occurrence, yet the colouring is beautifully varied with a felicitous success almost unrivalled even by sacred poets. He paints the distresses of his own age or that immediately approaching with a dark pencil, and by means of a few deep shadows often presents a scene truly terrific, and calculated to make the beholder shudder. Then spreading before you the golden age of the Messiah in all its splendour, he seizes upon the soul, and bears it onward on the wings of his inspiration.†

But of all the prophets whose compositions have come down to us, Joel has been said to be the most original writer. Who does not recognize in this Hebrew the great poet, the striking painter of nature? Few indeed are able to reach the height of his comprehensive imagination. Every where he shows invention. Every where he unfolds beauties. Subject and execution display the hand of the master. His strain rises in grief, and ends in joy and exultation. What enchanting imagery and pictures of happy times does he paint! Pure, flowing, strong, and, to use an idiom of his own language, 'mighty before the Lord,' is the language of Joel. He belongs to the golden age of Hebrew literature, and he is worthy of it.‡

Habakkuk, the inimitable singer of griefs and of joys, of sadness and of consolation, language is too weak to eulogize as he deserves. The noble hymn which forms the third chapter of his book is beyond all praise.

In these and other writings of the Hebrews there is "a splendour and sublimity which, considered merely as poetic, excite our wonder, and disdain all comparison with any other compo-

* Comp. Herder, Th. II. p. 343.

† Compare Jahn's Introduction, p. 344. Justi's *Sionitische Harfenklänge*, p. 262.

‡ Comp. Wahl ubi sup.

sitions." To continue in the language of the learned lecturer, already quoted, "They form a fountain of fiery and godlike inspiration, of which the greatest of modern poets have never been weary of drinking, which has suggested to them their noblest images, and animated them for their most magnificent flights."* Milton felt the force of Hebrew poetry, and his own splendid genius willingly bowed before the authority of its inspiration.

4. The considerations which have already been advanced to show the claims of Hebrew literature on the attention of scholars, will, I trust, be allowed to have some weight. Another, and the last which shall be introduced in this division of the subject, is drawn from the style of the Hebrew writings. This point has indeed in some measure been anticipated in the remark just made; and this was hardly to be avoided, from the intimate connexion of poetry with the character of the composition. Still, there are a few observations which justice to the subject will not permit me to withhold.

a) In the first place, the style of the Hebrew writings is remarkable for its simplicity. This is indicative of good sense. It is the weaker and more injudicious class of writers that become affected, and substitute sound and pompous pretence for substantial thought, of which they have often but little to dispose. The idea which the Hebrew author intends to give us, he gives us in plain words, which were in common use in his day among the class of people to whom he belonged, or for whom his book was originally intended. There is reason to believe, that the most careful examination of the language of the Old Testament will accumulate the evidence in proof of this position, that if we except those subjects which, from their very nature, must ever be obscure to men, and those parts which, in the character of the composition, are elevated or recondite, it was to those who first received it one of the plainest of books.

b) In Hebrew narrative brevity is another very remarkable property, which indeed sometimes amounts to a peculiarity. It is certainly worthy of consideration, that in general the Hebrew historians content themselves with stating facts, leaving it to the reader to draw inferences. For myself, I must be permitted to say, that this trait of character in the writers under consideration, viewed in the degree in which they exhibit it, strikes me

* Schlegel, I. 190.

as quite original, and, let me add, worthy of imitation. If a writer of the Old Testament relate an event out of the usual course of nature, however extraordinary among miraculous events the transaction may be, he very seldom stops to comment. He states the fact, and then proceeds to the narrative, leaving the simple truth to make its own impression. In the relation of acts of atrocity and persecution, calculated to harrow up the feelings of men so intimately associated with the sufferers as some of the writers must have been, it is remarkable that no indignant feelings escape them; but with a simplicity altogether inimitable, and a dignified brevity to which there is nothing comparable, they tell us the facts as they transpired.

c) There is one quality more which deserves attention. In very many parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, the style is remarkably characteristic. I mean, it is adapted to the situation, circumstances, and characters of the speakers. Hence it may be inferred, that the authors drew their portraits from real life, or that they were admirably qualified to delineate whatever features they pleased. Let me be permitted to illustrate this remark by one or two examples.

The beautiful story of Joseph, which for unaffected simplicity, correct delineation of manners, and deep pathos, is altogether unrivalled, affords a striking instance. The venerable old patriarch had for many years mourned a beloved son. He is at last assured that his darling has not been torn to pieces by a wild beast, as he had been led to suppose, but that, by the marvellous providence of God, he has risen to be lord of Egypt. It is not the strangeness of his fortunes, it is not the dignified station to which his son is raised, that makes any impression on the mind of the father. Every feeling of this kind is lost in one absorbing thought. Every consideration is forgotten in the overwhelming delight produced by the assurance that he still lives! "Enough! Joseph my son is yet ALIVE!"* This is all that the fond father thinks of, all that his heart feels, all that his soul cares for. An inferior writer would have accumulated a number of impertinent circumstances; but the master looks into the very centre of the soul, and copies what he sees and feels to be indelibly stamped there. Nothing else occurs to him; that one thing is all. I will not say, that none but a parent

* Gen. 45: 28.

could thus have written, but I will say, that none but a parent can fully enter into the feelings of the writer.

How exceedingly characteristic and graphical is the narrative of the woman of Zarephath in the first book of Kings.* During the time of a famine of extraordinary severity, Elijah applies to a widow in that part of the country, to accompany the draught of water she was about to bring him, with some solid food. She replies, that as truly as God lives she has nothing but a handful of meal and a little oil, and that she is gathering two sticks to dress the scanty leavings of the barrel for herself and her son, that they may eat it and die. Was there ever a more appalling picture of poverty, famine, and despair! Two sticks which the old woman might chance to pick up, would be enough to cook all the provisions that remained, to dress the last earthly meal. Nothing more was then to be looked for, no further relief to be expected but—death. The historian may dilate upon the miseries of famine; the exhausted sufferer has but few words of description. But these few tell the whole calamity. They paint its horrors to the very life; and you see here the wretched victim making up her mind to eat her last morsel, and—to die.†

* 1 K. 17: 8—12.

† Lecture Introductory to the course of Hebrew Instruction in the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by C. C. Moore. pp. 16, 17.—“Those parts of the Hebrew Scriptures which are written in prose, are remarkable for the ease and clearness of their style, and their entire freedom from any thing like ambitious or unnecessary ornament. The descriptions to be found in them are like paintings whose lights and shades are in masses, and whose touches are few and bold. The effect produced by the Hebrew manner of relating is, to place the objects and actions described immediately before the eye of the mind. The leading facts are seized by the author, and all attendant circumstances neglected. Thus a life and vigour are imparted to the descriptions and to the speeches, quite peculiar to the Scripture compositions. As in the human countenance, more may oftentimes be conveyed by a flash of expression than by the most laboured words; so, in the Bible, a whole train of ideas is frequently awakened, or a most powerful effect produced, by some brief phrase or sudden exclamation. These writings possess a wonderful and unrivalled union of pathos and strength. In them every thing appears natural and unsought. And, with regard to the character and conduct of persons therein portrayed, the most perfect candour and impartiality

It is possible, indeed I am apprehensive it is very probable, that what I have ventured to say this evening in favour of Hebrew literature, and also what I said on a former occasion, will be ascribed by many to prejudice; perhaps to an unwarrantable professional bias, amusing to men of more general views, but not at all conclusive to their understandings. While on the one hand, so far from being conscious that such a supposition is well founded, I feel that the remarks made do not approach the elevation of the subject; I am aware on the other, that great allowance is to be made for the sentiment, unfortunately too general, that the Bible is to be regarded simply, solely, and exclusively, as the repository of religious views and doctrines, and in no sense at all as a collection of works of taste and elegance. I have called this sentiment unfortunate; and it is so, because it is the result of a partial and very imperfect view of the truth. The opposite error, I freely grant, is infinitely the worse of the two. It is much better to venerate the Hebrew Scriptures merely as the inspired source of religious truth, and to view the sacred volume in no other light than this, than, with many of the scholars of Germany, to tarnish its lustre by considering it as entitled to no higher claims than the noblest production of human genius can assert. But does the absurdity of one extreme justify the opposite? That the Hebrew Scriptures demand the attention of the believer in revelation, and that the divinity of their origin constitutes their highest claim to his regard, is a view of the subject, which, among others, I hope to present to you at our next meeting, should your indulgence be again extended to me. But the influences of divine inspiration are not incompatible with the exercise of natural genius and human industry and talent; and both these views of the Hebrew Scriptures are to be regarded in weighing their legitimate claims to attention. Let the subject have a fair trial; and if, upon a thorough investigation of its merits, it shall be found that in plans for liberal education justice has not been done to this department, let us, governed by a sense of duty, atone for the default, by a generous regard for what we are conscientiously convinced is the RIGHT.

are manifest; their vices and crimes are related in as simple and unqualified a manner as their virtues and good actions. No false colouring appears to be thought necessary; all bears the stamp of truth and reality."

LECTURE III.

Were a human being of exalted intelligence and deep feeling, in the full enjoyment of mature powers, to be placed for the first time in a situation where all the splendours of nature are brought before his view, it is difficult to imagine the lofty conceptions and thrilling emotions which the magnificent prospect would inspire. He sees the valleys glistening with golden harvests; the plains joyously resounding with the voice of the husbandman and his domestic associates, of the shepherd and his fleecy care; the streams slowly creeping in the meadows and through the woods, or sweeping with irresistible violence along their majestic course; the noble oak, stretching his vast limbs beautiful with foliage towards heaven; the deep dark forests, extending further than the eye can reach; the rocky mountains, that seem to wall up the earth, and by their impregnable masses to defy the assaults of other worlds, and to bear on their dim tops the vault of heaven with all its glories. Such a scene would be too splendid for language to describe. Imagination itself would find it difficult to conceive the overpowering impressions it must produce. Under these circumstances, let us suppose the astonished observer to be informed of that ineffably great and glorious Being, by whom all these magnificent creations are brought into existence and activity; to be told, that the Maker's presence pervades, animates, controls, governs the whole; that every where his influence extends, and that all the eye can comprehend is the temple of that Majesty, who was from everlasting and will ever be the same, the Infinite, the Eternal. Overawed by the presence of the Holy One, he would fall down before him in all the reverence of expressive silence.

Let it not be thought that the picture is too highly coloured, or that the comparison is overstrained, when it is applied to the contents of the volume which constitutes the Hebrew Scriptures. The student, who comes to an examination of this collection with a feeling merely critical, who indulges himself in viewing its exhibitions simply as objects of taste and splendid creations of imagination and genius, is like the looker on the natural world, who knows nothing of its Author, Former, and Preserver. He is struck with the beauty and order that are every where predominant, the extensiveness, magnificence, and sublimity of the views that are displayed before him, and he

cannot repress his delight and admiration. But the holy Agent that influences all, the soul that animates, the Spirit, pure, celestial, and altogether divine, that pervades the whole,—this, alas ! is unappreciated and unknown.

In presenting the claims of Hebrew literature to the attention of the scholar, I have thus far confined myself to those points which it possesses in common with the literature of ancient nations in general. Perhaps, indeed, it may be the opinion of some, that no other characteristic ought to be introduced ; that the Hebrew writings ought to be viewed in none other light than that in which all others are viewed. But it is the divinity reigning throughout the holy volume which gives it its peculiar excellence ; and I do not see why its most striking characteristic should be omitted. If the lecturer be not limited to a partial exhibition of its claims, how can he be denied the right of assuming that which is its most honourable distinction ? Mere justice to the subject requires this.

Those who recognize the doctrine of the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures, must of course regard them as an invaluable depository of true religious faith, and must be especially interested in advancing a correct knowledge of them. It is to such more particularly that this lecture is addressed.

And in speaking to such, I address myself to all who are Christians, with whom the inspiration of the Old Testament is a primary and fundamental article of faith. If we do indeed believe the Hebrew writings to have been inspired by God, we must believe them to be intelligible productions ; not, like the unconnected ravings of the agitated Sybil, susceptible of any meaning that circumstances and passion might choose to suggest, but bearing one definite sense, perspicuous to the reader who has knowledge sufficient to comprehend it, and rational to the clear and unprejudiced judgment. If such be our views of the Hebrew writings, we owe it to that love of truth which is the characteristic of a generous soul, and that disposition to communicate instruction for the general good, which is the predominant feeling of every elevated mind, to use our best efforts in order to extend an acquaintance with them. The ministers of religion, and young men who intend to devote themselves to the sacred profession, must feel this inference in all its weight.

The inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures implies such pervading divine influence on the views of religion, and of all matters essentially connected with it and supporting and maintaining

it, as shall exclude error, and exhibit spiritual truth, so as to advance the best interests of man. Such an influence is asserted and implied in the representations of several writers of the Old Testament; so that, if we allow them to have been rational and sensible men, the denial of it is nothing less than an abandonment of their moral and religious character. It is also necessarily involved in the facts which many of these writers exhibit in their works now extant, so that any other view of the subject is altogether inadequate to explain the phenomena which their writings contain. Formerly those who rejected this view, regarded the Hebrew prophets as visionary enthusiasts, men of overheated imagination, expressing themselves with an inaccuracy and obscurity, which, while it made them unintelligible to others, proved that they themselves had no very clear conceptions of their own meaning. Hence it would follow of course, that they must have been an ignorant set of men, and their productions must be characterized by error and absurdity. It is curious to remark, and no less interesting to observe the fact, as affording a striking comment on the illusions of the human mind, when deceived by the *ignus fatuus* of misguiding error, that, in our own day, the very same class of thinkers and writers on the subject of revelation, as connected with the Old Testament, have taken a stand the very opposite. Ask the German disciple of naturalism, what he thinks of the Hebrew prophets? He will tell you, that they were men of extensive information, profound wisdom, enlarged views of the political and religious state of their own and of surrounding nations, strongly attached to the theocracy, able to penetrate farther into the probable results of causes in operation than other men; men who were enlightened politicians, thoroughly acquainted with the history of past ages, with the government and institutions of their own and of surrounding countries, perfectly conversant with the springs of human action, and particularly with the political views of nations connected by interest and policy with the Jewish people. They were men of extraordinary sagacity, and, from the well known operations of causes with which they were familiar, they were able to calculate with moral certainty the results which they predicted and announced as oracles from God; men who held a dignified station in the community, and in point of influence and practical authority, were at the very head of the nation. But although the attempts to support this scheme are exceedingly plausible, nothing is more certain than

that its defenders have been obliged to set at nought all evidence militating against it, which is to be derived from history. They have been obliged to abandon the authenticity of several works, although it has been uniformly supported by a plain and undenied tradition of the people, of whose literature they make a part, reaching—as far as we are able to judge—up to the days of their respective authors. They have been obliged to adopt interpretations which are not merely at variance with those generally received, but also with the whole character of the Bible as such, and better suited to the fables of oriental mythology; interpretations assumed without proof of the theory on which they rest, and contradictory and frigid in the results that they exhibit. Such a scheme is utterly inadequate to explain the Hebrew writings. But it is no trifling subject of congratulation to those who are particularly interested in the study of these writings, that they are acknowledged to contain specimens of genius of the highest order, and as such to deserve the attention of every scholar, by men whose profound learning must place them at the very head of all literary circles. A Hebrew prophet is neither an ignorant fanatic nor a sagacious politician. He is a divinely directed teacher of the true religion, and such teachers were promised to his nation by the inspired Moses. It is not essential to the character of a prophet *as such*, that he shall be endowed with the power of foreseeing future events, although such power was evidently possessed by many of the Hebrew prophets. In either capacity, as a divine teacher of the true religion, and as a seer to look into the ages to come, it is plain that the influence by which he is guided is not destructive of his own powers, whether of native genius or strengthened by education. Consequently it leaves him in the free exercise of his imagination, of his mental faculties, and of his feelings. These may be chastened and controled by education, discipline, society, and various other causes; or may run wild, as it would appear to a cold western reader, in all the luxuriance of oriental nature, splendid in its seeming extravagance. Hence it is that the principle under consideration has no necessary connexion with the style of each writer. This is formed, as in other cases, by the usual circumstances, and therefore in some works it is purer, or more sententious, or more ornamental, or more sublime, than in others. One writer penetrates the very soul by his deep pathetic; another agitates and harrows up the heart by the bursts of passion that force out an utterance; while a third car-

ries you up to the heavens in majesty of thought and sublime elevation of sentiment.

The inspiration of the Hebrew prophets is not limited to their character as instructors in religion. It is often exhibited in the hymn of praise, the song of triumph, and the ode of victory. And lastly, it is plainly developed in the prediction of future events, beyond the ken of human foresight, however sagacious and penetrating.

The knowledge of the future differed greatly in different prophets. With some it was a glimpse of those visions of distant ages, the full view of which was poured out before the enraptured eye of another. The obscurities in the delineations of the one, must therefore be cleared up by the brighter exhibitions of the other; while both must be set in the purest light by the event.

It would be rash to undertake to determine the various ways in which predictions were communicated. But one very usual method seems to have been, to present before the imagination of the prophet an outline of the future, delineated and portrayed in different degrees of graphic minuteness, the prospect more or less apparently distant, sometimes obscurely marked, and sometimes presented in bold relief, the distant now mingling itself with what is close at hand, now partially lost in the remote perspective. The prophet, intent upon the scene, and borne away by that commanding energy which fixes his whole soul upon the prospect, copies what he sees, and describes what he witnesses. The copy is indeed a faithful picture of the original, the description a true account of the fact; but the colouring, the style, the figures,—these properly belong to the writer, and they are modified by the infinite diversity of external circumstances, which have contributed to form his whole mental constitution.

Let us approach the Hebrew prophet, and let us catch, if possible, a glimpse of the scene that he surveys; or rather, let us feel it as described by himself. The man of God is on his watch-tower. The Spirit of the Highest seizes him. He is entranced, and, in holy vision, gazes on the prospect. It is his own country, 'the glory of all lands,' that lies before his view. Amazement overwhelms him. Silence, long and deep silence, declares his unutterable feelings. At length he speaks; let us draw near and listen:—

"I am pained in my very heart ;
 My heart throbs with anguish ;
 I cannot be still.—
 The clangour of the trumpet,
 The war-shout, O my soul, thou hearest it.
 Destruction upon destruction is cried out,
 The whole country is destroyed ;
 In an instant, crushed are my tents,
 My hangings in a moment.
 How long must I see the standard of battle ?
 Must hear the voice of the trumpet ?
 I behold the earth ;
 It is waste and desolate.
 I gaze upon the heavens ;
 They have no light.
 [The sun is extinguished ;
 The moon is turned into blood ;
 The stars are quenched !]
 I see the mountains ;
 Lo, they tremble,
 And all the hills are quaking.
 I look, and lo, there is not a man ;
 The very birds of the air are gone.
 I look—Carmel is a desert ;
 All its cities are destroyed ;
 At the presence of Jehovah,
 At the presence of his fierce indignation."^{*}

Such are the bitter groanings which a Hebrew prophet utters, and such the awful images that he employs, in describing the desolations of war when it ravages his own dear native land : groanings which force their way from his torn and bleeding heart ; images, the sublimity of which, is only equalled by their terror. Frequently he portrays different views of the picture presented to him, and contrasts the happy with the afflictive. Thus the sublime Isaiah, while he obeys the divine command in announcing judgments, seldom fails to accompany them by views of the golden future, the reign of the Messiah. Does he see his country desolated by the all-powerful Assyrians ? In the distant horizon he descries the coming glory, and not unfrequently intermingles the one scene with the other. He be-

^{*} Jer. 4: 19—26. The lines included within brackets are founded on such passages as Is. 13: 10. Ez. 32: 7, 8. and Joel 2: 10, 31.

holds the nation oppressed, the country destroyed. The traveller passes through it distressed and famishing. In his desperation he curses his king and his God. He looks upward, but in vain. There is no help for him in heaven. He casts his eye on the earth. Behold darkness distracting and terrific. In darkness is he driven onward.

“Yet this distress shall not be perpetual.
Once he disgraced the land of Zebulun and of Naphthali;
But hereafter will he honour the country on the sea,
The region of the Jordan,
Galilee of the nations.”

The prophet now enjoys a vision of future felicity.

“The people that walked in darkness
Behold a great light!
They that sit in the country where death spreads his shadow,
Light beams upon them.
Thou hast increased the nation;
Thou hast augmented their joy.
They rejoice in thy presence as with the joy of harvest,
As the victors exult in dividing the spoil;
For the yoke that burthened them,
The staff that smote their shoulder,
The rod of the oppressor,
Thou hast broken it in pieces,
As in the day of Midian.
Every greave of the combatant booted for the battle-shock,
And the blood-stained war-dress,
Is devoted to burning,
Is fuel for the flames.
For a child is born unto us,
A son is given unto us,
And the government shall be upon his shoulder.
They shall call him,
Wonder, Counsellor,
Mighty God,
Everlasting Father,
Prince of Peace.”*

It must be evident that the declarations of the prophets were of absolute certainty and of vital truth. They saw the objects they announced already in existence. They smote the country with the rod of their mouth, and again their powerful words de-

* Is. 8: 21—9: 6.

livered it. God laid upon their lips the message, and breathed on them with celestial fire. Full of an impression that was often irresistible, they spoke sometimes in violence to their own natural inclinations, urged by a higher power.*

The religious views of a Hebrew prophet are therefore of divine origin. They come to us from the third heaven, and bring along with them something of the awful glory of the place. As might be expected, they are consequently true, not accommodated in their essential reality to the erroneous prepossessions of any age or country, but intended and calculated to instruct all ages. And, as it were reasonable to anticipate, they are also of extraordinary interest to the whole human family.

They instruct us in the existence and character and attributes of God. And while they communicate ideas on these important points, they tell us nothing that would shock good sense and feeling. They represent to us no Epicurean deity, sitting above the universe and never regarding its inhabitants or its destinies; no Aristotelian influential spring, operating on its own coeval and coeternal machine; no Platonic governor, forced by his very goodness to form and arrange the eternal mass; no blind theogony suited to the gross conceptions of sensual and ignorant men; they know nothing of two independent, eternal, and perpetually contending principles; but they tell us of one pure, intelligent, holy Spirit, uninfluenced by any thing external, voluntarily creating all things, infinite in power and wisdom and perfection. In vain will you examine the volumes of antiquity to find such a delineation of the God that made you. The poets of Greece and Rome do indeed represent their Jupiter in images sublime and terrific, although—let it be added without offence to the classic muse—sometimes frigid, if not ridiculous. But the Hebrew poet is ever true to his original, who is always the infinite, eternal, unlimited, independent **JEHOVAH**.

The religious views of the Hebrew prophets convey information respecting the actions of the Deity. No fortuitous concurrence of atoms arranged by chance this harmonious structure of the world, but all was made by the Infinite Mind. He spake, and the universe sprang into being, and into order. And what he made, he governs, not subject to the control or to the influence of any extraneous principle or agent.

This leading characteristic of the Hebrew Scriptures is that

* Comp. Jer. 20: 7—9; and see Herder, *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*, II. p. 54.

which distinguishes them from all other works of antiquity. In this respect they stand alone. Whence did the Hebrew poets draw that inspiration, which taught them these and other great truths inscrutable to uninstructed mortals? No summit of Helicon or Parnassus raised them nearer to the skies. No Castalian fountain, no gushing waters of Pimplea, poured forth in never ceasing abundance, moistened their sacred lips. On the top of Zion, in the shades of Carmel or of Lebanon, they inhaled the air of heaven, and drank in the blissful gale that breathed upon them in all its celestial fragrance. Or else it was the holy fire from God's own altar that warmed them. Seraphs presented the purifying flame, and prepared the souls of the prophets for the illuminating Spirit.

If it be admitted then, that the sentiments contained in the Hebrew writings are of so pure and illustrious an origin; and if the general views of the character of those writings as given in the preceding lectures be allowed to be just; it is a very natural inquiry, Why are not these works more valued? their contents more studied and better understood? How is it, that in literary communities their legitimate claims as works of talent, are so generally overlooked? And, what is more serious still, how is it, that in Christian communities their rightful demands are neglected? How is it, I would ask, in the language of one whose name, as associated with sacred literature, is well known,* How is it, that "believing the Hebrew Scriptures to contain a revelation from heaven, they are not to be counted worthy of our study? Shall years of toil and expense be occupied in the study of Greek and Roman history and mythology; shall no efforts be deemed too great to accomplish this purpose; and yet not one feeble attempt be made to lead the youthful mind to the original source of all true history, and of the only true theology?" Shall we insist upon our children becoming "familarly acquainted with all the actions" of the so-called deities "of Greece and Rome, actions shameful to be recorded, beyond measure shocking to be perpetrated;" and yet never instruct them in those original oracles "which unfold the glorious and perfect character of Him in whose sight the heavens are not clean?" With the same animated writer, I would express my

* See Prof. Stuart's Letter on the Study of Hebrew, in the *Quarterly Register and Journal of the American Education Society* for April, 1829, p. 198.

own sentiments in the phraseology of a Hebrew,* and declare, that "as a sword in my bones, I feel the bitter reproach of such a question." And I beg leave to add the conviction of my own mind, that it is a question which no consistent believer in divine revelation, who reflects with a suitable degree of seriousness on the subject, can answer to his own satisfaction.

But let me not be misunderstood. I have no objection to make to the study of the Greek and Latin classics, pruned, as I think some of those productions ought to be. I believe them to be the best ground-work of a truly liberal and enlarged education. I would recommend them with all my heart to those who wish to form themselves for useful service to their country or to the world in general, as affording admirable discipline for the mind, and solid preparation for the enlargement of its best powers. I am not of the number of those who imagine the time to be lost, which is spent in acquiring an accurate knowledge of words, and a philosophic acquaintance with their combinations; particularly, as best developed in the Greek tongue. I am satisfied, that, generally speaking, the more accurately and correctly we learn to speak, the more clearly we shall learn to think. Of course, the more rapidly we shall advance in real and substantial knowledge. And, believing as I do, that the imperishable monuments of Greece and Rome are among the very best means to facilitate this result, I see with regret that the prevalent feeling is too hostile to their interests, in favour of science and modern languages. I would say to those who determine to lay a foundation deep and secure enough to support a thorough system of education, lay it in the works of antiquity, which all ages subsequent to their own have united in venerating. Only let me be permitted to ask, Why should we not add to these, the classics, the sacred classics of Palestine, and correct the monstrous fables contained in the one by the pure and celestial truths of the other? How is the fact to be explained, that ardent and enterprising young men willingly devote their time to the former, while they remain utterly ignorant of the latter? Is not the poetry of the author of the book of Job, and of Isaiah and Habakkuk, as worthy of being read, as that of Aeschylus or Sophocles or Euripides? Are not the fragments of history in Genesis as valuable as the narratives of Herodotus, or the biographical stories of Xenophon? In the solid instruction conveyed, and in the moral influence exerted

* Ps. 42: 10.

on the character, the poetry and history of the Hebrews are incomparably the superior.

I am aware that it is the opinion of some excellent persons, that to introduce the sacred books of the Hebrew Scriptures into any course of education not exclusively theological, would tend to diminish the reverence which ought to be felt for the holy volume as the inspired word of God. The objection appears plausible, and, as I have myself several times heard it advanced, I beg your indulgence to one or two remarks in relation to it.

Let us inquire who they are that do really hold this sacred volume in estimation? Is it they whose reverence for it is so profound, that they always keep themselves at a respectful distance from it, and have never formed a tolerably correct acquaintance with its contents? Surely to look at the Bible remotely, is not to reverence it. The views it exhibits and the truths it comprehends, are communications to us from God, infinitely interesting to us as his rational and responsible creatures. They concern our religious principles and practice here, and our happiness hereafter. Of course, we are under the strongest obligations to become well acquainted with them. Who shows most respect for his Bible? the man who puts it in his library or suffers it to lie on his parlour-table unopened, or he whose daily practice is to read it, and to become familiar with its contents? The question admits of but one answer. To respect the communications of heaven is to know them well, and sincerely to delight in them.

And is it imagined, that our reverence for the Scriptures must be diminished, because we read them in the original languages, and not in the version commonly received? This is preposterous, and for that very reason does not deserve refutation. Whence then is this diminution of reverence to spring? From looking with closer inspection and keener insight than ordinary into the Holy Scriptures, as God himself has given them? Infidelity indeed might willingly advance such a sentiment; and it has been said by the German philosopher, Kant, that "a holy book acquires for itself the highest respect with those who cannot read it, or at least cannot gain from it any connected idea of religion."* But nothing can be farther from the truth. Such a sentiment is a libel on the Holy Scriptures.

* See the *Biblical Repository*, No. I. p. 118.

The more we look into the volume of inspiration, the clearer and the brighter do its contents become; the more harmony do we see among all the parts; the more majesty in the whole; in one word, the more that proclaims its author. In proportion as we learn to view its exhibition with our own eyes, and to judge for ourselves of their relative importance and magnitude, it is very possible, indeed it is but too probable, that we shall abandon some sentiments previously cherished, and modify many others. A study of the Scriptures may indeed diminish our complacency in other sources of instruction, but not our respect for that 'wisdom which cometh from above,' and 'is a fountain of life to all who seek her.'

Let the Hebrew Scriptures be studied, with proper views of their origin, character, progressive development, and ultimate object; let them be studied with as extensive knowledge as can be acquired of contemporaneous antiquity; let them be studied with a view to the bearing they have on the great development of Christianity which they were intended to introduce. Thus the student's reverence will increase as he advances, and the prevailing language of his feelings will be that of David: "Thy testimonies are wonderful, therefore doth my soul keep them."*

I might urge the subject under consideration upon several other grounds. Many errors, very extensively circulated, may be traced to a want of acquaintance with the idioms of the Hebrew language. The study of it would of course tend to correct them. I have little doubt, that a large proportion of the more popular objections to revealed religion might be traced to the same source. Could men be brought to comprehend the true meaning and spirit of the Bible, they would feel that these objections are in reality of but little weight,† or else, that they lie with equal force against natural religion. In this latter case they press the deist more strongly than the believer, and must drive the real free-thinker either into the extravagances and horrors of atheism, or lead him to the faith which perceives its own ignorance, and patiently waits until it shall please that Being 'who doeth all things after the counsel of his own will,' to

* Ps. 119: 129.

† See Rosenmüller's *Handbuch der biblischen Alterthumskunde*, Band I. p. 5, 6. I should however be very far from extending the application of the principle as far as this learned author applies it.

raise the veil, and to initiate him into those sublime mysteries, which terrestrial senses are incompetent to explore.

I shall close the present lecture, and with it the defence of the claims of the Hebrew language and literature, by pointing out the particular influence which the study of them must exercise on that of the New Testament. This view of the subject must especially recommend itself to the clergy, whose duty it is to teach the doctrines of Christianity as drawn from that source. But since it is the interest of Christians in general to be taught the principles of religion by able instructors, and to possess themselves a competent acquaintance with the sacred volume which is the depository of their faith; it is hoped, that the few moments to be devoted to this argument will not be considered as mispent, even by a general audience.

Every one knows that the New Testament was written in Greek. But perhaps every one does not know, that this Greek is very peculiar. Yet such is the fact. The language of the New Testament is widely different from that of ancient Greece and its national writers. Any one may convince himself of the truth of this by a slight examination. Whoever has learned Greek merely from the New Testament, will undoubtedly find the Greek of Demosthenes, of Aeschines, and of Thucydides, as strange and unintelligible as Arabic. He may be able to translate the whole of the former, but he will not be able to translate perhaps a single sentence from the works of these authors; and, on the other hand, if he understands these, the language of the New Testament will no longer be altogether strange to him, although still not altogether familiar. This betrays, too plainly to be mistaken, an intermixture of the peculiarities of a foreign dialect. And if the reader be at all acquainted with this dialect, he will immediately perceive it to be that of the later Hebrew, or, as it is more usually denominated, Syro-Chaldaic.

He meets, for instance, with idioms of the national language, which was vernacular in the provinces in which the authors of the New Testament lived, and among the persons from whom they descended. In many turns of expression, in the peculiar use of several particles, in the manner of connecting particular phrases and words, in the frequent repetition of certain figures of speech, he immediately recognizes men, accustomed from childhood to think in an oriental tongue, or according to its peculiarities.

And if he have no previous acquaintance with this intermin-

gled language, the result will still be the same. Every foreign language, which a people receives merely as adventitious, and which they are forced to receive by outward circumstances, must unavoidably be commingled with the more ancient native tongue, if it cannot fully supplant this tongue; and it must be commingled most unavoidably by the lower classes, who have not acquired either language according to the rules of grammar, but merely by intercourse with others and through necessity.”*

This view of the subject does certainly apply to the New Testament, the writers of which were of Hebrew extraction, and accustomed to think and speak in the Hebrew idiom. Other circumstances also contributed to modify their language; but it would not comport with my purpose to trace them to their source. All that my present argument requires is the fact, that the Greek of the New Testament is Hebraistic. There was a time, when a divine would have been branded with odium for making such an assertion. To say that the authors of the New Testament did not write pure classic Greek was, at one period, supposed to be an imputation on their divine authority. The controversy on this subject, which arose in Germany in the early part of the seventeenth century, and was not brought to a termination until the middle of the last, after it had extended into Holland and England, affords abundant evidence of this remark. It has been said of the controversy, that it was more remarkable for the learning than politeness of the disputants—“*plena quidem eruditionis, at non aequae plenae humanitatis.*”† This is no doubt true. Still the question relating to the style of the New Testament was settled, and since that time the most able critics have maintained the opinion already stated, the correctness of which is now almost universally conceded.

The bearing of this point on the subject under consideration must be evident. If words occur in the New Testament, the meaning of which is modified by that of analogous words in Hebrew, if its phrases and figures and allusions are often Hebraistic; it becomes necessary for every one who would thoroughly comprehend his Greek Testament, to study his Hebrew

* See *Einleitung in die theologischen Wissenschaften von G. J. Planck*, II. p. 2 seq.

† See *Morus, Hermeneutica Novi Testamenti*, Vol. I. p. 223. No. III.

Bible. In order to draw this conclusion the topic has been introduced.

Considering these views not merely as important, but as essentially necessary to be brought into practice by all who teach the sacred oracles of God's truth, I have ventured, thus imperfectly, to bring them forward. If, in the view of any, I have spoken too freely on this subject, let me appeal, in vindication, to an authority which, among protestants at least, must be acknowledged to be among the highest; I mean, the immortal Luther. "My knowledge of the Hebrew language," says the great Reformer, "is but limited; yet I would not barter it for all the treasures of the world." Many persons may regard this as an extravagant hyperbole; I do not wonder at his language. Appreciating the feeling that gave rise to it, 'out of the abundance of the heart, my mouth hath spoken.'

ART. V. ON THE PREVALENCE OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE IN PALESTINE IN THE AGE OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

By John Leonard Hug, Prof. of Theology in the University of Freiburg in the Breisgau.*

MATTHEW was desirous of being understood in the country, which he intended should more immediately be influenced by his Gospel; it is therefore not superfluous, if we wish to form a judgment upon his situation as an author, to endeavour to obtain correct ideas of the state in which he found the language of the country. According to some, the Greek language had at that time acquired important prerogatives by the side

* See the Introductory Article in No. II. p. 209.—The following article constitutes Sect. 10 of the second volume of Hug's *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 3d edition, Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1826. This work has been translated from the German and published by the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL. D. London, 1827. The translation is very imperfect, sometimes even giving a sense directly contrary to the original. It was moreover made from the *second* German edition. The present article is printed

of the national language;¹ but if again we listen to others, we should doubt whether any one in Palestine understood Greek; whether Peter, John, James, Jude, or even Matthew had any knowledge of this language, which might be peculiarly expected from a man engaged in the business of collecting customs.² But if we cast our eyes upon the changes which took place in those countries, we shall come to a very different result.

By the conquest of the Macedonians the state of Asia underwent many changes as to opinion, customs, science, and language, the history of which, from want of documents, will never be entirely developed. What I say here respecting the language, has reference chiefly to Palestine.

“What mean then (such are the words of an ancient author) Greek cities in barbarous countries, and the Macedonian language among Indians and Persians?”³ Even in Media also the Macedonians had built Grecian cities.⁴ On the Ti-

from Wait's version, with very many corrections and important additions from the *third* edition of the original.

The subject is discussed by Hug, as is mentioned in the Introductory Article (p. 316), in connexion with the question respecting the original language of Matthew's Gospel. The author's opinion is in favour of a Greek original; and it was therefore proper for him to shew how extensively the Greek prevailed at that time in Palestine and the adjacent regions. This circumstance accounts for the manner in which the discussion is introduced, and for the paragraphs at the close.—Ed.

¹ The authors upon this subject have been specified by Kuinoel, in Fabric. Biblioth. Graec. Edit. Harles. T. IV. L. IV. c. 7. p. 760. To these add, Dominici Diodati J. C. Neapolitani de Christo Graece loquente Exercit. Neapoli, 1767. I could not obtain this treatise even at Naples.—Fr. Guil. Schubert, Dissertat. qua in sermonem, quo Evangel. Matthaei conscriptum fuerit, inquiritur. Götting. 1810.

² Giambernardo de Rossi, della lingua propria di Christo, etc. Parma, 1772. It is particularly directed against Diodati. The celebrated author sometimes confounds different ages; often makes use of bad weapons; but is a sturdy combatant.

³ Seneca Consolat. ad Helviam, c. 6.

⁴ Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνίδες πόλεις κτίσματα τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐν τῇ Μεδίᾳ. Strabo, XI. 6.

gris, Seleucia was principally inhabited by Greeks;⁵ to the south-east was the magnificent Ctesiphon;⁶ and to the north-west was Sittace.⁷

Babylon imitated Macedonia; in its neighbourhood lived Greeks and Macedonians.⁸ From thence along the Euphrates upwards lay Nicephorium, a Grecian city, surrounded also by other Greek towns;⁹ and further on in Mesopotamia was Charrae, a settlement of the Macedonians.¹⁰ But not to enter into details, we refer (in Appian) to a large catalogue of cities in further and hither Syria, which were reckoned to the Greeks.¹¹ Tigranes, the Armenian, in his march to Phenicia by way of Syria, destroyed no less than twelve Greek cities.¹² Between Syria and Babylonia we meet with the ruins of Palmyra, on which are found more Greek than Palmyrene inscriptions.¹³ Even some, written in the Palmyrene character, are nevertheless, in their language, Greek.¹⁴ In hither Syria, on the boun-

⁵ Jos. Ant. XVIII. 9. 8. *Οἰκοῦσι δὲ αὐτὴν (Σελεύκειαν) πολλοὶ τῶν Μακεδόνων, καὶ πλείστοι Ἕλληνες.* Dio Cass. XL. 16. ed. Tauchn. *Σελεύκεια πλείστον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ νῦν ἔχουσα.*

⁶ Jos. Ant. XVIII. 9. 9. *Κτησιφῶντα. . . πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα.*

⁷ Plin. H. N. VI. 31. "Oppidum ejus Sittace Graecorum: ab ortu est," should be thus pointed: "Oppidum ejus Sittace Graecorum; ab ortu est Sabata; ab occasu autem Antiochia."

⁸ Plin. H. N. VI. 30. *Babylonia . . . libera hodie ac sui juris, Macedonumque moris.* Joseph. Ant. XIII. 5. 11. *καὶ γὰρ οἱ ταύτη κατοικούντες Ἕλληνες καὶ Μακεδόνες. λ.*

⁹ Dio Cass. XL. 13. *Ὁ Κράσσος τὰ τε φρούρια καὶ τὰς πόλεις τὰς Ἑλληνίδας μάλιστα, τὰς τε ἄλλας καὶ τὸ Νικηφόριον ἀνομασμένον, προσεποίησατο.*

¹⁰ Dio Cass. XXXVII. 5. *Καρχαῖοι, Μακεδόνων τε ἀποικοῦντες.*

¹¹ Appian. de Reb. Syriac. LVII. Tom. I. p. 622, 23. edit. Schweigh.

¹² Strabo. XI. 16.

¹³ Rob. Wood, the Ruins of Palmyra, otherwise Tadmor in the desert, Lond. 1753. fol. contains 26 Greek inscriptions, and only 13 Palmyrene. Also Corn. le Brun, Voyage au Levant, Paris 1714, gives from the original English accounts the Greek inscriptions, p. 345—366.

¹⁴ Barthelemy, Reflexions sur l'alphabet et sur la langue, dont on se servoit autrefois à Palmyre, in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscript. et Belles Lettres, T. XLV. 8. p. 179 seq.

daries of Palestine, and in Palestine itself, the Greeks, as was natural from the situation and neighbourhood, made still greater intrusions. The many commotions which here took place furnished great inducements to them. The Ptolemies and Seleucidæ had a long contest for the possession of these countries; they brought their Greeks with them, and placed them in the administration and as inhabitants of the older and more recently built cities, and stationed them as garrisons.

Antioch, the capital of hither Syria, in near connexion with Palestine, was by its founder peopled with Macedonians and Greeks,¹⁵ and obtained the reputation of Greek refinement and science.¹⁶ Not only in Antioch, but in several cities of Lower Syria, *ἐν τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ*, Macedonians and Greeks, together with Jews, were introduced as inhabitants.¹⁷

Likewise Tyre and Sidon, cities yet more ancient, which were under fewer restrictions and treated with distinction on account of their consequence, yielded to the Greek influence, and changed their language. When the rulers of the Roman empire had established their dominion in these countries, they ordered the edicts which they published at Tyre to be exposed in the public places in two languages, viz. the Latin and the Greek, that every one might be able to read them.¹⁸ The same thing took place at Sidon; a Roman edict had to be made known in the Greek and Latin languages.¹⁹ A general order to the cities of Tyre, Sidon, and Askalon, contains the same clause: "This edict shall be exposed in the temples in

¹⁵ Joseph. Ant. XII. 3. 3. Bell. Jud. VII. 3. 3.

¹⁶ Cicero pro Archia poeta, c. 3. Archias was born at Antioch, loco nobili, celebri quandam urbe et copiosa, atque eruditissimis hominibus, liberalissimisque studiis affluentibus.

¹⁷ Jos. Ant. XII. 3. 1. *Καὶ γὰρ Σέλευκος ὁ Νικάτωρ, ἐν αἷς ἔκτισε πόλεις ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ . . . τοῖς ἐνοικοθεῖσιν ἰσότητους ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόσι καὶ Ἑλλήσιν . . . τοὺς Ἰουδαίους.*

¹⁸ Jos. Ant. XIV. 12. 5. *Ἰν' αὐτὸ (διάταγμα) εἰς τὰς δημοσίους ἐντάξῃτε δέλτους γραμμασι Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς, ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ ἔχητε αὐτὸ γεγραμμένον, ὅπως ὑπὸ πάντων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι δυνήσεται.*

¹⁹ Jos. Ant. XIV. 10. 2. *Βούλομαι δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ καὶ Ῥωμαῖσιν ἐν δέλτῳ χαλκῇ τοῦτο ἀνατεθῆναι.*

the Latin and Greek languages.²⁰ In the above-mentioned edicts, the language of the legislators, as well as that of those upon whom it was incumbent to obey them, was naturally taken into consideration. As to Sidon itself, a decree of the city (somewhere about the years 144—47 before our era) is preserved upon a marble, worded in the Greek language, by which it pays honour to the commander of the body-guard of Ptolemy Philometor.²¹ Askalon is particularly worthy of our notice, because, being situated in Palestine, at several epochs it constituted a part of the Jewish state. It moreover produced men who distinguished themselves in Greek learning, as philosophers, historians, and grammarians.²² Such was the fortune of the principal cities.

A monument of the ancient Berytus establishes the same in regard to that city. Eastward from the present site [of Beyroot] are the remains of the colonnade of a temple, which was served by Greek priests of an order of mendicants; for there were already such even in heathen times. The following courteous inscription bespoke the charity of visitors: *Τῆς τοῦ προσιόντος ἀνδρὸς εὐνοίας αἰὲ σαφῆς ἔλεγκος ἢ προσοπισ γίνεται· δίδου προθύμως ὃ παρέχεις, ἢ μὴ δίδου· παρὰ γὰρ τὸ μικρὸν γίνεται πληρῆς χάρις.* 'The sight of an approaching visitor is an evidence of his good will; give willingly what thou offerest, or give nothing; even for a small gift there is full gratitude.' It is not possible to specify exactly the date of this inscription; but the shape of the Σ, as it is given in the copies, carries it back at least into the first century.²³

²⁰ Jos. Ant. XIV. 10. 3.

²¹ Voyage du Paul Lucas dans la Grèce, l'Asie mineure, et l'Afrique, T. II. (the second voyage.) After the second part, (Inscriptions trouvées à Seide, n. 5.) is the said decree of the city. Ptolemy Philometor had Cleopatra his sister to wife, and banished Demetrius Soter and Alexander from the kingdom of Syria; then placed upon his own head the crown of Egypt and Syria; 1 Maccab. 11: 8—13. The inscription I read thus: *Ἡ πόλις Ἀριαν Δαμοθέτου, κρητα, τον αρχισωματοφυλακα, και επι της πολεως αρετης ἐνεκεν, και ευνοιας της εις βασιλεα Πτολεμαιον και βασιλισσαν Κλεοπατραν την αδελφην θεους φιλομητορας, και τεκνα αυτων, και της εις αυτην ευεργεσιας.*

²² Stephan. de Urbib. V. Ἀσκάλων.

²³ Maundrell, March 18th.

The heights of Lebanon still contain the remains of ancient edifices; and among them one dedicated to the emperor Tiberius: *ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙ ΤΙΒΕΡΙΩΙ ΚΑΛΑΤΑΙΩΙ ΚΑΙ ΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΙ ΚΑΙ* etc.²⁴

The Jews, indeed, when the incursions under Antiochus Epiphanes became too serious, preserved themselves in the interior of the country with arms in their hands, by means of the bravery of their Asmonaeon chiefs, from the language and the manners of the Greeks; but many of the cities, which the Syrian kings had torn from the Jewish states and peopled with other inhabitants, they were not able to regain.

This glory remained for Aristobulus and Alexander, the first Asmonaeans who assumed royal dignity. At the death of the latter they were all, together with several others, brought under subjection to the Jews; or destroyed, where the inhabitants would not embrace Judaism.²⁵ Yet that was not of long duration.

Pompey on his return from his expedition against Mithridates, conducting his legions through Syria, took advantage of the dissensions among the Jewish princes, to render Palestine dependent on the Romans. On this occasion he recovered from the Jews the cities which they had taken from the Syrian kings, ordered those which had been demolished to be rebuilt, and the latter as well as the former to be restored to their former inhabitants. These were Gadara, Hippos, Scythopolis, Pella, Dios, Samaria, Marissa, Azotus, Jamnia, Arethusa, Gaza, Joppa, Dora, and Straton's Tower.²⁶ At that time the following were rebuilt: Samaria, Azotus, Scythopolis, Anthedon, Raphia, Dora, Marissa, and Gaza.²⁷ In all probability, they were all, if not entirely, at least partially, inhabited by Greeks, or by Syrians who spoke Greek.

Respecting some of them, we can specify it with certainty. Dora, once a city of Galilee, subsequently disputed with the Jews their right of citizenship. Claudius decided the dispute, and adjudged to the Jews an equal right of citizenship with the

²⁴ Otto Friedr. v. Richter, Wallfahrten im Morgenlande, 1822. p. 103. at Kalaat Fakra.

²⁵ Jos. Ant. XIII. 15. 4.

²⁶ Jos. Ant. XIV. 4. 4.

²⁷ Jos. Ant. XIV. 5. 3.

Greeks.²⁸ Gadara and Hippos, on the east of Galilee, had become entirely Greek cities.²⁹ The former even possessed men famous in Greek science.³⁰ In the heart of Palestine, between Galilee and Judea, and formerly belonging to the former, lay Bethshan, called by the Greeks Scythopolis.³¹ The Greeks who resided here, after having changed the name of the city, traced back its origin in Greek mythology to Bacchus,³² and called themselves, upon their coins, Nysaeon-Scythopolitans. In other respects, they have made themselves memorable by the basest treachery against their Jewish fellow-citizens.³³ On the south-west border of Judea we meet with Gaza, a city of the Greeks.³⁴

That Joppa did not remain free from the influence of the Greek language, may be inferred from its fortunes. On account of its situation and the importance of its harbour, the Alexandrian and Syrian kings often took it from the Jews, and kept it in a state of defence by means of their garrisons.³⁵ In the days of Strabo³⁶ the Hellenized fable of Andromeda was already transplant-

²⁸ Jos. Ant. XIX. 6. 3. "Ἐτι μέντοι καὶ συμπολιτεύεσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι.

²⁹ Jos. Ant. XVII. 11. 4. Γάδαρα καὶ Ἴππος Ἕλληνίδες εἰσὶ πόλεις. Compare Bell. Jud. II. 6. 3.

³⁰ Strabo, XVI. 29.

³¹ Βαιθσάν occurs (Joshua 17: 11) in the Alexandrine translation without explanation; but in Judges, 50: 27 Βαιθσάν, ἢ ἐστὶ Σκυθῶν πόλις. The first of the profane writers in whom we find Σκυθῶν πόλιν is Polybius, V. 70. 4.

³² The fable is in Pliny and Solinus. Liebe, Gotha numaria, p. 335, 336, has cited it in illustration of their coins, which are inscribed Νυσαιων τῶν καὶ Σκυθοπολιτῶν. Compare Eckhel Doctrin. Num. vet. P. I. Vol. III. p. 439.

³³ Bell. Jud. II. 18. 3, 4. Vita Josephi 6. The Scythopolitans summoned the neighbouring Jews to the defence of the city against their mutinous countrymen. They rushed to arms and were victorious; but were fallen upon unawares by the Scythopolitans, and in return put to death. These were Greeks, as we see from a long speech in Bell. Jud. VII. 8. 7. p. 429. ed. Haverc.

³⁴ Jos. Ant. XVII. 11. 4. Bell. Jud. II. 6. 3.

³⁵ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 59 and 93. 1 Macc. 10: 75. 12: 33, 34. 13: 11. 14: 34. 2 Macc. 12: 3. Joseph. Ant. XIII. 9. 2. XIV. 10. 22.

³⁶ Strabo, XVI. 28. Also Pliny, Mela, and Solinus.

ed hither, for the purpose of procuring ancient renown for the place, and of retracing it back to times when no Judaism yet existed.

Afterwards Herod found means to elevate himself to the throne of the Asmonaeans, first through the favour of Antony, and then through that of Augustus. When he saw himself secured in the possession of it, he and his sons after him either built new cities in honour of the Cesars, or embellished the old ones, and put Greek inhabitants into them. The greatest and most magnificent was Cesarea, the capital of the country next to Jerusalem, and principally peopled with Greeks.³⁷ But they became so ungrateful after the death of the king, that they denied to the Jews a share in the city. Nero afterwards declared, against the Jews, that the Greeks were the masters of the city.³⁸ They fared worse at Tiberias; under the same king, the Jews fell upon their fellow-citizens, the Greeks, and completely overthrew them.³⁹ Thus far chance has favoured us with the testimonials of history in regard to the cities of the Herods; if the catalogue be not very copious, let it be recollected, that I am referred to only a single source, namely, Josephus, who only makes mention of the Greeks when some remarkable occurrence requires him to do so.

Respecting other cities, we can only infer from circumstances or from the testimony of numismatics. Cesarea by Panium,⁴⁰ built by Philip, had temples, theatres, a stadium, and coins stamped in the Greek language, under Augustus, Caius Cesar, etc. The impressions of others may be easily found in Eckhel and Rasche.

³⁷ Bell. Jud. III. 9. 1. *Καισάρειαν μεγίστην τῆς δὲ Ἰουδαίας πόλιν, καὶ τὸ πλεον ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων ἐνοικουμένην.* Compare II. 13. 7.

³⁸ Bell. Jud. II. 14. 4. *Καὶ οἱ Καισάρων Ἕλληνας, νικήσαντες παρὰ Νέρωνι τῆς πόλεως ἄρχειν.*

³⁹ Vita Josephi 12, where the inhabitants are said to have killed πάντας τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Ἕλληνας.

⁴⁰ So the cavern is called from which the Jordan springs, *Πανέϊον, Pan's Cavern*; for it was consecrated to Pan and the nymphs, as the Greek inscriptions without upon the rocks testify. Seetzen in Zach's Monathl. Correspond. Oct. 1806. p. 343. Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, Journal of a Tour from Damascus in the countries of the Libanus and Antilib. p. 39.

Josephus gives us a larger catalogue of cities, upon which the Jews revenged themselves for the cruel wrongs which they had suffered from the Greeks in Cesarea.⁴¹ It is natural to suppose that they were Greek cities, which were made to expiate the crimes of the Greeks in Cesarea. Among them are such as we have just mentioned as Greek cities, Gadara, Hippos, Scythopolis, Askalon, Gaza; from which we distinctly see what sort of cities is meant. The historian, indeed, does not in this place call the people of Cesarea Grecians, as he does elsewhere, but Syrians; and the cities, Syrian cities. But this is explained by the fact that Josephus, in further Syria,⁴² carefully distinguishes the Greeks and Syrians; while, on the contrary, in *hither* Syria, he uses *Ἕλλην* and *Σύρος* alternately, and as synonymous; as if no farther difference existed here between Greek and Syrian.⁴³

These are the cities which he names. Beyond the Jordan, in the east, Philadelphia, Gerasa, Pella, Gadara, Hippos; on this side the Jordan, Scythopolis; Kedasa, a frontier town on the Tyrian and Galilean border; along the coast, Ptolemais, Gaba, Cesarea, Askalon, Gaza, Anthedon; in the interior, Sebaste. The first six are cities of Decapolis. Here recent discoveries come to our help. Philadelphia is still majestic in its rubbish, in the ruins of its temples, and other works of Grecian architecture; its theatre is the largest in Syria. Gerasa still surpasses this city, if not in splendour, yet in the preservation of its edifices; its temples and palaces, mostly of the Corinthian order; two theatres, naumachiae, and baths. All these ruins give evidence of Grecian life, as do also the fragments of inscriptions which are found in that language.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Bell. Jud. II. 18. 1.

⁴² Jos. Antiq. XVIII. 9. 8, 9.

⁴³ Bell. Jud. II. 13. 7, compare 14. 4. Vita Josephi 11. Antiq. XVII. 5. 7. Histoire de l'Academie des Inscript. et Belles Lettres, T. II. p. 170, 171, in 8vo.

⁴⁴ The inscription on a broken column in a public building at Gerasa, which has been very imperfectly copied by Buckingham, (*Travels in Palestine*, c. XXI. p. 378,) I would at least in part correct in this manner: *ἐπι . . . του μεγαλοπρεπεστατου . . . και αρχοντος εγενετο το εργον του εμβολου.* Another one at Suf, at the distance of an hour and a half from Gerasa, I read thus: *αγαθητι τυχη . . . Δι αγιον και εθνιωι ηρωι, και ηλιωι αμερα, ηοι, Δημητριου παιδανιου. . . . Αγριος απελευθερος τον βωμον ανεθηκεν κατ' ευνην λυκαβαντε . . .*

The case is the same with the districts of Auranitis and Trachonitis, which in the time of Christ were under Jewish rulers, Herod and his son Philip. The wanderer often meets with forsaken cities, and in most of them dilapidated edifices of ancient architecture; Greek inscriptions on temples, basilica, gates, aqueducts, and tombs. Those of which the date can be determined, belong to the age of Trajan, or to that of Adrian and the Antonines; and these are the most numerous.⁴⁵ They are indeed later than the times of the apostles; but a land does not change its language in a period of from twenty to fifty years; and a Hellenism so entire is conceivable only on the supposition, that already for many generations Greeks had been established here as inhabitants of the land.

The names of Auranitis and Trachonitis remind us of Abilene, the tetrarchy of Lysanias. Upon a summit between Damascus and Baalbeck, called *Nebi-Abel*, stands a Doric temple. Within the temple a metrical inscription in the Greek language proclaims the renown of the architect, the name of the foundress, and the year of the reign of Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, in order to mark the date of the erection.⁴⁶

According to these appearances, the former Israelitish *East*, or country beyond the Jordan, was sprinkled over towards the north with Grecian towns and cities; while towards the south it was mostly in possession of free cities of Grecian name and character, surrounded by their territories, Philadelphene, Gerasene, Gadaritis, Hippene, all under Roman protection. On the opposite or western border, from Antioch along the Syrian, Phenician, and Jewish coast, there was a line of cities even to the Egyptian frontier, in which Greek, if not the only, was yet the predominant language. The middle region between these two borders, comprehending Galilee and Judea, in spite of its aversion, could never withdraw itself from all intercourse with

⁴⁵ Seetzen collected 69 inscriptions, and among them only one Palmyrene; all the rest Greek; and alas! all lost. Zach's *Monathl. Corresp.* May 1806. p. 311. Those copied by Burckhardt are well known; see *Journal of an Excursion into the Haouran in 1810*; and *Journal of a Tour from Damascus into the Haouran in 1812*; in his *Travels in Syria*. A few which had escaped Burckhardt, may be found in O. F. Richter's *Wallfahrten im Morgenlande*, p. 554—562.

⁴⁶ Pococke's *Travel's in the East*, Vol. II. § 177. In German under the title: *Beschreibung des Morgenlandes* II. § 177.

Greeks and their language; so much the less indeed, because under Herod several of the maritime cities, as Joppa, Askalon, Gaza, Anthedon, belonged to the Jewish territory, as did Cesarea always; and in the interior, besides Scythopolis, there arose important cities, such as Sebaste, Tiberias, Cesarea by Panium, which were more or less inhabited by those who spoke Greek. The Greek tongue indeed had not been able entirely to supplant the national language, but it had acquired an important place by the side of the latter; and favoured by the circumstances of the times, it had spread widely and established itself firmly.

From the time of Pompey, the opposition against the incursion of the Greeks into the interior was removed; the barriers were not only broken, but the Greeks were even the favoured party. They became still more so under Herod the first, who did not conceal from the Jews that he gave the preference to the Greeks,⁴⁷ and did not stop at this confession, but by costly establishments even manifested that it was his purpose to Hellenize the Jews.

He built at Cesarea a theatre and an amphitheatre;⁴⁸ at Jericho, a stadium, amphitheatre, and theatre;⁴⁹ a stadium, and an amphitheatre under the walls of the holy city, and at last a theatre even within its circumference.⁵⁰ The immense expense of this species of edifices, particularly in the interior of the country, at Jericho, and even in Jerusalem, shews how much he was resolved to accustom the Jews to the Greek drama and to the sanguinary diversions of the Roman combats.

How much the subsequent Roman government, which was conducted by the procurators and the praetors of Syria under whom they were placed, contributed to the adoption of the Greek language or retarded it, deserves an inquiry, which may be proposed in the following manner: In what language did the praetors of Syria and the administrators of Judea, Vitellius,

⁴⁷ Ἑλλησι πλείον ἢ Ἰουδαίοις οἰκείως ἔχειν ὁμολογούμενος.—
Jos. Ant. XIX. 7. 3.

⁴⁸ Jos. Ant. XV. 9. 6. Compare XVI. 5. 1.

⁴⁹ Bell. Jud. I. 33. 6, 8. Antiq. XVII. 6. 5. XVII. 6. 3.

⁵⁰ Bell. Jud. II. 3. 1. Antiq. XV. 8. 1. *Θέατρον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ὑποδόμησεν.* Compare Eichhorn de Judaeorum re scenica, Commentat. Soc. R. Scient. Goetting. recentior. Vol. II. Class. Antiq. p. 10—13.

Petronius, Pilate, *speak* when they sat as judges, and when they addressed the assemblies of the people?

Formerly it was customary for the Roman governors to speak only in their own language; even in places where they were not understood, as in Greece and Asia. Up to the reign of Tiberius the ancient custom had so far been laid aside that, according to the declaration of a contemporary, the places in which the senate assembled at Rome, resounded even to deafening with Greek debates.⁵¹ Where they formerly heard the Greek ambassadors only through the medium of an interpreter, and answered them in the same manner,⁵² a Roman emperor now made long speeches to them in the Greek language.⁵³

When they presided as judges, they frequently gave judgment according to Roman law in Greek words. When Tiberius made an exception in this particular, and refused to admit the testimony of a centurion in the Greek language, the historian observes, that the emperor was not herein consistent; for on the same tribunal he had taken many examinations in this language, and pronounced many decisions in it.⁵⁴ Verses of Homer were often interspersed in the judgments of Claudius;⁵⁵ while, on the other hand, he frequently met with annoyances through the forwardness of the Greeks.⁵⁶ When Nero first appeared in public business, he spoke in favour of the affairs of the Bononians, and for those of the Rhodians and the Ilienses, before the consul; for the first in Latin, for the others in Greek.⁵⁷

⁵¹ Valer. Max. II. 2. 3.

⁵² Aul. Gell. Noct. Att. VII. 14.

⁵³ Suetonius. Claudius. c. 42. He only made a difference with ambassadors of Roman descent, and who resided in the provinces. These he addressed in Latin, and required a Latin answer. Dio Cass. LX. p. 676. edit. Wechel. Sueton. Claudius. c. 16.

⁵⁴ Dio. Cass. LVII. p. 612. ed. Wechel. ed. Rob. Steph. p. 419. Suetonius limits it only thus far: *Sermone Graeco . . . non tamen usquequaque usus est. Abstinet maxime in senatu.* Tiber. c. 71. Wherever he made use of the Latin language he took great pains to speak and write it with purity. Dio Cass. LVII. p. 613. ed. Wech. ed. Rob. Steph. p. 420. Comp. Sueton. de illustri grammat. c. 22.

⁵⁵ Sueton. Claud. c. 42.

⁵⁶ Sueton. Claud. c. 15.

⁵⁷ Sueton. Nero. c. 7. Compare Seneca, *Controvers.* IV. p. 291 Bipont.

If then the emperors in Rome itself administered justice to the provincials in the Greek language; and the affairs of the Greeks, which their ambassadors brought forward, were discussed in the senate and before the consuls in the Greek language also; we may infer what was the manner of proceeding by the Romans in Greece and Asia.

We are not destitute of examples on this point. Cicero, at Syracuse, spoke in a Greek senate in the Greek language, with which Verres reproached him.⁵⁸ He, however, was not very likely to do any thing in his professional capacity which he was not able to justify by precedents. P. Crassus, who, as proconsul, was commissioned to wage war with Aristonicus in Asia, carried it so far that he answered and issued his commands to each of the Greek tribes in its own dialect, according as he was addressed; to the Ionians in Ionic, to the Æolians in Æolic.⁵⁹ Augustus, as conqueror and sovereign, addressed the people of Alexandria in the Greek language.⁶⁰ Through Greek eloquence Mucianus persuaded the people of Antioch to declare for Vespasian.⁶¹ The Greek language even appears to have been the court-language of the proconsuls of Asia and Syria.⁶²

Once more then: What language did the procurators of Palestine, Pilate, Porcius Festus, employ, when they presided as judges? or the praetors of Syria, Petronius, Vitellius, when they, as was frequently the case, addressed the people? That the Romans in Syria and Phenicia made use of the Greek language, we know from the preceding proofs; but that they made use of an interpreter in Palestine, there appears nowhere a trace either in Josephus or in the sacred books.

With respect to the people, the superior orders could scarcely do without this language on account of the new circumstances of society; but with respect to the multitude, it was decided by adventitious circumstances, the sphere in which each moved and his business. "Few of my countrymen," says Josephus at the end of his *Archæology*, "would have been able to compose this book in the Greek language, on account of their defi-

⁵⁸ Cicero, in *Verr.* IV. 66.

⁵⁹ *Valer. Max.* VII. 7. 6.

⁶⁰ *Dio Cass.* LI. 16. p. 454. ed. Wech. ed. Rob. Steph. p. 307.

⁶¹ *Tacit. Hist.* II. 8.

⁶² *Seneca Ep.* XII. de *Ira*, II. 5.

ciency in the grammatical knowledge of it, in which I can boast myself superior to others; although I do not speak it well myself on account of the established customs of my country. For with us the knowledge of foreign languages, and correctness and elegance of pronunciation, are accounted vulgar, since freed-men of a low class could also acquire them, and even slaves also if they were so inclined. We only attribute erudite acquisitions to those who are acquainted with the laws and are able to explain the sacred books."⁶³

A knowledge of the more ancient language and of the religious documents, was consequently an object of the higher sort of Jewish education. Even for the existing language of the people, for the Aramaean, there were no places of instruction. In the same manner was the Greek language neglected; the Jews understood it, but not grammatically, and learned it by intercourse and commerce; in which manner it was communicated to the lower orders, who, if instruction had been offered, were not in a situation to receive it.

The religious authorities were so little opposed to the diffusion of the Greek language, that they esteemed and honoured it above every other language. Works written in it were reckoned along with the books of Jewish learning; and even in legal cases, which came in contact with religion, the use of it was admitted. So we are informed by the oldest and the most to be relied on of the Talmudic records, viz. the Mishnah; for I am not disposed to give credit to all the dreams of the later Jews.

"The Jews are not permitted to compose books in all languages; it shall only be permitted them to write books in the Greek." This is a declaration of Rabbi Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, which was acknowledged as a statute.⁶⁴

⁶³ Ant. XX. 11. 2. See the text cited at length on p. 344 of this volume.—ED.

⁶⁴ Mishn. Tract. Megill. c. 1. n. 8. רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: 'R. Simeon filius Gamalielis dicit, etiam de libris non permiserunt ut scribuntur nisi Graece.' According to the explanation of R. B. Maimon and of Obadiah of Bartenora, the הלכה or observance was according to R. Simeon's decision; compare c. 2. n. 1, where the two Rabbins declare it to be indifferent, whether the Megillah is read in Chaldaic or in Greek. Through this the objection of a learned author is

A bill of divorce might be written in *Greek* or *Hebrew*, or, if it were wished, in both languages, and might also be signed by the witnesses in Greek or Hebrew; in either language, and with either subscription, it was valid.⁶⁵ Yet had the Jews many scruples in regard to divorces, and allowed to a non-Judaic court of justice no voice whatever in them, and acknowledged no one as a sufficient witness in such cases, unless it were one of their own people.⁶⁶ So indulgent had the Jews become in a legal process which involved the religious or Mosaic casuistry.

The first prohibition against the Greek occurs in the later days of the Jewish state, when Titus threatened Jerusalem. In the war of Vespasian the wreath of the bridegroom and the cymbals were abolished by public order; but in the war of Titus the use of the bride's wreath was also interdicted, and the fathers were commanded henceforward to prevent their sons from learning Greek.⁶⁷

From this prohibition we might explain, if it were necessary, why Josephus being sent by Titus to persuade the besieged to less desperate measures, spoke to them in their native language, *τῆ πατριῶ γλώσσῃ* and *Ἑβραϊζῶν*.⁶⁸ But even if this prohibition had not been issued, there existed in the old ancestral sound a

removed, who maintains that it was contrary to the ancient customs, for a Jew of Palestine (Matthew) to have written a book in the Greek language. Bertholdt, *Hist. Introd.* to the writings of the Old and New Testaments, Part III. § 320. p. 1176. The passage to which he refers (Joseph. *Antiq. Proem.* 2.) only speaks of the difficulties of expressing one's self in a foreign language according to its peculiarities; for Josephus wished not only to write Greek, but to write it elegantly. *Ant.* XIV. at the commencement.

⁶⁵ *Mish. Tr. Gitin.* c. 9. n. 8. גַּט שְׁכַחְבוּ עֵבְרִית וְעִדְיוּ יוֹנָת וְעַד יוֹנָת וְעִדְיוּ עֵבְרִית עַד אֶחָד עֵבְרִי וְעַד אֶחָד יוֹנֵי כְּתָב סוֹפֵר, וְעַד כֹּשֶׁר : 'Repudii libellus si Hebraice sit conscriptus, et nomina testium Graece; aut versa vice; unius testis nomen Hebraice, et unius Graece; si conscripserit eum scriba et testis, legitimus est.' Compare herewith the preceding paragraph in the same section, *Gitin*.

⁶⁶ *Gitin.* I. n. 5.

⁶⁷ *Mish. in Sotah.* c. 9. n. 14. בַּמָּלוּם שֶׁל טִיטוּס גָּזְרוּ עַל עֵטְרוֹת : כְּלוּת וּשְׁלֵא יִלְמַד אָדָם אֶת בְּנוֹ יוֹנָת בַּמָּלוּם שֶׁל טִיטוּס גָּזְרוּ עַל עֵטְרוֹת : 'Orto bello Titi, cautum de coronis sponsarum, et ne quis filium in Graecanicis erudiet.'

⁶⁸ *Bell. Jud.* V. 9. 2. VI. 2. 1.

token of like extraction and of like interest in the fate of the native land ; and on that account it possessed an inducement to confidence. Thus it was considered by Titus,⁶⁹ how could we then ever look upon it as a proof of the ignorance of the besieged in regard to the Greek language ?

I must moreover state in addition, that when the revolters, in the last decisive moments, seemed to have become a little more humble, they requested a conference with Titus. He had never before appeared in the negotiations. He approached, ordered the Romans to cease hostilities, had an interpreter at his side, (*ὅπερ ἦν τεκμήριον τοῦ κρατεῖν*, as Josephus adds,) and began the conference himself.⁷⁰ Here he spoke by means of an interpreter. Was this person then present for the purpose of translating the words of Titus into Hebrew ? For that office he would rather have chosen Josephus ; but he, who never forgets *himself* in the history, was not the person ; had he been, he would have mentioned it. The interpreter also was not present for the purpose of speaking Hebrew, *πατριῶ γλώσση*, which Josephus would not have omitted to mention. For what purpose then, one may ask, was the interpreter necessary ? The words of the historian explain it, if we would only understand them. The emperor spoke *ex majestate imperii*, that is, LATIN, after the old Roman manner ; thus much the words signify : *ὅπερ ἦν τεκμήριον τοῦ κρατεῖν*, *this was the distinguishing mark of the sovereign* ; which has been falsely referred to the following clause : *primus, quod victoris indicium, dicere instituit*. It would have been better to have preserved the translation of Ruffin, who, at least, comes nearer the mark : *adhibitoque interprete, quo argumento superior ostendebatur*.

The interpreter then translated his words into a language more generally understood, but, as we inferred from the manner of Josephus, not into the Hebrew. What language could it then have been ?—Besides, it is mentioned in corroboration, as praiseworthy in Titus, that he made use of the Latin language in state affairs ; but in his scientific amusements, of the Greek.⁷¹

⁶⁹ *Τάχα ἐνδοῦναι πρὸς ὁμόφυλον δοκῶν αὐτούς.* Bell. Jud. V. 9. 2.

⁷⁰ Bell. Jud. VI. 6. 2.

⁷¹ Suidas. V. *Τίτος*—*τῇ μὲν Λατίνων ἐπιχωρίῳ γλώττῃ πρὸς τὰς τῶν κοινῶν ἐχρήτη διοικήσεις, ποιήματα δὲ καὶ τραγωδίας Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ διεπονέτο.*

We now return to our subject. It is then no longer doubtful, that up to the time in which Matthew wrote, the Greek language had firmly rooted itself in Palestine. But what relation existed between the two languages, is not yet, from the connexion of all these facts, quite obvious. One scene in Paul's life promises us some explanation on this head. At Jerusalem, in an insurrection which was raised against him in the temple, he was saved with difficulty by means of the guards; he demands permission to address the assembled people; he ascends the steps and addresses them in the Hebrew language; Acts 21: 40. This pleased them, and we see in it the predilection for the language of the country. But this approbation shows at the same time, that the people might have been addressed in a different language; the relation of the historian even shows that the assembled crowd was already prepared for an address in another language. "When he had beckoned to them with his hand and a profound silence had ensued, he spoke to them in the Hebrew tongue: Men and brethren, hear now the defence which I make to you. When they now heard that he made use of the Hebrew dialect, they kept the more silence, *μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν,*" Acts 21: 40—22: 2. It is evident from the relation, that they expected an address in another language, and that they heard to their great satisfaction a defence in the Hebrew. But what language could they have expected? The complaint against Paul, and the immediate cause of the insurrection was, that he had introduced Greeks into the temple; Acts 21: 28. His accusers were Grecian Jews from Ionia, who shortly before had seen Trophimus the Ephesian with him; Acts 21: 27—30. The accusation against him, and his accusers, lead us to expect only a Greek address. The case is so much the stronger, since it does not concern individuals, but the people, who are his auditors, and the city which is in commotion. To judge from this occurrence, the people had a predilection for the language of the country; but the mass—there might be an exception as to thousands and thousands—the mass understood also Greek; more from circumstances than from an inclination to foreign languages and manners. But it was on a festival; a multitude of foreigners were present. Very true; but still the greater part were natives, who could have listened to the Greek, and who rejoiced in the Hebrew instead of it.

It may now appear less strange that even in the capital, the

central point of Judaism, peculiar religious places of assembly were found, in which Greeks belonging to any country assembled and formed respectable congregations, such as the Alexandrians, the Syrians, Greeks of Asia Minor, etc. Acts 6: 9. 9: 29.

The Christian school of this city also consisted partly of members who spoke Greek, or Hellenists, who were numerous enough to maintain themselves in a dispute with the Jews; Acts 6: 1.

We are here drawn into a controversy, which for the sake of omitting nothing we cannot avoid. It has been wished to get rid of these Jews who spoke Greek, and of the Jewish Christians, from the Acts of the Apostles.

In order to get rid of them, we have been referred to an explanation which had already been for a long time abandoned, and which is to the following purport: "Hellenists are nothing but proselytes, who were always held in less esteem by the Jews who belonged to the twelve tribes or the Hebrews in the more confined sense of the word, and who, in reference to their heathen extraction, were called Hellenists."⁷²

At all events however they spoke Greek; and it is the more probable they did so, from the circumstance of having been of heathen extraction, or but lately heathens themselves.—And who could expect any thing else from natives of Cilicia, and particularly of Cyrene, Alexandria, and Ionia? Acts 6: 9. If we would prove, from the example of Philo, that the Alexandrians did also understand something of Hebrew, this could have been but very little; and besides, there were very few as learned as he was.

Let us analyze these notions a little. What is a Jew? What is a Hebrew? What is a *Ἕλληνας*? and what is a Hellenist?—The name of Jew (we speak of the times of our Lord and the apostles) is the common expression for all who, according to their extraction, came from the ancient kingdom of Judah, on whatever part of the earth they might be living; (*φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι*, Gal. 2: 15. *πάντες κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην*, Acts 24: 5;) and the religion of this race of men, *γένος*, is called Judaism, *Ἰουδαϊσμός*, Gal. 1: 14. Therefore the Jews stand in con-

⁷² On the Language of Palestine in the time of Christ and the Apostles, according to de Rossi, by Dr. Pfannkuche; in Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek, Vol. VIII. Part 3. p. 472. [Translated in No. II. of this work, p. 358.]

tradistinction to the heathens, ἔθνη, Rom. 3: 29. 9: 24, etc. or also in contradistinction to the chief people of the heathens, viz. the Greeks, Ἕλληνες, Acts 28: 4. Rom. 2: 9. 10: 12. 1 Cor. 1: 24; and to be addicted to Judaism, is Ἰουδαΐζειν, but a pagan mode of life is ἐθνικῶς ζῆν, Gal. 2: 14, and never Ἑλληνίζειν. He who had come over from heathenism, and who had not yet been so long in Judaism as to be considered by the nation as a fellow-citizen, was a proselyte or a son of the proselytes, Acts 6: 5. 13: 43. And in Acts 2: 10, Ἰουδαῖοι and προσήλυτοι occur, for the whole of the professors of Judaism.

In the same manner as the Jews and the Greeks are opposed to each other, so also are the Hebrews and the Hellenists, Acts 6: 1. Wherein can that consist, by which the Hebrew distinguishes himself, and by which he becomes a subdivision of the general name of Jew? Certainly not in religion—in that he is a Jew; not in extraction, φύσει, in that also he is a Jew. In what else then can it consist but in the language? When we speak of customs, opinions, and religious worship, Ἰουδαϊκός only is used; but when we treat of the national language, writings, and literature, then Ἑβραϊκός is used; we say, Ἑβραϊκὴ διάλεκτος, Acts 22: 2. 26: 14. Ἑβραϊκὰ γράμματα, Luke 23: 38; and we speak and write Ἑβραῖσι, John 19: 17, 20.⁷³ But we never say Ἰουδαϊκὴ διάλεκτος, Ἰουδαϊκὰ γράμματα, etc. It would therefore appear pretty evident, in what the Hebrew distinguished himself from his whole nation.

If then the peculiarity by which the Hebrew distinguishes himself, consists in the language, we may likewise guess where in the peculiarity of the Hellenist, who is opposed to him, consists; that in like manner must be referred to the language. Hence Ἑβραΐζειν and Ἑλληνίζειν were opposed to each other. The word Ἑβραΐζειν means, in Josephus, to utter any thing in the Hebrew language, τὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος διήγγειλε Ἑβραΐζων.⁷⁴ What then could Ἑλληνίζειν be?—That which it has ever been, to speak Greek; as for instance, Thucydides says, II. 48, Ἑλληνίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλώσσαν, 'they adopted the Greek language, which they now speak;' and Xenophon, Anab. VII. 3. 12, Ἑλληνίζειν γὰρ ἠπίστατο; or as Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16, says

⁷³ Josephus de Macc. 12, where the mother admonishes her son Ἑβραϊκῆ φωνῇ and τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ.

⁷⁴ Bell. Jud. VI. 3. 1.

of the daemon, whom the native of Palestine drives out, ἀποκρίνεται Ἑλληνίζων ἢ βαρβαρίζων, 'he answers in both languages of Palestine, in the language of the country βαρβαρίζων, and in the Greek Ἑλληνίζων.' Accordingly, a Hellenist was well explained by the Scholiast to be "a Jew by extraction who speaks Greek;"⁷⁵ and if John Chrysostom, as it seems to me, inferred this signification from the formation of the word only, still he was too good a Grecian for us on this account to dispute his assertion.⁷⁶ If we consult one of the older Greek grammarians, we obtain from him the information, that from Ἑλλην comes Ἑλληνίζω, thence Ἑλληνιστί, as from Δωρίζω, Δωριστί, Αἰολίζω, Αἰολιστί. He is here decidedly speaking of language and dialect.⁷⁷ Hellenists then are distinguished by their language, in consequence of which they are opposed to Jews speaking Hebrew or Aramaean; they are men who speak Greek.

Still, (and here I principally complain of Bertholdt,) a too great importance is placed upon the circumstance of Jesus being introduced as speaking Hebrew, Mark 5: 41 ταλιθά κουμί, 7: 34 ἐφραθά, and Matthew 27: 46. Mark 15: 34. It might be replied, that the Hebrew words in these passages are quoted by the Evangelists as something remarkable, which would not have been the case, if Jesus had generally spoken Hebrew; and what could well be urged against this answer? Yet we will not dismiss the matter so abruptly. Our Lord may well have spoken to the Jewish multitude in Hebrew, because they were pre-disposed to listen to it. But how did he speak to a mixed assembly, collected from different parts and different cities? How did he speak to proselytes and heathens; how at Gadaris? Matt. 8: 28. Mark 5: 1. Luke 8: 26. How in the districts of Tyre and Sidon, Mark 7: 24, where the Syrophenician Greek woman, γυνὴ Ἑλληνίς Συροφοινίκισσα, entered into conversation with him? How in Decapolis, which consisted of Greek cities, such as Philadelphia, Gerasa, Gadara, Hippos, Pella?

⁷⁵ Schol. in Act. Apost. VI. 1. edit. N. T. Frid. Matthæi, Ἑλληνιστῶν—τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν φθεγγομένων, καίτοι Ἑβραίων ὄντων τῷ γένει.

⁷⁶ J. Chrys. Commentar. in Act. VI. 1, 9. Ἑλληνιστὰς δὲ οἶμαι καλεῖν τοὺς Ἑλληνιστῶν φθεγγομένους, οὗτοι γὰρ Ἑλληνιστῶν διελέγοντο Ἑβραῖοι ὄντες. Tom. IX. p. 111.

⁷⁷ Apollonius Alexandrin. in Imman. Bekkeri Anecdotis Græcis, Vol. II. p. 572.

Finally, even if Jesus more frequently spoke Hebrew, in what manner does that affect Matthew, who had not to speak to detached parties, which went to and fro, sometimes to Hebrews and sometimes to Hellenists, and who could not accordingly change his language; who must have conceived to himself a fixed class of men, and chosen his language according to them; among whom, the present and a future generation, to which perhaps the Hebrew might become less familiar, were included?

Let us now collect the observations which we have made, into one point of view.

1. Asia was, through the dominion of the Macedonians, filled far and wide with Greek cities. In hither Asia many were erected by the dynasty of the Ptolemies, and principally of the Seleucidae. More ancient cities, such as Tyre and Sidon, changed their language in consequence of this influence.

2. The Syrian, Phenician, and Jewish coast throughout, to the very frontier of Egypt, was occupied by cities either wholly or half Greek. The Israelitish *East*, from the Arnon upwards, Gilead, Bashan, Haouran, Trachonitis including Abilene, was towards the north Greek, and towards the south mostly in possession of the Greeks. In Judea and Galilee were several cities, wholly or at least half peopled by Greeks.

3. Herod the Great made an enormous expenditure to convert his Jews into Greeks.

4. The Roman dominion rather promoted than opposed this progress to Hellenism.

5. The religious rulers also of the Jews threw so few obstacles in its way, that until the later periods of the state they shewed respect to the Greek language; they acknowledged it as the language of their literary works, and as admissible in legal transactions.

6. Being thus favoured on all sides, this language was spread by means of traffic and intercourse through all classes, so that the people (though with many exceptions) considered generally, understood it, although they adhered more to their own language.

7. In the holy city itself whole congregations of Jews who spoke Greek, were established. From these, and from Greek proselytes, the Christian school at Jerusalem was partly derived.

I. Let us imagine Matthew placed in these circumstances ; if he wrote Greek, the mass of the people understood him. But for that part of the people, who perhaps only spoke the language of the country, he was compensated by those cities which the Greeks had taken from the Jews, or which, through the favour of the Herods, they possessed as occupants and co-inhabitants, on the borders, or in the interior of the country ; then also by the Hellenistic communities in the holy city, and by the Hellenists in the Christian school, to whom he could not make himself understood in any other way. If he wrote Hebrew, he renounced the great, and perhaps the nobler part of the readers, whom we have just mentioned.

II. If he regarded Auranitis, Trachonitis, or the remaining eastern territories, formerly the inheritance of the tribes of Israel, but now belonging mostly to the cities of Decapolis, he had a preponderating motive to employ the Greek language.

III. At the same time, if he had the adjacent western regions in his view ; if he looked on Antioch, the capital of Syria, where the believers were first called Christians, Acts 11: 26, or on the neighbouring Syrian churches, Acts 15: 23, 41 ; if he thought on Tyre where a Christian school already flourished, Acts 21: 3, 4 ; on Sidon, Acts 27: 3 ; and on other cities along the Phœnician coast ; (for they all fall within the compass of the view, which he may have taken in the composition of his work ; they all had an evident acquaintance with Palestine and its inhabitants ;) he could no longer be undecided, to which language he should give the preference ; he could choose none but the Greek.

IV. If his whole thoughts were fixed on those latter times of the people, in which he wrote his book, believing the predictions of his Lord, which caused him to expect an approaching dissolution of the Jewish state, of the prelude to which he was himself already an eye-witness ; and if he wished to produce an effect, even when this should be completed ; if he wished to be still understood, when the remnant of the Jews, without a temple and without public worship, wandering about and destitute of homes in their own native land, should have yielded up their possessions to others ; if he were desirous of writing not merely for a few years or a few months ; then he could never have written in the language of this people, who in a short time would cease to exist as a people.

ART. VI. LEXICOGRAPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A CRITIQUE ON THE LEXICONS OF WAHL AND BRETSCHNEIDER.

By Augustus Tholuck, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. Translated from the German by the Editor.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

IT does not strictly fall within the plan of this work to give reviews of books; although in special cases, articles of this kind will by no means be excluded. In the present instance, it is thought that the criticisms of a man of great learning and piety, upon two works which have a most important bearing upon the study of the New Testament, cannot but be acceptable to the Christian public among us; and that the parallel which is drawn between the two, and the remarks that are every where interspersed respecting the proper sources and the most judicious plan of treating the New Testament lexicography, cannot fail to afford useful information to the student of sacred literature.

There is also a particular reason in the case, which induces the Editor to lay the following article before his readers. It was written in consequence of a suggestion and request of his own. In the course of one of the many very pleasant walks, which it was his privilege to take with Prof. Tholuck, during the last year of his residence in Halle, the conversation turned upon the subject of the lexicography of the New Testament, and was so full on the part of the Professor, and so rich in suggestion and remark, that the writer requested him to put down on paper the heads and leading thoughts at least of the conversation, with a view to the advantage to be derived from them in a future edition of the Lexicon of the New Testament, formerly published by the Editor. To this Professor Tholuck consented; but afterwards preferred to make of it an essay, which might first appear in the *Literarische Anzeiger*, a periodical work which he had then just established. The article assumed the shape of a review, probably, because it was easier to make remarks on works already in existence, than to lay down mere abstract principles. In its present form, it does not embrace all the topics touched upon in the conversation alluded to; but those which are taken up, are treated with more fullness and particularity.

The Editor takes this opportunity of announcing his intention of proceeding speedily to the preparation and publication of a new edition of his Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. The former edition was, what it purported to be, principally a translation of the first edition of Wahl's *Clavis philologica*; which, however, was subjected to a thorough revision; and some of the most important articles were written anew. At that time, the works of Bretschneider, Riemer, Passow, and others, were not generally known in this country, and were not accessible to the Editor. It is obvious, therefore, that a new edition of the lexicon will require much revision and very considerable changes and additions, in order to bring it up to the highest standard of New Testament lexicography at the present time. In the interval since its publication, there have appeared new editions of the works of Wahl and Bretschneider; (the same that are reviewed in the following article;) and also two successive editions of the lexicon of Passow; to say nothing, either of the persevering and successful labours of Winer in the grammar of the New Testament, or of the recent commentaries of Tholuck, Flatt, Fritzsche, Bleek, Rheinwald, Pelt, and others abroad, and of the no less learned and to us still more important works of Professor Stuart at home.

In the new edition it will be the object of the Editor to draw from all the new sources which are thus opened; as well as to give the results of his own investigations. The former edition will, of course, remain the basis of the work; and there are very many articles which will require no change whatever. It is, however, his intention to incorporate both into the plan and body of the work, every thing in which the lexicon of Bretschneider may seem to have the preference over that of Wahl; while the excrescences and errors of both, (of which the following critique points out not a few), will be carefully avoided. One change from the former edition may in particular be expected; viz. the host of references to classical authorities will be very much diminished. Of what possible consequence can it be to shew, that the most common words in the language were used in the same manner by classic writers? that *ἀγαπάω* for instance is also used by Xenophon in the sense of *to love*? Such references can only be required, where there is some infrequency or doubt in regard to the use of a word; and even then, one or two passages cited at length are better

than twenty references. It is a more important point, to shew where a word is *not* used by classic writers; and to point out its real character and quality.

It must be obvious to all, that the execution of the work upon this plan, will require a great amount of time and labour. Should a kind Providence spare his life and health, the Editor hopes to be able to accomplish it in the course of the present and the coming year. To complete it in any shorter period, would seem to be hardly possible under the most favourable circumstances.

EDITOR.

REVIEW.

Clavis N. T. Philologica, auctore C. A. WAHL, 2 Vol. Ed. 2.
Lips. 1829. pp. 874. 683.

Lexicon Manuale in libros N. T. auctore C. G. BRETSCHNEIDER, 2 Vol. Ed. 2. Lips. 1829. pp. 780. 662.

The publication of these two Lexicons after the work of Schleusner, has undoubtedly advanced the lexicography of the New Testament in a very great degree; although the encomiums which were lavished, especially upon the work of Wahl on its first appearance, were, probably, somewhat exaggerated, and the really important points were not brought forward on that occasion with sufficient prominence. To which of these works the preference is due, is a point on which public opinion is yet divided. Still, the majority of theologians seem inclined to assign the palm to that of Wahl, principally because of the more extensive philological research, and the logical arrangement. We shall, therefore, direct our attention chiefly to this work, interspersing our remarks on Bretschneider by the way.

That the work of Wahl in the new edition, (we speak always of this, inasmuch as it is so greatly changed and enlarged,) is distinguished above that of Bretschneider in reference to philological investigation,—including both what respects lexicography and grammar,—and also in regard to logical arrangement, as well as generally in respect to carefulness and diligence of execution, cannot well be called in question. The very first glance at many of the articles shews this. Compare e. g. the articles *εἰ, σίμῃ, ὄρε, ἵνα, μὴ, οὐ*, etc. and especially all the prepositions.

We find every where the most careful use of all philological helps and previous labours, the most laborious selection of citations from the classics, the most accurate logical division and determination of the significations, the most diligent collection and arrangement of the New Testament passages under the numerous divisions and subdivisions, also accurate and in part new grammatical investigations. The article *εἶμι* covers twenty pages; *εἶ* and *εἰς* not less than thirty pages; (the articles *εἶ* and *εἰς* were printed separately as a literary offering at the jubilee of Niemeyer in 1827;) the article *εἶν* not less than *thirty-seven* pages. In all these respects, therefore, Wahl presents us doubtless more than Bretschneider. But we must be permitted much to doubt, whether this laborious and cautious research has always been a fruitful one; and whether those things which have been regarded as giving to the work of Wahl a preference, are in all cases real advantages.

We begin with that feature which is most prominent in the new edition, and on which especial care has been bestowed, viz. *the logical arrangement*. Much of what has been done here, we must regard in general as inappropriate, and more calculated to retard than to assist in the understanding of the Scriptures; and in saying this, we know that we have several very important voices in the philosophical and theological community upon our side. Those articles which are treated of with particular copiousness, are always preceded by a *conspicuum*, or table of contents, after which follows the *uberius rei expositio*;—a course to which the author was compelled, in consequence of the too great fullness and detail of the articles. For the sake of those who have not access to the book itself, we give here a specimen of the *conspicuum* of the article *εἶμι*.

I) sum, I am

A) copulat subjectum c. praedicato

a) universe

aa) interveniente adjectivo α) universe et αα) solo posito—ββ) addito dat. personae—vel *for any one*—vel *in respect to any one*—vel pertinente ad amicam, quae est alicui c. aliquo, necessitudinem—β) adjectivo negativo οὐδέν, μηδέν, dicto αα) de rebus—nunc universe—nunc de criminibus—ββ) de personis

bb) ope participii

cc) interveniente substantivo α) c. adjunct. conjuncto—universe—in similitudine—β) addito numerali—universe—

et dat. personae—γ) solo posito αα) proprie usurpato κ) plene—universe—additur dativ. personae i. e. dat. com-
modi—vel pertinens ad amicam alicujus c. aliquo neces-
situdinem—vel for any one—additur cum emphasi
οὔτως—δ) minus plene i. e. abest vel predicatum—vel
subjectum ββ) metonymice dictum γγ) metaphorice
dictum.

Thus this *conspectus* runs on for four pages; and then in eighteen pages more follows the *uberior rei expositio*. The appropriate biblical citations are every where inserted in their proper place; thus e. g. on a whole page the passages where εἶναι, connected with an adjective, designates WHAT a person or thing is, etc. But however much pains this logical decomposition and this arrangement of the appropriate passages may have cost the author; still such an unyielding adherence to system in a lexicon is in general unsuitable and useless. What in all the world can be the possible utility of collecting a whole page of passages, where εἶναι with an adjective denotes what one is by nature? To what purpose can a particular subdivision be, where εἶναι is connected with the numerals? etc. Indeed, such a minute adherence to system is in the highest degree prejudicial; since it thereby becomes utterly impossible to glance over all the different significations, and find out where we are to look for that which may suit the passage in question. How much time must be spent in vain in turning over the thirty-seven pages which the article ἐν occupies, before one can find the place where the passage occurs, for the sake of which he consults the article! And when moreover he has actually found it, still he is no better off than before; for—and this is the other disadvantage necessarily connected with such a minute dividing up of ideas—the lexicographer himself, in consequence of the monstrous number of subdivisions, has become doubtful where the passage is properly to be placed. E. g. we find ἐν θεῷ John 3: 21, under the signification *ad normam a Deo praescriptam*; but a reference is given at the same time to F. BB. a. bb. where another signification is specified, viz. *indolem mentem Dei indutus*. So ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, stands under the sense *by authority of Christ*; but we are also referred to the signification *ope Christi*, G. c. bb. Further, προσεύχεσθαι ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, *ad normam praeceptorum Christi*; but with a reference also to F. BB. a. aa. β. γγ. There one may look!

What would the learned world say to a lexicon of the classic Greek or Hebrew, written on similar principles? What would become of the lexicons of Passow and Gesenius, if executed in this manner? At least, the author ought not to have thought of putting upon the title-page of *this* edition the words, "Clavis usibus scholarum ac *juvenum* accommodata." More easily might the *juvenes* find their way through the endless labyrinths of the Roman catacombs, than through all these divisions and subdivisions. We hope the learned author will not take all this ballast with him into the small lexicon which he has announced.—If now such a minute and hair-splitting system of division is injurious to lexicography in general, it is especially so to that of the New Testament; for minute divisions and distinctions are no where more out of place, than in the word of God; which, like nature, exhibits multiplicity in unity. If therefore Bretschneider in this respect has done far less than Wahl, it is to be regarded rather as an advantage than a disadvantage. But even in him there is too much subdivision. We will shew this in one article, which is particularly important in reference to theology, the article βασιλεία.

Besides the significations referring to βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Schleusner has no less than *eight* belonging to βασιλεία. Wahl has reduced these to *three*, the last with two subdivisions: 1) *terra regis imperio subjecta, kingdom.* 2) *imperii administratio, dominion.* 3) *dignitas regia.* a) prop. Luc. 19: 12, 15. Apoc. 17: 12. b) pro βασιλεῖς, *reges vel regiae potestatis socii*, Apoc. 1: 6.—In Bretschneider's first edition, it stood thus: 1) *regia potestas.* 2) *respublica ipsa, quae imperio subest.* 3) *materia imperii, vel nationes, vel terrae.* In the second edition: 1) *regia potestas.* 2) *respublica ipsa, quae imperio subest.*—The order is better here in Wahl; first the kingdom itself, and then the *abstracta*, dominion and royal dignity; but it is inappropriate to bring forward these *abstracta* as two separate significations; and still more so is the subdivision under no. 3. Bretschneider has properly passed by the signification *imperii administratio*; but he also should not have placed the meaning *regia potestas* under a separate number. In the passages which Wahl brings to support the meaning *dominion*, the three, Matt. 6: 13. Luke 1: 33. Heb. 1: 8, may just as well be rendered *dignitas regia*; and *vice versa*, in Luke 19: 12, 15. Rev. 17: 12, which are brought in support of the meaning *dignitas regia*, we can with the same right say that βασιλεία signifies *dominion*; and Bretschneider has actually ranged them under this head. In

other passages, where βασιλεια is said to mean *dominion*, as Mark 11: 10. Acts 1: 6, we may just as well say that it means 'the kingdom itself' and not merely 'dominion.' When we pray, 'Thy kingdom come!' do we mean that this is the kingdom itself in its substance, but *not* the dominion or government of Christ, and *not* his exaltation as king, i. e. dignitas regia? Or would we say that we mean here Christ's exaltation and dominion, but *not* the kingdom itself in its substance? Certainly neither. To make distinctions here would be to interpret as a pedagogue, and dilute the meaning of the Holy Scriptures. So also in Luke 1: 31, where it is said, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end;" who will say that merely the dominion, rule, is meant, but not the royal dignity, and not the kingdom in its substance? Into what complete embarrassment must the beginner fall, who trusts to his lexicon as authority, when he now all at once must subject his sound natural logic and common sense, which teach him not only to separate, but also to combine, to such a minute and hair-splitting system of division and subdivision! How much sounder is the logic of other lexicographers, from Pasor down to Passow and Gesenius; of whom the latter under the word מְלִיכָה, without further division, simply places the signification, *kingdom*; while Passow gives in one number, *kingdom, regal dominion*. Pasor gave simply *regnum*; but Schwarz (1736) added other significations and much that was unsuitable.—Moreover the subdivision of Wahl under no. 3 is unnecessary, where it is said that in Rev. 1: 6 βασιλεια stands for βασιλεις. Why can it not mean, "He hath made us one kingdom," i. e. united us under one dominion?

This system of minute subdivision appears in all its perversion, in the article βασιλεια τῶν οὐρανῶν, which we shall treat of in its *theological* bearing further on, but wish now to consider simply in regard to its logical arrangement. Wahl asserts, more correctly indeed than Schleusner, that in βασιλεια τῶν οὐρανῶν the signification *regnum divinum coeleste* every where lies at the foundation. But now come a multitude of subdivisions, in which the passages of the New Testament are arranged in the most inappropriate manner possible: "aa) de tempore, quo augurabitur regnum divinum, commencement of the Messiah's reign, Matt. 3: 2. 4: 17. 10: 7. bb) instituta, quibus praeparantur regno divino, Matt. 12: 28. Luc. 11: 20. 17: 21. cc) de doctrina de regno divino, Matt. 21: 43. Luc. 18: 17. Marc. 15: 43. dd) de natura et ratione regni divini, Matt. 13:

43, 45. 25: 1. *ee*) de sorte et fatis doctrinae, Matt. 13: 24, 31. 22: 2." If now we look out the passages thus cited, we can hardly express our astonishment, that the author could so narrow down the significations of the New Testament. When Christ exclaims, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand!" who would suppose he meant merely to say, 'The time of its commencement is at hand?' When he declares, "The kingdom of God is among you;" who would suppose he meant only to say: 'adsunt, quibus praelegantur ad regnum divinum?' When it is said Mark 15: 43 of Joseph of Arimathea, that he "waited for the kingdom of God," who would believe that he was waiting simply for 'instruction respecting the kingdom of God,' and not for the kingdom itself and its substance?—Still worse is the mode of treating this article in Bretschneider, as we shall see farther on; for in Wahl we still find a certain unity running through the whole.

Far removed therefore from regarding the minute and exact logical divisions and distinctions in Wahl as an important ground of preference, we must on the contrary rather regard them, [when carried out to such an extent,] as an essential disadvantage; and must pronounce the work of Bretschneider in this respect preferable, precisely for the reason, that it exhibits less of *schematism*.

In respect to the philological character of Wahl's work, we must acknowledge the laboriousness and care, with which he has, in the first place, collected the proof-passages from the classics. In many cases this has been of great use in investigating and fixing the significations of words; but in this respect also he has doubtless taken much fruitless pains. When and where are citations from the classics of real utility? The answer to this question must first be determined. They can then be of real utility, only when they serve to confirm significations, either such as hitherto have unnecessarily been derived from the Hebrew, while they have also at the same time a firm ground in classic Greek; or such as are still wanting in our best Greek lexicons, especially in reference to the later Greek writers. If now this be a correct canon, then a great portion of the citations of Wahl would seem to be superfluous. What have classical citations to do in a lexicon of the New Testament, in support of the usual meanings of such words as *ἀδελφός*, *ἄγω*, *δῆλος*? If thus a great portion of Wahl's citations fall away as superfluous, we miss on the other hand many that are necessary. Many of his refe-

rences under a word or expression peculiar to the New Testament give us indeed the same word in a classic writer, but not in the same sense and application. Thus Wahl, under *ἰλεώς σοι*, cites Xen. Mem. I. 1. 9. Joseph. Ant. VII. 11. 8; where however we find only the word *ἰλεως* in its ordinary acceptation, and not at all this *formula averruncandi*. In the article *ἀρπαγμός* under the signification, “*res cupide arripienda, et necessario usurpanda*” (Phil. 2: 6), he refers to Plutarch de puer. educ. c. 15. Here the word *ἀρπαγμός* is indeed found; but in like manner only in its common meaning, i. q. *ἀρπαγή*. In other places also the already well known significations of words are again confirmed from the classics; while precisely for the unusual meanings, which the lexicons pass over, the proofs are not furnished. Thus under *πλήρωμα*, citations are made for the known sense, *a ship's crew or company*; but that it also stands both in the singular and plural for the *inhabitants of a city*, is not mentioned; comp. Aristides *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν κομωδεῖν*, p. 282 ed. Cant. Liban. Orat. ed. Reisk. Tom. I. p. 301. Just so under *ἐκλογή*, the proofs are wanting for the meaning *libera voluntas*; for which Bretschneider has produced the proper citations from Josephus and the Apocryphal books; and Ernesti had already pointed out (Inst. Interp. II. 8.) how necessary it was to confirm this very signification.

In a similar manner, in many of the more difficult words, a minute investigation of the meanings seems to be avoided. Thus we find under *ἀπέχω*: “no. 2 *absum, disto*.—c) *ἀπέχει pro abest, transiit sc. anxietas, it is past! alii aliter*.” Here it would almost seem as if some words had accidentally fallen out of the text; for he does not even specify the single well known passage where *ἀπέχει* is supposed to occur in this sense, viz. Mark 14: 41. Moreover he has without further inquiry approved and adopted the meaning of the word supported by Kuinoel and De Wette; and has not even mentioned the “*sufficit*” of the Vulgate and Luther [and also of the English version], which is sustained by Hesychius and the well known passage of Anacreon found by Henry Stephens and referred to by Wahl himself in his first edition. And generally speaking, all lexicographers of the Bible ought to have particular regard to the modern popular versions of the Scriptures; and every where to point out how far they correctly give the sense of the original.—In this particular article, Bretschneider has proceeded in the same partial manner; having given the meaning

"sufficit" without further inquiry, and without specifying any authority at all. What now must the younger or even the more advanced student think, and what decision can he form, when he consults both lexicons, and sees two entirely opposite meanings brought forward without any support whatever? In the other difficult word, *ἐπιβαλῶν*, Mark 14: 72, Bretschneider is more full; while Wahl simply gives the meaning *ruere*, which however in this passage is by no means so firmly established.

It is further not to be denied, that in general Wahl has paid too little regard to the Hellenistic character of the New Testament language. This has already been noticed by others; and especially by Winer, in cases where, although the New Testament usage has a point of support in the classic Greek, yet the derivation of it from an Aramaean source has more probability. So also the Alexandrine dialect has given a new signification to many Greek words; and hence it is always a surer course, to confirm the significations from this quarter, rather than from the classic Greek. In many cases also, as in doctrinal words, e. g. *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, *κόσμος*, we must regard the *usus loquendi* which prevailed among the earliest Christian teachers. In this respect Bretschneider is doubtless preferable; Josephus and the apocryphal books, both of the Old and New Testament, he has gleaned with exemplary diligence. May he but go on with the same diligence and derive equal profit from Philo, the apostolical fathers, and the earlier fathers of the church! It is indeed true, that his references are also sometimes unnecessary; in general, however, they are appropriate; and the want of references to the Hellenistic idiom in Wahl, is sometimes a great disadvantage. Thus under *θρόνος* in Wahl, we miss the signification *angel*, which is found Col. 1: 16, and which Bretschneider supports by suitable passages from the *Test. Patr.* XII. He might also have quoted from the Rabbins. Under *πραιτώριον* Phil. 1: 13, Wahl cites only the classical meaning, *castra praetoriana*; while Bretschneider proves from the *Acta Thomae*, that the word stands also very generally for *παλάτιον*. This ought not to have been overlooked, because it bears upon the judgment in regard to the time when the epistle was written. In his citations from the Seventy, Wahl has not always sufficiently investigated the meaning in which they used the word; and Bretschneider also has in this respect left much to do. The latter moreover might have adopted with advantage very much from the first edition of Wahl; e. g. under *προσλαμβάνω*.

νειν, the citations in Wahl from 2 Mac. 2: 15. Diod. Sic. XIV. 18; together with the accessory signification *amicè tractare*, which decidedly occurs Rom. 15: 7; although Bretschneider is right in giving prominence to the fundamental idea, and his references to the Seventy are entirely in place. So also under τέλος, the proof passages for τέλος ἔχειν, *eventum habere, de oraculis*, not only might, but should have been quoted; since many interpreters prefer in Luke 22: 37 the sense "it is over;" (Mark 3: 26.—τέλος ἔχειν often for τελευτᾶν in Plato, Ast de Leg. p. 223;) expressly because they say that only τέλος λαμβανειν is used of the fulfilment of prophecy. Wahl himself also in the second edition has preferred the meaning "it is over."

In respect to grammatical investigation, Wahl is more careful and thorough than Bretschneider; and has enriched the New Testament grammar with the results of his own labour and observation. Mistakes in the first edition are corrected; e. g. the gross one, that ἵνα, John 13: 1 ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα μεταβῆ, is to be taken for the adverb of place, *where*; further, that περί c. acc. Mark 4: 19, is a circumlocution for the genitive; that εἰς Mark 4: 22, is to be taken for οὐ, etc. Several instances of want of exactness and accuracy in the new edition are also censured by Winer (N. T. Gram. 3te Ausg.) p. 191, 337, 404, 407, etc. He does the same thing also in regard to Bretschneider; see e. g. p. 257, 428.

To both the philological and theological excellence of a lexicon of the New Testament, there is further required in the lexicographer an extensive and well grounded acquaintance with exegetical learning. He must have studied the interpretation of the New Testament carefully, in order to acquire from the context and connexion a consistent and settled view of the sense of words; and also to judge of different interpretations, where the sense is in any way doubtful. We have already seen from the examples ἀπέχει and ἐπιβαλῶν in Wahl, that he takes too little notice of different interpretations. So also elsewhere, e. g. in πυγμῆ Mark 7: 3, he gives only the explanation of Kuinoel, *fortiter*, which is not fully confirmed; his citations from Homer and Xenophon, which go to support the ordinary meaning, do not afford the least help. So also under the difficult τὰ ἐόντα Luke 11: 41, there is not a word except *quæ insunt*; though the meaning *pro facultate* should certainly have been mentioned; which Bretschneider moreover has done. In

John 8: 46, Wahl takes *ἀμαρτία* at once in the Hellenistic sense of *sin*; Bretschneider just as decidedly in that of *error*; without either of them thinking, as it would seem, of the other interpretation.

In other respects, both lexicographers stand about alike as to exegetical tact. In John 8: 43, both take *λάλια* as equivalent to *λόγος, sermo, narratio*; although even the ancient versions express here the difference, which is founded in the language and is here required also by the connexion; see Tittmann de Synonym. p. 79. Wahl in particular, with his philological ἀκριβεία, ought to have paid more regard to the synonymes, than he seems to have done.—*Εἶτα τὸ τέλος* 1 Cor. 15: 24, both explain by *ultima mortuorum pars*. For *τέλος* 2 Cor. 3: 13, Bretschneider adopts without reason the special meaning, *summa dignitas*.—*Πλήρωμα* Wahl explains more after the classical usage, *copia cultorum Dei*; Bretschneider better, comparing the idea of the Shechinah, *Christi quasi templum, in quo habitat, quod regit ut anima corpus*. This interpretation certainly better suits the connexion of the passages and the different applications, in which the word occurs.—Col. 1: 24 is explained by Wahl under *ὑστέρημα, calamitates propter Christum tolerandae*, which assuredly is the easier interpretation. Bretschneider has it, *Christi loco, quippe qui nunc in coelis versatur, ego jam ab adversariis vexar*; which interpretation, so expressed, seems a strange one; but still, if we look deeper into the reasons, it would seem perhaps to be most in accordance with Paul's usual mode of thinking; since according to him, Christ who dwells in believers, suffers the same things as the historical Christ.—On the other hand, it betrays little exegetical tact, when Bretschneider explains the *μῆς γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ* 1 Tim. 3: 2, 12. Tit. 1: 6, *they must be husbands of a wife, i. e. married!* (See against this, Winer p. 99.) Bretschneider explains also *ἐν Ἠλίᾳ* Rom. 11: 2, *per Eliam*. *Ὁ ἐν Χριστῷ* he makes also to mean *a Christian*; although Winer had already, in his Commentary on Galatians and in his Grammar, declared against this superficial interpretation.—In respect to the use of the prepositions, both Wahl and Bretschneider may still derive much profit from the booty, which Winer exhibits in the third edition of his Grammar.

It is a matter of importance, in the last place, in a lexicon of the New Testament, how the peculiar ideas of the christian religion are developed. Some of these are of such a kind,

that christian experience and deeper contemplation leads directly to the correct apprehension of them ; so the phrase above mentioned *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ, ποιεῖν ἐν Θεῷ*, etc. Other religious ideas of the New Testament—such as kingdom of God, world, Christ, Antichrist, flesh, spirit, Son of man, Son of God,—have a foundation in the Old Testament ; i. e. all these religious ideas, though in a lower degree, are already contained and pre-figured in the Old Testament. In connexion with the christian dispensation they are all surrounded with new light, and advanced to a higher sense. The lexicographer of the New Testament has, therefore, first of all to make the Old Testament idea the object of his research, and to express it exactly ; then, by a careful comparison of the parallel passages and from the consciousness of christian feeling, to obtain a clear view of the christian signification ; and, finally, to point out what is the point of connexion between the idea of the New Testament and that of the Old.

The investigation of the Old Testament ideas, which thus constitute the basis of similar ones in the New, has occupied the attention of interpreters and theologians, ever since Semler. In the province of lexicography we find these researches—after Pasor and Schoettgen, under the guidance of Lightfoot, had already often arrived at correct results—at the lowest point in Teller and Lange, who seem rather to wander and grope about at random. E. g. Teller says the word *κόσμος* signifies “the Jews,” and adds in support of his assertion (*Wörterb. des N. T.* p. 476): “Since it is not unknown to the readers of Philo’s writings, that this author not unfrequently represents the Jewish constitution as an image of the whole world, Moses as a *citizen of the world*, the temple and even the garments of the high priest as a figure of the whole world.” Lange says correctly, that no regard is here to be paid to Philo’s allegories: “There is nothing more common or natural, than to call other men *the world*, and especially those who are distinct and separate from us.” The good man did not bear in mind, that this mode of speaking comes from the New Testament itself. Meantime he insisted, that *κόσμος* should not simply be taken to mean the Jewish republic, but chiefly the heathen.

But even when the theologians of that age had thus apprehended any such biblical idea, they nevertheless did not strictly look after any point of connexion between it and that which they gave out as the christian meaning ; they only, without far-

ther ado, put down this superficial sense as the biblical one, which they themselves connected with the biblical words. According to Teller, world means simply "the Jews;" end of the world or of the age is "the end of the Jewish state;" Christ the Lord is "Christ the most perfect teacher;" kingdom of heaven, "the new dispensation of religion;" children of light, "happy people;" the state of being a child of God, "the pre-eminence of a Christian in respect to his profession of a better religion," or in a word, "Christianity," etc.

Schleusner has advanced farther in his investigation of the Jewish basis. He makes special use, as is proper, of the Rabbins for this purpose. Yet, with all his materials, he does not know what to do further. Without cause or connexion, he places the definitions of Teller by the side of those Old Testament *termini*. *Βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* means: "1) interdum simpliciter religio Christiana. 2) futura Christianorum felicitas in coelo. 3) propagatio religionis Christianae in terris." In like manner Schwarz had already unconnectedly given: "1) regnum gratiae Matt. 6: 10, 33. Luke 18: 29. 2) regnum gratiae, quatenus hujus majestas et utilitas potissimum spectatur, Mark 9: 1. Matt. 12: 28. 3) regnum Messiae, Luke 17: 20, 21. 4) regnum gloriae, i. e. beatitudo exquisitissima, etc."—In Wahl, and yet more in Bretschneider, we find a still more accurate acquaintance with the Old Testament basis of the New Testament ideas. In fact, Bertholdt, Keil, Ammon, and many others, have in this respect done very much to prepare the way. But in regard to the relation of these Old Testament ideas to the sense of the words in the New Testament, these writers do not seem to have formed for themselves any definite notion. Sometimes they go back to the Old Testament basis; and sometimes also not; compare in Bretschneider the words *κόσμος, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. But even when they do fall back upon the Old Testament basis, still they do this, and especially Bretschneider, without any definite plan. In Bretschneider *κόσμος* means "*incolae telluris*; et quidem de seculo quale erat temporibus Jesu apostolorumque vitioso, *the world corrupted by sin*. Notandum vero in pluribus horum locorum *κόσμον* ita dici, ut *homines non emendatos, the not Christian, the unreformed world*, indicare videatur."—Under *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* we find at first a copious account of the common Jewish view; but why does he pass over, in making out the Jewish idea of the Messiah's kingdom, the traits which the more religious Israelites

connected with it? Compare the song of Zacharias, Luke I. Afterwards he adds: "In evangeliiis, ubi vel discipuli Jesu vel Judaei loquuntur, βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ haud dubie secundum Judaeorum sententiam est intelligenda, ut etiam adeoque Servator ipse, ubi loquitur cum Judaeis, haud rare ex eorum sententia loquitur; Matt. 8: 11. Luke 22: 29, 30. Matt. 5: 5, 10. 19: 28. 20: 21—23. In aliis autem locis certo definiri nequit, quonam sensu Jesus βασιλείαν dixerit, ut Matt. 4: 17. 5: 10, 19, 20. 7: 21. 16: 19, 28. 18: 3, 4, 23. 12: 28. et passim. Certum vero est, Jesum ETIAM regnum sive felicitatem Christianorum post mortuorum resurrectionem hoc nomine significasse." Now it is very strange, first, that Bretschneider should suppose, when Christ says, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," or "Not every one who saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven," that in these and the other passages quoted, *we cannot know at all what Christ means by βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν!* And secondly, he needs to be set right when he says that Christ speaks several times of the Messiah's kingdom, *ex sententia Judaeorum*. With the passages which he cites in support of this assertion the case is just the same as in all other passages, where the Redeemer speaks of un-earthly things; he speaks every where in certain typical, figurative expressions,—a sort of costume,—which rest on an Old Testament basis. Or, when in order to describe the common enjoyment of eternal bliss, the figure of a feast with the patriarchs is employed, is this any thing more, than when future woe is represented as a fire and as a worm? or where it is said that God sits in heaven, sits upon a throne? In all this the Redeemer does not so much condescend *ad sententiam Judaeorum*, as to the feeble powers of human conception in general; just as we all even to the present day, without such corporeal figures, should be unable to comprehend eternal truth.

But on what then can the assertion rest,—when it has not yet been at all determined, what Christ himself understood by the kingdom of heaven,—the assertion: "It is however certain that Christ has *also* called the future happiness of Christians βασιλεία"? What is then with Jesus the fundamental idea? How does it hang together, that he has *also* called the future state of happiness by this name? A New Testament ground-idea has not been specified at all; for now follows still a *caeterum*. "Caeterum autem βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ dicitur in Nov. Test. a) de re Christiana, quatenus per christianam

doctrinam et ecclesiam colliguntur cives divini. b) de vocatione ad hoc regnum. c) de imperio, quod Jesus dominus hujus regni exercet. d) de auctore regni Christo." Of all these, which are brought forward merely as subordinate significations, that under *a*, somewhat modified, should have been given as the fundamental idea of the phrase in the New Testament. Modified it must be certainly; for what is the *res christiana*, if it is neither doctrine nor church, but is first by means of these collected? The meaning *d* we never expected to find again in a second edition. The passages referred to it are Luke 17: 21. Mark 11: 10. But who would believe, when Christ says "The kingdom of God is among you," that he means merely: "auctor hujus regni adest!" In this *auctor regni* the very *regnum* itself had appeared. Still more strange is another meaning of βασιλεία adduced from Matt. 11: 12, "The kingdom of God suffereth violence," where βασιλεία is made to mean, "nuntii regni divini."

The article under consideration is unquestionably composed upon a better plan in Wahl. He prefixes a definition of the Messiah's kingdom according to the Jewish notion; but immediately subjoins, that from the words of Jesus it is evident, that he did not in any way look upon himself as a Messiah in the low Jewish sense; and consequently, under the kingdom of the Messiah he must also have understood something of higher import, viz. the peace, felicity, of his followers in this and the future life. This definition, however, does not exhaust the subject; and we also miss the point of connexion with the Old Testament idea. The true definition would have been: 'Christ designates by βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν the community of those, who, united through his Spirit under him as their Head, rejoice in the truth and enjoy a holy and blissful life; all of which is effected through communion with him.' The article, as it already stands in Pasor and Schoettgen, is good.—The article κόσμος is also treated better in Wahl. He begins with the definition of ὁ κόσμος οὗτος, e. g. ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος; explains this correctly on the basis of the Jewish notions, though without pointing them out; then makes the subdivisions *plene* and *minus plene*; and takes κόσμος in the same sense as ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. He needed only to have gone on consistently, and derived the subordinate bad sense which κόσμος has in the New Testament from the circumstance, that κόσμος denotes what does not belong to the Messiah's kingdom, and consequently that which is not chris-

tian, i. e. all which is not in relation with Christ. Instead of this he has without any motive given the definition: "universitas hominum hujus mundi, imperfectionis, vitiositatis notione inclusa." But whence then, we may ask, comes this bad sense of κόσμος? The ground lies simply in the fact, that κόσμος designates the world as opposed to the kingdom of Christ, the αἰὼν οὗτος.

We are prevented by want of room from giving further details of the same kind. We would gladly do it, and may perhaps resume the subject at some other opportunity.

ART. VII. INTERPRETATION OF JUDGES, CHAP. V.

THE SONG OF DEBORAH AND BARAK.

By the Editor.

IN preparing the following article, I have made use of the ordinary commentaries upon the Hebrew Bible at large,—of which that of Le Clerc, in regard to philology, is the best on the book of Judges,—and also of the following works on this portion of Scripture in particular.

HIERONYMI in *Canticum Deborahae Commentarius*, in Hieron. Opp. Tom. II. Append. ed. Martianay.

C. F. SCHNURRER, *Carmen Deborahae, Iud. V.* in Schnurreri Dissertt. philologico-crit. Goth. et Amst. 1790.

J. B. KOEHLER, *Nachlese einiger Anmerkungen über das Siegeslied der Debora*, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, Th. VI. p. 163.—Also, *Nachtrag noch einiger Erläuterungen des Liedes der Debora*, in Eich. Rep. Th. XII. p. 235.

J. G. v. HERDER's *Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend*, Th. I.—Also, *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*, Th. II. VII.—This is perhaps the best translation.

C. W. JUSTI, *National-Gesänge der Hebraer*, Marb. und Leipz. 1803—18. Band II. p. 210.—Also in his *Blumen alt-hebräischer Dichtkunst*, Giessen, 1809. Bd. I. p. 14.

G. H. HOLLMANN, *Commentarius philologico-criticus in Carmen Deborahae, Iud. V.* Lips. 1818. The author was at the time a pupil of Gesenius, and gives in general his views.

Other less important *monograms* upon this chapter may be found in the work of Justi first above quoted.

The following triumphal song belongs indisputably in the first rank of Hebrew poetry, and is one of its most splendid and difficult specimens. In the ecstasy and energy of inspiration, the prophetess pours out her whole soul in thanksgiving to God for his divine aid; and in gratitude to the people of Israel for their patriotism in rising spontaneously to throw off the yoke of oppression. Her strains are bold, varied, and sublime; she is every where full of abrupt and impassioned appeals and personifications; she bursts away from earth to heaven, and again returns to human things; she touches now upon the present, now dwells upon the past; and closes at length with the grand promise and result of all prophecy and of all the dealings of God's providence, that the wicked shall be overthrown, while the righteous shall ever triumph in Jehovah's name.

The circumstances which gave birth to this remarkable poem are recorded in the fourth chapter of the book of Judges; and, so far as they are necessary to our present purpose, are these. The Lord had sold Israel, after the death of Ehud, into the hand of Jabin, a king of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor, situated not far to the N. W. of the lake Merom. This had been of old a powerful city, and had been destroyed by Joshua about one hundred and twenty years before, after a decisive victory over Jabin its king and the kings of the vicinity; Josh. 11: 13. The present Jabin was also powerful; for he possessed nine hundred 'chariots of iron,' i. e. armed with iron hooks and scythes. His whole army seems to have been under the control of Sisera, 'the captain of his host,' whose head-quarters were at Harosheth of the Gentiles, a city a short distance to the south of Hazor. It is stated, that for the space of twenty years, he 'mightily oppressed Israel.'

In the mean time, Deborah the prophetess, who had fixed her habitation (probably in a tent) beneath a well known palm tree between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim, to the northward of Jerusalem, 'judged Israel;' i. e. was the organ of communication between God and his people, and probably, on account of the influence and authority of her character, was accounted in some measure as head of the nation, to whom questions of doubt and difficulty were referred for decision. From the tenor of her triumphal song, as well as from other circumstances, the people would appear to have sunk into a state of total discouragement under the severe oppression of the Canaanites; so that it was difficult to rouse them from

their despondency, and induce them to burst the fetters of their bondage. From the gratitude which Deborah expresses towards the people for the effort which they finally made, we are warranted in drawing the conclusion, that she had long endeavoured to instigate them to this step in vain. At length she summoned Barak the son of Abinoam from Kedesh, a city in Naphtali, on a mountain not far from Hazor, and made known to him the will of God, that he should undertake an enterprise for the deliverance of his country. But such was his disheartened state of feeling, and at the same time such his confidence in the superior authority and character of Deborah, that he assents to go only on condition that she will accompany him. To this she at length yields consent. They repair both of them to Kedesh, and collect there, in the immediate vicinity of Hazor, ten thousand men, with whom they march southward and encamp on mount Tabor. Sisera immediately collects his army, pursues them, and encamps in the great plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon. Barak descends with his ten thousand men from Tabor, attacks and discomfits the Canaanites, and pursues them northward to Harosheth. Sisera alights from his chariot and flees on foot, as far as to the tents of Heber the Kenite in the vicinity of Kedesh, by whose wife he is slain.

In consequence of this victory, and probably for the purpose of an immediate triumphal celebration on account of it, this song was composed. The situation was similar to that of the people after the destruction of the Egyptian army in the Red Sea, when Moses and the children of Israel sang the splendid song of triumph: "The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea;" to which Miriam and the daughters of the people responded; Ex. c. xv. So also when Saul and David returned from the slaughter of the Philistines after the death of Goliath, the women came out from all the cities with singing and dancing and instruments, chanting in response: "Saul hath slain his thousands and David his ten thousands." 1 Sam. 18: 6 seq. In like manner, we may reasonably suppose that Deborah indited her song of triumph to be sung on the return of Barak and his warriors from the pursuit, laden doubtless with spoil, and rejoicing in a victory obtained with the visible assistance of Jehovah out of heaven. All the circumstances tend to support this supposition; and these will be more fully discussed in the following notes.

After these preliminary remarks, we may trace the course

and connexion of the thoughts in the poem in the following manner. In verse 2 the prophetess calls upon the people to praise the Lord for the burst of patriotic feeling in the nation, which led them to rise and avenge their wrongs. Verse 3 calls proudly on the heathen kings, to listen to her song of triumph over their allies. Verses 3—5 describe the *theophania* or appearance of Jehovah in a tempest for the help of Israel. In verses 6—8 she goes back to describe the state of despondency and degradation into which the nation was fallen; and in verse 9, which is parallel to verse 2, she again declares her gratitude to the rulers and the people, for having thrown off this despondent feeling. Verses 10 and 11 are an invocation to all, both high and low, to join in a song of praise and triumph with the returning warriors, who are dividing the spoil; and verse 12 is a vivid invocation to herself and Barak to lead in this song.

Thus far all may be said to be only introductory; for the actual song of triumph properly begins with verse 13. In this verse she relates her appeal to the people and her invocation to Jehovah for aid. In verses 14—18 the tribes who volunteered are named and applauded, while those who remained at home are censured; and this the poetess has contrived to make one of the most beautiful portions of the whole. In verses 19—23 the battle is most vividly described. In verse 23 the prophetess bursts away abruptly to invoke curses on the inhabitants of Meroz; and then by contrast goes on to pronounce blessings on Jael, and describes the death of Sisera, verses 24—27. By a master-stroke of poetical skill, the scene now changes, and the mother of Sisera is introduced in anxious impatience for his return, verses 28—30; and the whole concludes with the prophetic assurance, that they who love the Lord shall triumph.

In the following translation I have endeavoured to keep as near as possible to the Hebrew, both in the choice and the position of the words; and to exhibit, as well as I could, the conciseness and abruptness of the original, so far as it could be done without rendering the translation obscure. Without some special reason to the contrary, I have also preferred to retain every where the language of our English version. In many parts, however, this latter is wholly unintelligible; as are also the Septuagint and Vulgate. This fault certainly does not belong to the original Hebrew.

TRANSLATION.

1. Then sang Deborah and Barak the son of Abinoam on that day saying :
2. That the leaders led in Israel,
That the people willingly offered themselves,
Praise ye Jehovah !
3. Hear, O kings ;
Give ear, O princes ;
I will sing, even I, unto Jehovah,
I will celebrate Jehovah, God of Israel.
4. Jehovah, when thou camest forth from Seir,
When thou advancedst from the field of Edom,
The earth trembled, the heavens also poured down,
Yea, the clouds poured down waters.
5. Mountains quaked before Jehovah,
That Sinai, before Jehovah God of Israel.
6. In the days of Shamgar, son of Anath,
In the days of Jael, the ways lay desert,
And highway travellers went in winding by-paths.
7. Leaders failed in Israel, they failed,
Until that I Deborah arose,
That I arose, a mother in Israel.
8. They chose new gods ;
Then war was in their gates ;
No shield was seen, nor spear,
Among forty thousand in Israel.
9. My heart is *grateful* to the rulers of Israel,
To those who offered themselves willingly among
the people ;
Praise ye Jehovah.

10. Ye who ride upon white asses,
 Ye who recline on splendid carpets,
 And ye who walk the streets,
 Prepare a song ;
11. At the voice of those who divide *the spoil* by the
 watering-troughs.
 There shall they celebrate the victories of Jehovah,
 The victories of his princes in Israel ;
 Then shall the people of Jehovah descend to their gates.
12. Awake, awake, Deborah ;
 Awake, awake, utter a song.
 Arise, O Barak ;
 Lead forth thy captives, Son of Abinoam.
13. Then *I said*, ‘Descend, ye remnant of the nobles
 of the people !
 Jehovah, descend for me among the mighty.’
14. Out of Ephraim *came those* whose dwelling is by
 Amalek ;
 After thee *was* Benjamin among thy hosts.
 Out of Machir came down princes,
 And from Zebulun *those* bearing the staff of a leader.
15. The princes of Issachar also were with Deborah ;
 Yea, Issachar was the reliance of Barak,
 They rushed into the valley at his feet.
 Among the streams of Reuben,
 Great were the resolvings of heart.
16. Wherefore didst thou sit still among thy folds,
 To listen to the pipings of the herds ?
 Among the streams of Reuben
 Great were the revolvings of heart.
17. Gilead abode beyond Jordan,
 And Dan, why remained he quiet by the ships ?

Asher dwelt at ease on the shore of the sea,
And abode tranquil by his havens.

18. Zebulun, that people, in scorn of life rushed upon death,
And Naphtali, upon the lofty field.
19. The kings came, they fought,
Then fought the kings of Canaan,
By Taanach, on the waters of Megiddo ;
They took no spoil of silver.
20. They fought from heaven,
The stars from their courses fought with Sisera.
21. The river Kishon swept them away,
That stream of battles, the river Kishon.
O my soul, thou hast trodden down the mighty !
22. Then did the horses' hoofs smite *the ground*,
From the haste, the haste of their riders.
23. Curse ye Meroz ! saith the angel of Jehovah ;
Curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof ;
Because they came not to the help of Jehovah,
To the help of Jehovah with the warriors.
24. Blessed above women be Jael,
The wife of Heber the Kenite ;
Above the women *who dwell* in tents let her be
blessed.
25. He asked water, *and* she gave *him* milk,
In a lordly vessel brought she curdled milk.
26. She laid her hand upon the tent-pin,
And her right hand upon the workman's hammer ;
And she smote Sisera, she crushed his head,
And brake through and pierced his temples.
27. At her feet he sunk down, he fell, he lay ;

At her feet he sunk down, he fell ;
Where he sunk down, there he fell dead.

28. Through a window the mother of Sisera looked out,
And called through the lattice :
“ Wherefore delayeth his chariot to come ?
Why linger the paces of his chariots ? ”
29. The wise among her noble ladies answer her,
Yea, she returneth answer to herself :
30. “ Lo, they have found, they divide the spoil,
A maiden, two maidens, to each warrior ;
A spoil of dyed garments for Sisera,
A spoil of dyed garments, a vestment of divers colours,
A dyed garment, two vestments of divers colours, for
the neck of the spoiler.”
31. So perish all thine enemies, Jehovah !
But they who love him are as the going forth of the
sun in his strength.

And the land had rest forty years.

Before entering upon the notes to each verse in particular, there are two points which I wish to notice, having reference to the whole poem.

The first is the question in regard to its antiquity. This has always been assumed without question or doubt, as being coeval with the events which it celebrates. The poem has ever been ascribed unhesitatingly to Deborah herself, by all interpreters ; and they have moreover regarded it as arising naturally out of the events narrated in chap. iv. The first and only interpreter who has cast a doubt on this antiquity, is De Wette ;* who in

* In his *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung ins A. T.* Berl. 1817. p. 199. His language there is : “ Es fehlen bestimmte Spuren seines Zeitalters. Cap. v. worin Ps. lxxviii. nachgeahmt

consequence of the *theophania* in verses 4, 5, is inclined to place the poem in an age later than that of David, inasmuch as a similar description is found in Ps. LXVIII. He supposes, therefore, that a later writer may have composed this song, and inserted it here as a production of the renowned prophetess of old.

This supposition of De Wette evidently rests solely on the assumption that Ps. LXVIII. is the *original* poem, from which the *theophania* in this chapter must have been imitated. If this assumption can be shewn to be groundless, the whole of his doubt must fall to the ground, since it has no other possible foundation. Now that it is groundless, we may assert and shew, first, from the fact, that neither he nor any one else has brought forward a particle of proof in support of it; and secondly, from the circumstance, that the assumption is in itself improbable. The *theophania* in Judges v. refers to recent assistance afforded by Jehovah; he had even then helped Israel. The sixty eighth Psalm, as De Wette himself allows in his Commentary, refers to the solemn entrance of the ark in procession into the temple, either originally, or, as he supposes, upon its return after an important victory. In either case, what more proper in a song of praise on such an occasion, than to look back, as the poet evidently there does (Ps. 68: 7 seq.) to a *former* instance of Jehovah's appearing for his people? Besides, this description of the appearance of Jehovah in tempest and storm, is a sort of common property, whether imitation or not, among the sacred poets. We find the same in Deut. 33: 2, in Ps. 18: 8 seq. 144: 5, and in Hab. 3: 3; (comp. also Ps. 29;) the former of which instances I have as yet seen no good reason to place later than the last days of Moses, its long acknowledged author. I do not deny that there may be imitation in these cases. Indeed the comparison of Is. 2: 2 seq. with Mic. 4: 1 seq. and of Is. xv. xvi. with Jer. XLVIII. as also

ist, gehört in die Zeit nach David." De Wette seems, however, to have modified his first opinions; for in the third edition of the same work, Berlin 1829, p. 260, the passage stands thus: "Es fehlen bestimmte Spuren seines Zeitalters. Cap. v. enthält die Spuren eines hohen Alters, vielleicht des gleichzeitigen Ursprungs; vv. 6, 8, 14, 15, (comp. 4: 6, 10,) 23, 28." This was written after the appearance of the Commentary of Hollmann, to which De Wette refers.

of several of the Psalms, shews that the inspired prophets and poets did occasionally imitate each other. The relation between Ps. LXXVIII. and the poem under consideration, would then in my view be much better explained, by regarding the passage in the Psalm as an imitation of that in the song of Deborah; or with still more probability, perhaps, of the *theophania* in Deut. 33: 2.

But apart from all this, there are in the song itself positive marks of high antiquity. In the first place, it alludes to several historical facts, which are not mentioned in chap. iv. nor any where else in Jewish history; and which are such as a later writer would not have been likely to invent. Such are the mention of Jael in v. 6, a leader apparently contemporary with Shamgar (Judg. 3: 31), who is elsewhere entirely passed over. So too, in chap. iv. only the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali are spoken of (comp. 5: 18); but in v. 14, 15 of the song, Ephraim, Benjamin, Manasseh, and Issachar, are represented as having been present at the battle. In v. 23 the poetess invokes curses on Meroz, of which there is elsewhere no mention. All these are beyond the invention of a later poet; at least they give to such a supposition the highest degree of improbability. So too the mention of the *mother* of Sisera probably rests upon family circumstances, well known to the Israelites of the day; while a later poet, in employing an ornament of this kind, would have been far more likely to have introduced the wife or children of the unfortunate chief, lamenting the destruction of a husband or father.—In the second place, the poem exhibits no allusion whatever to events of a later age, nor any traces of a later language; for the prefix ψ for ψ ψ v. 7, which appears more frequently indeed in the later literature, occurs also several other times in the book of Judges; e. g. 6: 17. 7: 12. 8: 26. It most probably belonged at first to the language of common life, and was by degrees elevated into the language of literature and books. On the other hand, there are traces of the more ancient views in respect to God, which in later ages were changed, e. g. God is represented as dwelling on Mount Sinai; while afterwards Zion becomes his habitation. I am indebted for this last remark to a manuscript copy of the lectures of Gesenius, which I have in my possession; though the force of the remark is weakened by the circumstance that in Hab. 3: 3—at a far later period—we find the same representation. Compare the notes on v. 4.—This dis-

tinguished scholar also brings forward as another argument for the antiquity of the poem, a circumstance which seems to me to decide nothing; viz. that the number of Israelites capable of serving in war is stated in v. 8, at forty thousand. This, he says, is contradictory to Num. 1: 45 seq. where the number is stated at more than six hundred thousand; and since he regards the book of Numbers as a later compilation, his inference is, that the latter number has been exaggerated by popular tradition, and that the former one is therefore more probably correct. But without entering at length into the merits of the question, it is sufficient for our present purpose to remark, that v. 8 does not profess to specify the *whole* number of warriors in Israel; but simply gives a round number, and by poetical amplification a very large one, among whom no arms were to be found; in order to indicate strongly the destitution of the Israelites in this respect.

But leaving this argument out of the question, we may safely affirm that the doubts in regard to the antiquity of the song of Deborah, as being coeval with the events therein celebrated, have no solid foundation to support them.

The second point to which I have above alluded, regards the poetical rhythm of the Hebrew in this song. As a general principle we must assume, that the poetry of the Hebrews had no regular measure of words and syllables; or at least, if it had such a measure, all attempts to discover it have been in vain. Still, we perceive in some of the Psalms, and especially in Ps. cxx—cxxxii. or the so called *Psalms of Degrees*, a species of rhythm, depending on the position of the words, or rather on the repetition of an important word in one line at or near the beginning of the next line. The same feature we find to exist to a very great extent in the Song of Deborah. Thus in verse 7.

הָדָד לִי פָרְזוֹן בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל הָגָלִי
 עַד שָׁקַמְתִּי דְבוֹרָה
 שָׁקַמְתִּי אִם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל:

So also in vv. 19, 21, 23, 24. In v. 25 the second *στίχος* is wholly contained in the first; as is also the third in part. But the most striking instance of this rhythm is in v. 30.

הִלֵּא יִמְצְאוּ יְהִלְקוּ שָׁלָל
 רַחֵם רַחֲמִים לְרֵאשׁ גְּבֻרָה

שָׁלַל צְבָעִים לְטִסְרָא
 שָׁלַל צְבָעִים רִקְמָה
 צָבַע רִקְמָתָיִם לְצִוְאָרֵי שָׁלַל:

Whether this constituted a fixed species of rhythm among the Hebrews, and especially whether it is that which is designated by the term *שִׁיר הַמַּעְלוֹת* or *Song of Degrees*, is a question the discussion of which does not belong here. Gesenius has broached this opinion, (see his *Lex. art. מַעְלָה*; *Allgem. Lit. Zeitung*, 1812, No. 205,) and De Wette has adopted it. The only object of mentioning the subject here, is to point out the extent to which this feature is found in the poem under consideration.

NOTES.

VERSE 2. בְּפָרוֹץ פְּרִיעוֹת בִּישְׂרָאֵל. These words have been a *crux interpretum* in every age. The Vatican copy of the Septuagint has ἀπεκαλύφθη ἀποκάλυμμα ἐν Ἰσραὴλ, a revelation has been revealed in Israel, a version which certainly stands in no connexion whatever with the context. The Hebrew word פָּרַע does indeed mean to uncover, Deut. 5: 18; and in this respect such a rendering is at least nearer to the original than that of the Vulgate, which gives the sense of the whole verse thus: *qui sponte obtulistis de Israel animas vestras ad periculum*. In what way the idea *ad periculum* can be made out from the Hebrew words בְּפָרוֹץ פְּרִיעוֹת, it is beyond the power of criticism to determine.

A somewhat nearer approach to a meaning resting on critical grounds, is made in the version of Luther; which is followed also by Le Clerc, Michaelis, and Justi. In Luther it stands thus: *dass Israel wieder frey ist geworden*. Le Clerc translates: *Israele in libertatem adserto*, or literally, *cum liberarentur libertates in Israel*. Michaelis has: *dass Israel die Banden zerrissen*. The ground of this version lies in the fact, that the verb פָּרַע sometimes signifies to let loose, to free from restraint, e. g. Ex. 32: 25. Prov. 29: 18. But then this is always in a bad sense; and there is moreover no instance in the Hebrew where the noun פְּרִיעַ is employed in any corresponding sense. The objection to this version is its harshness; and besides it does not suit the context.

Another and still better supported meaning is that of our English version, *for the avenging of Israel*. This comes from the Syriac, which is also followed by the Arabic of the Polyglott, and gives the sense according to the Aramaean usage of פָּרַע, i. q. נָקַם, viz. *to avenge*; פָּרַע אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל; פָּרַע אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל, *pro vindicta qua vindicatus est Israel*. This is also adopted by Köhler. But here *Israel* is made the subject; which is not the case in the Hebrew. In order to do this, the prefix פָּ must be neglected, contrary to all critical rules. As it stands in our English version, *Jehovah* is by implication the subject; but this takes place only by an inversion of the whole verse. The objection of Schnurrer, viz. that the subject must thus be sought for in a subsequent clause, would here seem to be valid; especially as there is here an intervening clause with a different subject.

We come then at last to the sense given above in the translation, *that the leaders led in Israel*. This is expressed by Schnurrer thus: *quod imperio fungi voluerint duces in Israël*; in which he is followed by Hollmann: *quod imperarunt imperatores in Israël*. Herder adopts the same sense in his "Briefe": *dass angeführt die Führer Israëls*. Schnurrer was the first to propose this version in modern times; although it is found in the Alexandrine Codex of the Septuagint, with which also Theodotion coincides: ἐν τῷ ἄρξασθαι ἀρχηγούς ἐν Ἰσραήλ. The propriety of this mode of rendering appears from the *usus loquendi* in respect to both פָּרַע and פָּרַע; from the suitability of it to the context; and from the fact that the verse thus becomes parallel to another passage in this very poem.

To begin with פָּרַע. This word occurs only twice in the singular in the Hebrew Bible; viz. Num. 6: 5. Ez. 44: 20; and signifies in both instances the principal *lock* or *locks* of hair; derived probably from the sense of the verb, *to uncover*, especially the head, by cutting or tearing off the hair, Num. 10: 6. 21: 10. In the plural the word occurs only twice, viz. in the verse before us and in Deut. 32: 42. In this latter passage God says:

"I will make mine arrows drunk with blood,
And my sword shall devour flesh;
From the blood of the slain and of the captives,
From the heads of the פָּרַעוֹת of the enemy."

Here we must inquire, what are then the פָּרַעוֹת of the enemy?

Assuredly not *locks of hair*, which would make no sense; and still less *depilated, capitis nudati*, which the Vulgate has, and for which there is no authority whatever. Neither can it be *avengings*, or *revengings*, as our English version has it, from the Aramaean sense of פָּרַע given above; a meaning at utter variance with the context. The antithetic nature of the parallelism evidently shows here, that פָּרַעוֹת designates the most distinguished part of the hostile community, in contrast to the slain and captives. We might therefore safely adopt the rendering of the Septuagint here, from the nature of the case, without further inquiry, viz. ἄρχοντες, *leaders, rulers*. But we are not restricted by any such necessity; for the analogy of the cognate languages supports this sense. In Deut. 16: 18, Onkelos translates the Heb. שָׂטָרִים, *officers*, by פְּרִיָּנִין, a word from the same root as פָּרַעוֹת; and in Arabic the noun فَرَع is *summum et vertex rei*, and signifies also *caput et princeps familiae, populi*.* We may remark too that the Hebrew name for the Egyptian kings, פָּרַעוֹה, *Pharaoh*, comes from the same root. This word in the Coptic is ⲠⲚⲢⲟ, and with the article, ⲠⲟⲚⲢⲟ or ⲠⲟⲚⲢⲟ, and signifies *king*; and the Hebrews doubtless in adopting it into their own language, gave it a form which preserved, as nearly as possible, the original signification of the name; just as they have done with the name of Moses, and many others, to which a Hebrew etymology has been thus adapted.

From all these circumstances we are warranted in assigning to פָּרַעוֹת in the case before us, the meaning *rulers, leaders*. The plural here takes the feminine form; as is frequently the case in regard to the *nomina muneris* in Hebrew, as well as in Syriac and Arabic.†

Having thus settled the meaning of פָּרַעוֹת, we might at once assume that the verb פָּרַע is to be taken in the same sense. But here also we have the support of the Arabic, in which فَرَع signifies *summum cepit vel tenuit, superavit alios nobilitate, pulchritudine, etc.*

* See Hollmann in loc. † Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 468. 879.

The *usus loquendi* of this clause having been thus made out, we proceed to shew that the version above [given is suitable to the context. Israel had long been sunk in despondency, and was incapable of making an effort to throw off his chains. Hence the prophetess begins with a burst of gratitude to God, that the nation had once more roused itself to action. The second clause refers, by common consent, to the people, who spontaneously came forward to the war; what then could be more suitable or natural, than that the first clause should contain a reference to the princes and rulers of the people, who did the same? We see in the case of Barak how unwilling they were to lead the way; and the same fact is asserted in v. 7. That this unwillingness was overcome, both on the part of the rulers and of the people, the prophetess makes the opening subject of her song of praise.

In this way too this verse becomes in a manner parallel to v. 9, which is to be regarded as a poetical repetition, serving to shew strongly the former despondency and present exultation of the prophetess. It is a safe rule in the interpretation of Hebrew poetry, that wherever a parallelism of different members of the same poem can naturally be made out, such parallelism *caeteris paribus* is to be assumed.

The remainder of the verse presents no difficulty. The form **הִתְנַחֵם** is Inf. Hithp. which in Hebrew and in the cognate languages expresses the idea to offer or present one's self, particularly, for military service; or more literally to impel one's self to do any thing, from the form of Kal, to impel, induce. The whole verse then may be regarded as an exclamation to give praise to God, that in the oppressed and afflicted state of the nation, both rulers and people had at length the boldness to rise and assert the violated liberties of their country.

VERSE 3. The words **מְלִיכִים** and **רִצְוִיִּים**, *kings* and *princes*, may here be understood of the princes of Israel; and then it is merely a declaration to them, that the prophetess is about to begin a song of triumph, in which it is implied that they should join. This however would seem to be a feeble sense of the verse. Much more bold and forcible is the strain, when we refer these words to the kings of the Canaanites, the inveterate enemies of Israel, over whom or whose allies the people are now celebrating a triumph. The song then assumes a tone of lofty defiance: 'I, even I, a feeble woman, celebrate your overthrow.' These same Hebrew words are ap-

plied in like manner in Ps. 2: 2. The word רִיזֵן is the participle of רִיזָה, which occurs only in this form as an epithet for *prince*, literally *the weighty, honourable*; from רִיזָה to be weighty.

VERSE 4. The *theophania* here described is by most interpreters referred to the giving of the law on Sinai; see Ex. 19: 16. Even Schnurrer adopts this application. It is difficult to see any solid ground for such a reference; inasmuch as the present victory had no connexion whatever with Sinai or the events which there took place; and because too it is no where said, that God came to Sinai, but *from* it, Deut. 33: 2. Moreover there is obvious and substantial reason, to understand the passage in respect to God's appearing in behalf of Israel on the present occasion. In v. 20 it is expressly said that the *stars*, or the host of heaven, fought for Israel; and in v. 21 the brook Kishon is described as sweeping away the enemies; which could not well have been the case unless it had been swollen by a great fall of rain. All this points to a storm of thunder and lightning accompanied by torrents of rain, by which Jehovah discomfited the enemy; in the same manner as in Josh. 10: 11 the Lord is said to have "cast down great stones from heaven" upon the enemy, which are immediately afterwards said to be *hailstones*. That there was then such a tempest on this occasion, we are authorized to assume; and Josephus states the same fact, probably from tradition; Ant. V. 5. 4. This being the case, the difficulty in regard to the *theophania* vanishes. It is the majestic and sublime description of Jehovah, advancing in clouds and tempest and storm, to the help of his people. The same general imagery is employed by David in Ps. 18: 8 seq. and is found also in Ps. 144: 5. In Deut. 33: 2, Ps. 68: 8 and Hab. 3: 3, we have the same representation of the approach of Jehovah from the south; perhaps, as has been before suggested, because the Hebrews before the establishment of the ark in Jerusalem, conceived of God as dwelling on Mount Sinai; just as he is afterwards represented as dwelling upon Zion; see Ex. 3: 1. 24: 13. Num. 10: 3; also Ps. 9: 12. In this case, as Herder suggests, Habakkuk must be regarded as having simply imitated the more ancient representation, which he found already clothed in poetical language, without choosing to make such alterations as a change of times and opinions would seem to have demanded.

Let us proceed now to the consideration of the particular

words ; after exhibiting the parallel passages of Deborah and the Psalmist.

Judg. 5: 4, 5.

4 יהוה בצאחה משעיר
 בצעדה משדה אוחם
 ארץ רעשה גם-שמים נטסו
 גם עבים נטסו מים ;
 5 הרים נזלו מפני יהוה
 זה סיני מפני יהוה אלהי
 ישראל ;

Ps. 68: 8, 9.

8 אלהים בצאחה לפני עמך
 בצעדה בשימון ;
 9 ארץ רעשה את כמים נטסו
 מפני אלהים
 זה סיני מפני אלהים אלהי
 ישראל ;

The agreement and difference of the two passages is here presented to the eye ; so that no further remarks are necessary. The pouring down of water from the clouds is omitted in v. 9 of the Psalm ; but is spoken of immediately afterwards in v. 10. Indeed earthquakes and tempests are every where represented, as accompanying the appearance of Jehovah in his character of God of hosts.

Seir, שעיר, is that range of mountains which stretches from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea southwards towards the Elanitic gulf. This region was the seat of the children of Esau or Edom ; and is hence called here *the field of Edom*, the same as the later *Idumea*. The tempest therefore on which Jehovah sits enthroned, approaches from the southeastern quarter of the heavens.

VERSE 5. הרים נזלו. The Vulgate, and most interpreters, translate these words, *montes diffluxerunt, mountains flowed down* ; and understand this metaphorically of the melting away of mountains in terror before Jehovah. This figure is often adopted by the Hebrew poets ; and on this account there could be no objection to this rendering here. But the word usually employed to express this, is not נזל, but מטס ; see Ps. 97: 5. Mic. 1: 4. The proper meaning of נזל is *to flow, to run*, as water, Ps. 147: 18 ; and it is never elsewhere used to express the idea of *flowing down, melting*. It seems preferable therefore, in the present instance, to regard the form נזלו as the 3 pers. plur. praet. Niphal from the verb נזל, for נזלו, instead of the usual form like נטסו. The meaning then will be : *Mountains were shaken, trembled, quaked, at the presence of Jehovah ; a sense equally forcible and apposite as the other, and supported*

also by the Septuagint, which has *εσαλεύθησαν*. The form נזלזו instead of נזלו (which occurs Is. 64: 1, 3,) is then similar to fut. נבִּיֵּה for נבִּיָּה Gen. 11: 7. יזמו for יזמו Gen. 11: 6 ; or in the praeter, נסבֵּה for נסבָּה Ez. 41: 7. נבִּקֵּה for נבִּקָּה Is. 19: 3.* In Is. 64: 1, 3, the English version has given also to נזלו the meaning *to melt* ; but this is against all authority. The

Arabic verb زلزل means *to shake the earth*, and the noun

زلزال signifies *earthquake*.

After thus celebrating the majesty of Jehovah in his appearance for the overthrow of the hostile kings, whose remaining allies she has just invoked to listen to her song, the prophetess turns to describe the forlorn and degraded state to which Israel had previously been reduced.

VERSE 6. All the historical notice we have of Shamgar is contained in Judg. 3: 31. His victory over the Philistines seems to have occurred eighty years after that of Ehud over Moab. As to the interval which followed between him and the oppression of Jabin, there is nothing specified. In this interval, probably, we must place Jael, who is here spoken of along with Shamgar, as a judge or deliverer of Israel ; but who is no where else mentioned in the Jewish annals. The older interpreters have generally supposed this person to be the same with the wife of Heber, mentioned below. There is however no ground whatever for this assumption, except the identity of the names ; and in the multiplicity of instances in which different Hebrews bore one and the same appellation, this ceases to be an argument for an identity of persons here. There are besides several considerations against this assumption. The wife of Heber is no where spoken of, except as the destroyer of Sisera ; had she been formerly celebrated, there could hardly have failed to be some distinct allusion to it. Further, the phrase בְּיַמֵּי פ, *in the days of any one*, is no where employed except in reference to persons who have made an epoch in history by their character and distinguished standing ; e. g. Gideon, Judg. 8: 28 ; Saul, 1 Sam. 17: 12 ; David, 2 Sam. 21: 2 ; Samuel, 1 Kings 10: 21, etc.

* Gesenius Lehrgebäude, p. 372. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 266.

הָדְלוּ אֶרְחוֹת, *the highways ceased*, sc. to be occupied, i. e. the high roads were abandoned by travellers, on account of the many hostile incursions, by which they were rendered insecure. The same idea is expressed in Is. 33: 8, נִשְׁמְרוּ מִסְלֹת שְׂבַח עֲבָר, אֲרָח, *the highways are desolate, the traveller ceaseth*.

עֲקָלְקָלוֹת—נְתִיבוֹת. The word נְתִיבָה usually means *an elevated, beaten road*, from נָתַב, i. q. Ar. ^{نَتَب} *elevatus fuit*. Here, as opposed to the *עֲקָלְקָלוֹת*, it serves to designate the open public roads, in distinction from the obscure and *crooked by-ways* which travellers were now compelled to take.

VERSE 7. הָדְלוּ פְּרוֹזוֹן. The word פְּרוֹזוֹן has been the subject of much difference of opinion, and of much controversy. The different manuscripts of the Septuagint exhibit a great diversity. The Vatican codex has *δυνατοί*; and in a similar sense, seven other Mss. and Theodoret have *οἱ ἀναρούυτες*. The Vulgate also has *fortes* with a like meaning; with which the translation above given agrees. The Alexandrine copy of the Sept. gives simply *φράξων*, retaining the Hebrew word; while the Complutensian and Aldine copies, and also eight Mss. in Holmes, exhibit *οἱ κατοικοῦντες*, but without any critical ground. The Chaldee translates it *קְרִי פְּצֻחָיָא*, *urbes villarum, unvalled cities or towns*; and so also the Syriac and the Rabbins, whom Le Clerc and Köhler follow. Our English version has also adopted this sense, as a collective one, for *the inhabitants* of the villages; and Luther exhibits the same, *Bauren, peasants*. With these Herder also coincides. This meaning accords well with that of the similar word פְּרוֹזוֹת, Esth. 9: 19, which undoubtedly signifies *country-towns*; and it would not be inappropriate to the context in the particular verse before us. But it would be less suitable in v. 11 below; and as the meaning given in the translation is there still more appropriate, and is also supported by the *usus loquendi*, I have preferred to adopt it. The Arabic verb ^{فَرَز} signifies *to divide, separate*; and hence, as Schnurrer suggests; we have the nouns פְּרוֹזוֹן and פְּרוֹז Hab. 3: 14, in the sense of the Hebrew שֹׁפֵט, i. e. *judge, ruler, leader*. So also Dathe, Gesenius, and Hollmann.—The idea of the verse is, not that there were no leaders in Israel; but that through despondency they had ceased to act—had failed to rouse the people against their oppressors. Compare the conduct of Barak, Judg. 4: 8.

עַד שֶׁקָּמְתִי. For the ש prefixed, see the remark on p. 577 above.

אִם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל. The prophetess here calls herself *mother in Israel*, in the sense of *benefactress*; just as distinguished men are termed *fathers of their country*, or *fathers* in general; Job 29: 16. Gen. 45: 8. Compare also the use of the term *father* towards a prophet, 2 K. 6: 21. 13: 14.

VERSE 8. יִבְחַר אֱלֹהִים הָדְרִשִׁים. These words are susceptible of two interpretations: *they chose new gods*; or, *God chose new things*, i. e. new modes of deliverance for his people, e. g. by a female hand and not by military valour. The former is the version of the Seventy, Chaldee, the Rabbins, the English, Le'Clerc, Schnurrer, Herder, Dathe, Hollmann, and others; while the latter is exhibited by the Syriac, Arabic of the Polyglott, Vulgate, Luther, etc. In favour of the former it may be said, that *Israel*, which has been mentioned immediately before, may with perfect ease and propriety be regarded as the subject; while moreover the choice of new gods, the turning aside to idolatry, is throughout the Book of Judges assigned as the cause of God's displeasure against his people and of their consequent subjugation to their enemies; comp. Judg. 2: 11 seq. 2: 20 seq. 3: 7, 8, 12. 6: 1. 8: 33. 10: 6, 7. 13: 1. Against the other interpretation we may also say, that although הָדְרִשִׁים is used in the feminine in a similar meaning, Is. 42: 10. 48: 6. Jer. 31: 22; yet the sense thus obtained harmonizes less with the context here, and is less supported by historical analogy. Strictly speaking too, we may say with Schnurrer, that on this supposition the subject of the next clause must be the Israelites, and it must then refer to the wars waged *by* them against their enemies,—an interpretation which would do violence to the sense of the whole passage.

לָחָם נִצְרָתִי, lit. *warring of the gates*, i. e. war *in* or *around* the gates or cities; with reference, no doubt, to hostile incursions, in which the cities of Israel were surprised and plundered; comp. 1 Sam. 30: 1 seq. The form לָחָם is for לָחַם, (which is found in some Mss.) like דָּבַר for דָּבָר, etc. The word may either be taken as a noun, or as the infinitive of Piel used as a noun, *to oppugnare*. Gesenius prefers the former.

מִגֵּן אִם בְּרָאָה, *no shield was seen*. The word אִם is here a direct negative; as also in Is. 22: 14. 2 K. 3: 14. Prov. 27: 24, where it is parallel with לֹא. See Gesenius' *Lex.* under אִם, A. 6. This negative sense may here be derived from its use

either as an interrogative, or as a particle of swearing.—In respect to the number *forty thousand*, see on p. 578 above. The clause may also refer to the dejection and apathy of the whole people, who neglected to rise and employ even the arms which they had, in behalf of their liberties.

VERSE 9. After this description of the bondage of Israel and its effects upon the courage of the people, the prophetess now, by a natural contrast, again repeats her exclamations of gratitude to the princes and the people, that they at length had risen and triumphed. The verse is thus parallel with v. 2. The preposition ל is to be supplied before רַמְתֶּם נְדָבִים; an omission which is not unfrequent in poetic parallelism; see Deut. 33: 4, and comp. Prov. 27: 7. 13: 18. etc.* She invites here further the whole nation in general, to join her in this gratitude and in a song of praise to Jehovah. The following verses are more specific.

VERSE 10. This verse specifies three classes of persons, whom we may regard as including the whole people. The first are *those who ride upon white asses*. These we may take to be the nobles, princes, magnates; first, because it is expressly related that the thirty sons of Jair who judged Israel, and the seventy sons and nephews of Abdon, who also judged Israel, rode upon ass colts, Judg. 10: 4. 12: 14; a circumstance which seems to be mentioned as pertaining to their rank in life;—and secondly, because it is a well known fact that white elephants, camels, asses, and mules, or rather those approaching to white, have always been highly prized among oriental nations, and are usually the property of princes. It is also proper here to remark, that the ass of warmer countries, as Palestine, and also e. g. in Genoa, is quite a stately animal, and bears little resemblance to his degraded brother in more northern regions. Comp. Bocharti Hieroz. P. I. p. 476. or T. I. p. 529, 543, ed. Rosenmueller; also p. 163, or p. 151 ed. Rosenm.

A second class of persons is described in the words יֹשְׁבֵי עַל-מִדְיָן. What is then מִדְיָן? The Septuagint, Vulgate, Chaldee, the Rabbins, Luther, the English, Le Clerc, and others, take it as if compounded from מִן מִדְיָן; and then render, *those who sit in or for judgment*, i. e. judges. Such a use however of the particles עַל and מִן is elsewhere unknown in He-

* Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 837. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 559. b.

brew. Nor does it help the matter to write the word with other vowels, e. g. מְרִין, for this would mean *controversy* and not *judgment*. Michaelis has very arbitrarily translated, *ihr die auf Wagen fahren*; probably for the sake of antithesis with the preceding and following clauses. The easiest and best supported interpretation is that which I have given, upon the authority of Cocceius, Schnurrer, Herder, Dathe, Gesenius, Hollmann, and others. In this מְרִין is regarded as the less common form of the plural, either of מַר, whence מְרוּ Ps. 109: 18, and מְרוּ Lev. 6: 3; or of the fem. מְרָה, whence מְרוֹת Ps. 133: 2; just as מְלִין from מְלָה Job 12: 11. Both of these

words come from מְרַר, Arabic مَرَّ, in the sense of *to extend, spread out*; and they are spoken properly of any thing *which may be spread out*, e. g. of carpets or coverings, and of the large outer garments of the Hebrews, which they also used to sleep upon at night, Ex. 22: 25, 26. Deut. 24: 13.* Those then who are here said *to recline on carpets* are the *rich, the opulent*, in distinction from the nobles and the poor;—the idea of *costly, splendid*, being here implied, as in 1 K. 22: 10.

The third class are those *who walk the streets or by the way*, i. e. the poor. Thus then we have *the nobles, the wealthy, and the poor*, or the whole nation, to whom the invocation of the poetess is addressed, to join the song of triumph.

I ought to remark here, that Schnurrer does not refer the two last στίχοι to different classes of men. He supposes that those *who recline on carpets* and those *who walk the streets*, simply designate persons of every class who are at leisure or are engaged in business, i. e. the whole community; and he compares Deut. 6: 7, where the Israelites are commanded to talk of the precepts of the law both while they ‘sit in the house and walk by the way.’ The rendering of the Syriac version and Arabic of the Polyglott would rather support this view, viz. *sedentes in domibus*. But it is well remarked by Hollmann, that in the passage of Deuteronomy referred to, it is not so much the object to include the whole community of persons, as it is to cover every *moment of time*; so that the point of Schnurrer’s comparison falls away.

The turn given to this verse by Jerome is somewhat amusing, and as some perhaps may think, not wholly inapposite. “Asensores asinarum populus Israel dicitur; asinae vero in quibus

* Jahn, Bib. Archaeol. § 122. Mod. Traveller, Palestine, p. 8.

ascendunt, Doctores tribus Israel dicuntur; super quorum doctrina reliquus populus quasi super asinas ascendere dicitur, id est, requiescere. Et ipsi asinae dicuntur, hoc est, gradientes instar asinae in lege, sedentes super iudicium, id est, super legem, etc."

VERSE 11. The prophetess has just called upon all the people to join in a song, and she now declares the occasion, *at or on account of the voice, or joyful cry, of those who divide the spoil*. It would be in vain here to attempt to enumerate the different interpretations proposed of this verse. The difficulty arises principally from the word מְחַצְצִים. The Septuagint has ἀπὸ φωνῆς ἀνακρουομένων; the Vulgate paraphrastically and arbitrarily, *ubi collisi sunt currus, et hostium suffocatus est exercitus*. Similar to these is Le Clerc. But the word unquestionably means either *archers*, or those *who divide* sc. the spoil. If the former, it is a denominative in the Piel form from חָצַץ, *arrow*; if the latter it is the Piel part. from חָצַץ to *divide*, which probably derives its meaning from the oriental custom of dividing by lot by means of arrows.* The former sense is followed by the Chaldee, the Rabbins, Luther, the English, and also Justi; to whose interpretation I shall recur again below. I have preferred the sense *to divide*, on the authority of Schnurrer, Herder, Dathe, Gesenius, Hollmann, and others; and because it seems to me to accord better with the context. In this interpretation, the מְחַצְצִים are the victorious warriors, who return laden with booty to their various tribes, and halt at the watering places to divide out the spoil. These, as is well known, are the usual places of encampment and rest in the east; and the division of the plunder was also an occasion of rejoicing and song; see the description of such a scene, 1 Sam. 30: 16. In Is. 9: 2 also, *the joy of those who divide the spoil* is used by comparison to indicate *great joy*; comp. Ps. 68: 13. 119: 162. Is. 33: 23. In these rejoicings the prophetess now calls upon the rest of the nation to join; also around these streams and watering places to celebrate their triumph, the aid and victories of Jehovah; and then to descend in tranquillity to their several cities. Compare here verse 15; and also Virgil Ecl. I. 51, 52:

hic inter flumina nota
Et fontes sacros frigus captabis opacum.

* Pocock. Spec. Hist. Arabum, p. 324. A. Schultens ad Job. 40: 25.

Should any one prefer here to render מְקוֹל by *more than the voice of etc.* expressing a degree of rejoicing greater than that of those who divide the prey, I know not that there would be any very valid objection. The remainder of the verse would not be affected by such a mode of rendering.

Justi proposes still another version, which is not without its merits. He takes מְחַצְצִים in the sense of *archers*, i. e. hostile warriors, who were wont to seize upon the shepherds and their flocks when collected around the watering places. The prefix מ in מְקוֹל he would render by *prae, loco, instead of*. His version then is: *instead of the noise of the [hostile] archers around the watering-troughs, there they shall celebrate, etc.*" But to say nothing here of the force thus put upon the preposition מן, this interpretation, to my taste at least, has less of elegance, and harmonizes less with the context, than either of those discussed above.

שֵׁם יְהוָה צְרָקוֹת יִהְיֶה. The verb יְהוָה is fut. Piel from the root חָנָה. The noun צְרָקָה signifies not only *righteousness*, but *benefit, favour*, and also *deliverance*, i. q. יָשַׁע and יְשׁוּעָה, Is. 45: 24. 46: 13. 51: 6, 8. 56: 1. Hence we may properly translate it here *favours, deliverances, victories*, always perhaps with the accessory idea of their having been *righteously bestowed*, as against idolaters. The word יִרְדֶּה some have proposed to read יִרְדֶּה; so Schnurrer and Dathe. But this is unnecessary; because the praeter, when it follows a future, may take of course a future sense.*

VERSE 12. Having thus invited the whole nation to join the song of victory, the prophetess now turns to herself and Barak, the leaders and heroes of the triumph, in a tone of vivid appeal and excitation. She calls upon herself to dictate a strain descriptive of the preparation and the conflict,—that strain to which the nation shall respond; and on Barak to lead forth his captives and display them in triumph before his countrymen. If we assume this to be the proper interpretation, then the remainder of the poem is the song which Deborah thus indites.

It is however only with hesitation that I have at length given the preference to the above interpretation. Schnurrer proposes a different connexion of the parts; viz. to unite verse 12 with the succeeding verses; and to regard it as the appeal and in-

* Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 794. Stuart's Heb. Gr. § 503. c. 2.

vocation of Deborah *before* the battle; comp. 4: 14. We must then supply אָמַרְתִּי, *I said*, before v. 12; and suppose that she commences her narrative of the conflict by recounting her original appeal to herself and Barak.—My reason for preferring the other view is, that verses 9—11 are a series of invocations to the people of all ranks to celebrate Jehovah; which would very naturally be followed by an appeal of the prophetess to herself to lead them in their song of praise; and because her original appeal to Barak and the people seems to be contained in v. 13.—That such appeals to one's self are not unusual in Hebrew poetry, is an almost unnecessary remark; see Ps. 42: 6, 12. 103: 1—5. 104: 1. et al.

VERSE 13. According to the view we have taken, the prophetess here begins the song which she has called upon herself to indite, by recounting her appeal to the people and her invocation of Jehovah's help, *before* the battle. It is necessary to supply here אָמַרְתִּי after אָז, instead of before v. 12 as is done by Schnurrer. The omission of the forms of אָמַר in this manner is one of the most common features of Hebrew poetry; see Cant. 3: 2, 3. Ps. 8: 4. Is. 3: 6. 14: 8. Job 8: 18. 9: 19. Num. 23: 7. et al. saep.*

Then [I said], descend ye remnant of the nobles of the people. A much controverted clause, and one which has often been rendered at random, without any critical authority; as will be obvious to any one who will look at the various versions of the Scriptures. With Gesenius and Hollmann I take יָרֵד here to be 2 pers. imperat. from יָרַד to *descend*, instead of the regular form יָרַד, for which we also find the form יָרֵדָה Gen. 45: 9. Such instances of a double future and imperative are not uncommon in verbs *Pe Yodh*. Thus we find from יָרַשׁ the imperative forms יָרַשׁ 1 K. 21: 15 and יָרַשְׁהָ in pause with הָ paragogic, Deut. 33: 23; from יָצַק the imp. יָצַק 2 K. 4: 41, and יָצַק Ez. 24: 3. †—The word שְׁרִיד, *remnant*, is explained by v. 7. I prefer to take עָם here in the same sense as if it were the genitive after אֲדָרִים; just as we find in Ex. 28: 17 סִבְרִים אֲבָן, *rows of stones*; Ruth 2: 17 אֵיפָה שְׁעָרִים, *an ephah of barley*; see also the other instances adduced by Gesenius, ‡

* Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 850. Stuart's Heb. Gr. § 555.

† Ibid. p. 383. Stuart ibid. § 246.

‡ Lehrgebäude p. 667.

who supposes the latter noun is to be taken not so much in place of a genitive, as of an accusative, or perhaps adverbially.

In the Septuagint the verse stands thus :

Τότε κατέβη κατάλειμμα τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς ·
 Λαὸς κυρίου κατέβη αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς κραταιοῖς ἐξ ἐμοῦ.

This evidently depends upon another reading of the Hebrew vowels and accents, viz. יָרַד instead of יֵרַד, and also עַם יְהוָה instead of the present separation by the *Atmach*, as follows :

אָז יָרַד שָׂרִיד לְאַדְרָיִם
 עַם יְהוָה יָרַד לִי בְּגִבּוֹיָרִים :

This division and mode of reading Michaelis and Schnurrer have also adopted, and after them all modern commentators, except Gesenius and Hollmann. They would then render the passage thus :

Then a remnant descended against the valiant,
 The people of Jehovah descended for me against the mighty.

It is not to be denied, that the reasons brought forward by Schnurrer in favour of this interpretation are specious, particularly when taken in connexion with his views of v. 12. He remarks, that the parallelism of the two parts of the verse are thereby rendered much more striking ; that the connexion with v. 12 (in his view of it) is more natural and appropriate ; that it thus agrees with chap. 4: 14, where Barak and his troops are said to have descended from Tabor. But in opposition to all this we may affirm, that there is no *necessity* whatever for a change of the vowels, and therefore it is better to avoid such a change ; and further, that the sense is much more forcible, and more in accordance with the occasion and the whole tenor of Deborah's mission, if we suppose her thus to have invoked the presence and aid of Jehovah.

VERSE 14. בְּעִמְלֵק — מְנִי The poetess now proceeds to review those who joined the standard of Barak. The word מְנִי is here the poetic form with *Yodh paragogic* for מֵן. Before עִמְלֵק the relative אֲשֶׁר is of course to be supplied ; as also the verb יָרַד from the third clause of the verse. *Root* is here a *firmly established seat, dwelling* ; compare the similar use of the verb, Is. 27: 6. Ps. 80: 10. Job 5: 3. But how could Ephraim be said to dwell by Amalek, when this people, as is

well known, inhabited the country to the south of Palestine, between Mount Seir and the Egyptian borders? The answer is rendered easy by a notice in Judg. 12: 15, where it is said that Abdon was buried "in the land of Ephraim in the mount of the Amalekites, בְּדֶהַר הָאֲמֵלֵקִי." It is hence probable, that colonies of this people had formerly migrated into the country of the Canaanites, and that one of these at least had maintained itself among the Israelites of the tribe of Ephraim. It is the Ephraimites who dwelt near them, who thus come out to the war. Schnurrer supposes *Amalek* to be, both here and in 12: 15, only the name of a mountain; but the other supposition seems more probable.—Other explanations it would be a loss of time to recount; suffice it to say that they are mostly not more intelligible than our English version: *Out of Ephraim* was there a root of them against Amalek.

אַחֲרַיִךְ בְּנִימִין בְּעֵמְמִיךְ, after thee [O Ephraim, came] Benjamin, among thy people, hosts. Ephraim is addressed as if present, comp. Is. 1: 29. We must presume the number from Benjamin to have been so small, as not to have formed a distinct corps.

מָנִי — מַחֲקִיקִים. *Machir* was the son of Manasseh, and the father of Gilead, Gen. 50: 23. Num. 27: 1; and is put here for the tribe of Manasseh. The word מַחֲקִיקִים is part. Poel from חָקַק, and signifies the same as הַחֲקִיקִים in v. 9 above. Sept. ἐντασσοῦτες, Vulg. principes.

מְשִׁבִּים זֵבֶדֶת סֹפֵר, they that bear the staff of a leader, sc. in war, i. e. the staff of office. Most of the versions take סֹפֵר here in the sense of *scribe, writer*; which is indeed its most common meaning, but does not suit the connexion here. The word is also applied to two great officers of state, viz. to the secretary of state, who made out orders and decrees in the king's name, 2 Sam. 8: 17. 2 K. 19: 2. 22: 3; and also to a high military officer, who had the charge of raising and mustering the troops, 2 K. 25: 19. Jer. 52: 25. In the present passage it seems to be taken nearly in this latter sense; or rather, for a military leader or prefect in general. The verb מָשַׁךְ to hold is construed with זֶבֶד before the object. Compare the Greek ἀσκητοῦχος.

VERSE 15. שָׁרֵי is here the unusual plural form from שָׁר, instead of שָׂרִים; like גֹּבְרֵי, Amos 7: 1. שָׂרֵי Zech. 14: 5.* There is therefore no necessity for changing the vowel-points

* Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 523. Stuart's Heb. Gr. § 325.

to טָרַי as Schnurrer proposes; nor for translating it *my princes*, as Le Clerc and others have done.

יִשָּׂכָר בֶּן בָּרַק. The most obvious rendering of these words is, as *Issachar, so Barak*; supplying the בֶּן of comparison before Issachar; and they are so rendered by Gesenius in his *Lex. art.* בֶּן, I. 2 *d*, as also by Luther and Le Clerc. But it is difficult to see what connexion the words, taken in this sense, can have with the rest of the verse. A far better solution is proposed by R. Tanchum, as quoted by Schnurrer: *quidam putant בֶּן significare eos quibus nixus fuerit Baracus quosque sequentes habuerit, ex illa significatione vocis בֶּן quam habet Ex. 30: 18.* In this passage of Exodus, בֶּן signifies a *support, basis*, on which any thing rests; so also in I K. 7: 31. et al. I have therefore translated, *Issachar was the RELIANCE of Barak*, i. e. his stay, support; deriving בֶּן from בָּנָן in the sense of בָּן. Most of the modern commentators prefer to derive it from כִּבֵּן in the sense of *to cover, protect*; and translate it *praesidium, guard*. This is not however supported by the *usus loquendi*, and seems unnecessary.—The meaning of the verse thus far seems to be, that while the chiefs of Issachar were with Deborah, the people of that tribe followed Barak.

שָׁלַח בָּרַק אֵלָיו. Literally, *were sent down at his feet*, i. e. followed him into the valley, with the accessory idea of *impetuosity*. Many refer this to Barak, who was 'sent on foot into the valley.' So our English version; certainly without critical ground or any very intelligible sense; while in chap. 4: 10, the very same phrase is translated correctly.—The interpretation first given, renders this clause parallel to the preceding one; Issachar closely followed Barak, and was his stay and support.

Thus far we have the catalogue of those tribes who took part in the enterprise, viz. Ephraim, Benjamin, Manasseh, Zebulun, and Issachar. Of these only Zebulun is recorded in chap. iv. while Naphtali who is there mentioned, is here first spoken of in v. 18 below; where both Zebulun and Naphtali are particularly celebrated. Probably they constituted the chief portion of the troops and bore the brunt of the battle, dwelling as they did in the more immediate vicinity of Jabin. Thus they are naturally the only tribes mentioned in the brief notices of history; while on a triumphal occasion like the present, the deeds of all who were concerned in the battle, would doubtless be placed in the strongest light.

בְּסִלְגֹתָ רְאוּבֵן. With this clause commences the list of

those tribes which failed to obey the summons of Deborah ; and here v. 16 should properly begin. The tribe of Reuben dwelt east of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, from the river Arnon northwards, and possessed part of the plain of the Jordan, which was 'every where well watered,' Gen. 13: 10. Their country was celebrated for its rich pasturage, Num. 32: 1.* *Among the streams of Reuben* means simply *in the well watered land of Reuben*, its fertile plains and vallies.

הִתְקַדְּבִי. The word הִתְקַדְּבִי signifies a *decision, resolution, decree*. The idea of the verse is, that the Reubenites at first resolved to join their countrymen, and 'willingly to offer themselves ;' but afterwards remained quiet at home. This conduct the prophetess first describes in a tone of apparent praise, which by a poetical artifice is converted into the keenest irony. She pronounces their original resolution and purpose to have been magnanimous ; inquires why it was not fulfilled,—why they preferred to remain at home and listen to the piping of the herdsmen ? She then repeats, as it were, her first declaration of approbation ; but by the change of a single letter, (הִתְקַדְּבִי instead of הִתְקַדְּבִי,) she pronounces their magnanimous *resolution* to have been empty *deliberation*, resulting in cowardly indolence. A similar species of paronomasia occurs in Ps. 49: 13, 21.

The word מְשַׁפְּתִים here and in Gen. 49: 14, is probably i. q. שְׁפָתִים Ps. 18: 14, and means the *folds, pinfolds*, in which flocks and herds in warm countries are during summer enclosed at night ; from שָׁפַת to *place, set*, like *stabula* from *stare*. It is every where spoken in reference to the ease and quiet of pastoral life, in opposition to the toils and dangers of war. The usual word is גְּדֵרָה.—This interpretation is proposed by R. Sal. Ben Melech : בֵּין הַמְּשַׁפְּתִים הֵם מְעַרְכוֹת וְגֵדְרוֹת הַצֹּאן i. e. *the ranges and folds of the flocks*. The dual form probably arises from the number of hurdles of which the enclosures were usually composed ; so also גְּדֵרֵי חַיִּים Josh. 15: 36.—The meaning more usually attributed to this word is *drinking-troughs*, i. e. for the cattle. This is illustrated at length by Michaelis on Lowth, (p. 599. ed. Rosenm. Lips. 1815,) but does not rest on sufficient grounds ; see Gesenius' *Lex.* sub *voc.*

* The reputation of this tract for pasturage continues to the present day ; see Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, Germ. ed. with notes by Gesenius, II. p. 628. Rosenmueller, *Alterthumsk.* Bd. II. Th. I. p. 264.

Verse 17. גִּלְעָד—שָׁכֵן. *Gilead* was the name of the son of Machir, v. 11, and also the name of the mountainous country east of Jordan, inhabited by the tribe of Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh; Deut. 3: 15. Josh. 13: 25, 31. 22: 9. It may therefore here mean either that half of Manasseh, (the other half having gone out to battle, v. 11,) or the tribe of Gad, or both these. The latter is not improbable; and it is certain that Gad at least must be intended. *Gilead* is put directly for Gad, Ps. 60: 9. The verb שָׁכֵן necessarily here implies *to dwell at ease, quietly*, as in Ps. 16: 9. 55: 7. Prov. 7: 11. The mere fact of *residing* beyond Jordan could surely be no cause of reproach.

וַיִּירָא—דָּן. This clause is rendered by Michaelis, Schnurrer, and others, *and Dan, why feared he ships?* But the other meaning of דָּן, viz. *to sojourn, dwell*, applies much better here; first because of the parallelism with שָׁכֵן and יָשָׁב; and secondly, because we no where read of hostile incursions by sea against the Israelites. That the verb in this sense must here be construed with an accusative, is no objection; for a decided instance of the same construction occurs in Ps. 120: 5. The limits of the tribe of Dan included the haven of Joppa, Josh. 19: 6, and also the coast farther south. This interpretation moreover is supported by the Septuagint, Vulgate, Luther, and the English version; and was afterwards adopted by Schnurrer himself.*

אָשֶׁר—יָשָׁבוֹן. The same reproach is here brought against Asher, that he remained inactive on his coasts. The noun חוֹף, from חָפַף *to wear away*, signifies *coast, sea coast*, inasmuch as this is continually wearing away by the water. So in Arabic, حَافَّةٌ, حَائِفٌ, signify *margin, sea coast*. The plural גְּבִיִּים stands often in poetry in cases where in prose we find the sing. יָם; e. g. Gen. 49: 13. Job 6: 3, compared with Gen. 32: 13. 41: 49, etc. In the next clause, מְסָרְעִים are properly *rents, fissures*, sc. in the coast, from פָּרַץ *to rend*; and hence *bays, harbours*. The celebrated harbour of Acco or Ptolemais, now St. Jean d'Acre, lay in the territory of Asher. Achzib also and Tyre are mentioned as falling within the limits of this tribe, Josh. 19: 29.

* In his *Notae ad Spec. Tanchumi Hierosol.* Tüb. 1791.

VERSE 18. Zebulun and Naphtali are here particularly celebrated. They are the only tribes mentioned in chap. iv. Jabin and Sisera dwelt in their territories; and the oppression would therefore naturally fall most heavily on these tribes. We may conclude therefore, that they were more eager to throw off the yoke of bondage; that they indeed would rise in greater numbers, and exhibit a more determined valour. Hence they are said to *have despised their lives even unto death*, i. e. to have rushed fearless upon danger and death. The Arabian poets use similar expressions; see the quotations in Schnurrer ad h. l. — *The lofty field* is here probably spoken in reference to Mount Tabor, on which the army of Israel was at first encamped; lit. *the heights of the field*, perhaps also the more elevated parts of the plain of Esdraelon.

VERSE 19. The prophetess now proceeds to describe the battle. From the circumstance that *kings* are here spoken of, we may with probability infer that other allied kings took the field with Sisera. Such confederacies were not unusual; see Josh. 10: 3 seq. 11: 1 seq.

בְּחַתְּמֵיךָ עַל-מִי מְגִדּוֹ. Taanach and Megiddo were cities of the Canaanites, each of which had its own king. They are always mentioned together, except in Josh. 21: 25; and the inference is that they lay near each other; Josh. 12: 21. 17: 11. Judg. 1: 27. 1 K. 4: 12. 1 Chr. 7: 29. In the division of the land under Joshua, they were assigned to Manasseh; although it is expressly said that they lay within the territory of Issachar, Josh. 17: 11. For a time, however, the Canaanites were not driven out of them, Judg. 1: 27. Afterwards Taanach was assigned to the Levites, Josh. 21: 25. At a later period the two formed part of one of the twelve districts over which Solomon placed purveyors, 1 K. 4: 12. In 1 Chr. 7: 29 they are said to be inhabited by the descendants of Ephraim. Megiddo was fortified by Solomon, 1 K. 9: 15; and was afterwards the scene of the death of Ahaziah, 2 K. 9: 27, and of Josiah, 2 K. 23: 29. 2 Chr. 35: 22.—We find also mention of the *plain or valley* of Megiddo, 2 Chr. 35: 22. Zech. 12: 11; and of the *waters* of Megiddo, in the verse before us. These waters and the plain, of course, derive this appellation from their immediate proximity to the city.

Where then were the cities of Taanach and Megiddo situated? Where are we to look for the plain and the waters of Megiddo? The whole context and the nature of the case shew,

that they could not have been far remote from Mount Tabor; and as the Kishon is represented as having swept the enemies away, the field of battle must have been upon the renowned plain of Esdraelon. But to obtain a more definite idea of the situation of these cities and of the battle ground, it will be necessary to go more into detail.

The great plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon, (the latter being the Greek pronunciation of the former,) lies within the ancient borders of Zebulun and Issachar, and expands itself between the Jordan and Mount Carmel, in a direction nearly from E. S. E. to W. N. W. It is skirted on the N. by the mountains of Nazareth and Mount Tabor; on the E. by the mountains of Gilboa, which form the western border of the Jordan valley; on the S. by the mountains of Ephraim or Samaria, and the hills which stretch from these to Mount Carmel; and on the S. W. and W. by this latter mountain, and by hills which separate the plain from the coast at the distance of seven or eight miles from the sea;* among which lies the lake *Cendevia* of Pliny, the source of the Belus. The line of mountains on the north side of the plain is bold; and through these enters the ravine which conducts to Nazareth.† About two or three furlongs further east, stands Tabor, projecting somewhat upon the plain. Still farther to the eastward the plain extends about three or four miles, on its northern side, to a line of hills; beyond the southern end of which hills, it is prolonged towards the range of Gilboa. This range, which separates this tract from the vale of the Jordan, rises into peaks, probably one thousand feet above the level of that river.‡ Between these are *Wady's* or ravines which descend to the Jordan. Opposite to this prolongation of the vale of Esdraelon towards the S. E. on a spot where the ridge of Gilboa sinks down and forms a tract of elevated rocky country, open to the west and descending to-

* Shaw's Travels, p. 333 seq. French Transl. Tom. II. p. 13 seq.

† Jowett's Christian Researches in Syria and the Holy Land, Bost. 1826. pp. 128, 129.

‡ Dr. Richardson, in Mod. Traveller, Palestine, p. 248. Bost. 1830. The natives still name this ridge *Djebel Gilbo*. Most travellers call the northern part of it *Hermon*, but improperly; see Rosenm. Alterthumsk. Bd. II. Th. I. p. 135. The proper Hermon is N. E. of Paneas.

wards the Jordan, is situated the village of *Bisan*, the ancient *Bethshan* or *Scythopolis*, at the distance of twenty four miles south of Tiberias. Two or three miles south of Bisan, the mountains rise again.*—On the south side of the plain also, the mountains of Ephraim are penetrated by several valleys; one of which, entering by *Gennyn* (the ancient *Ginaea*), is the usual road from Nazareth to Nablous or Sychar, and Jerusalem.†

The plain of Esdraelon is computed by Dr. Jowett to be about fifteen miles square, making allowances for irregularities, and for its running out on the W. towards Mount Carmel, and on the E. or S. E. towards the Jordan. Although it bears the name of *plain*, yet it abounds with hills, which in viewing it from the adjacent mountains, shrink into nothing.‡ Burckhardt estimates the plain to be about eight hours long and four hours broad.¶ It is now almost desolate; although exceedingly fertile, and capable of supporting many thousands of inhabitants.§

Mount Tabor, in Latin *Mons Itabyrus*, now *Djebel Tor*, stands isolated and prominent above all the surrounding mountains. Its form is described by Burckhardt and others, as that of a truncated cone;¶ the sides of which are not so steep but that it may be ascended on horseback. Its altitude is estimated by Volney at from four to five hundred *toises*, or from 2500 to 3000 feet.** The sides are covered to the very top with forests of oaks and wild pistachio-nut trees. The summit is an oval plain, described by Pococke as half a mile long and a quarter of a mile broad. Maundrell makes it two furlongs in length by one in breadth. On it are still to be seen the remains of fortifications, probably of the time of the crusades. The prospect from Mount Tabor is described by all travellers as one of the loveliest on earth. The eye wanders over the mountains and plains of Galilee, takes in the mountains of Ephraim, and rests upon the 'excellency of Carmel'; while immediately be-

* Richardson, *ib.* p. 246. Burckhardt, II. p. 592. Germ. ed. with notes by Gesenius.

† Jowett, *ib.* p. 146.

‡ Jowett, *ib.* and p. 222.

¶ Burckhardt I. c. p. 579. The reckoning by hours is very uncertain. As a general rule, an hour's distance may be assumed to be the space which a horse or mule will walk over in that time, *i. e.* from *three to three and a half miles*.

§ Jowett, p. 222.

¶ *Loc. cit.* p. 579.

** Voyage en Syrie, Tom. II. p. 212.

low is the wide plain of Esdraelon, spread out like a carpet; through which the Kishon is seen winding its way and approaching gradually the base of Carmel.* During the greater part of summer, the mountain is every morning covered with thick clouds, which clear away towards noon.†

The united testimony of ancient authors and modern travellers, (with the exception of Shaw,) makes the Kishon take its rise near the foot of Tabor. In the plain, on the E. or N. E. of the mountain, and at a short distance from the base, is a *Khan*, called the 'Khan of the Fair,' from the circumstance of a market being held there every Monday. Here are the ruins of a castle, formerly belonging to the Knights of St. John; it appears to be the same in which Arvieux found a garrison in 1660. From this place Tiberias bears a little N. of E. at about three and a half or four hours' distance. In the immediate vicinity is a fine fountain, which Arvieux says is the source of the Kishon.‡ Its course is at first southerly; and as it passes through the plain, it receives of course the waters of the circumjacent mountains. There are also many springs in the plain itself. Burckhardt saw several in passing from Nazareth to Bisan,|| besides crossing a brook soon after entering the plain. Dr Richardson, in travelling from Gennyn to Bisan, proceeded along a fertilizing stream, which he crossed and recrossed several times. In four hours from Gennyn he came to its source, where it issues in a large current from the rock, and is called *El Geled*, or *the cold*. In two hours more he arrived at Bisan, having gradually withdrawn from the valley, and got upon an elevated rocky flat.§ Mr King also in passing from the plain of Sharon (by Cesarea) to Nazareth, on entering the plain of Esdraelon, among the hills which skirt it on that side, crossed a small branch of the Kishon.¶ Maundrell also saw the traces of many smaller brooks and torrents, falling down into it from the mountains, which in winter or after rain must cause the stream to swell greatly. At the S. W. corner of the plain or valley, the Kishon reaches the foot of Carmel, and then flows to

* Arvieux's Travels, Germ. edit. II. p. 233.

† Burckhardt, p. 581.

‡ Loc. cit. p. 230. Burckhardt l. c. Jowett, p. 131.

|| Page 590. § Mod. Trav. l. c. p. 246.

¶ Missionary Herald for 1827. p. 66.
No. III. 76

the N. W. between its base and the hills on the north ; there being here, according to Dr Jowett, a prolongation of the valley. Where the Kishon approaches the sea shore, it is described as larger than the Belus, and as a considerable stream. When Maundrell saw it, its waters were low and inconsiderable. Dr Pococke forded it. In the beginning of September 1815, Otho von Richter 'rode through the clear green water of the Mukattua (Kishon), which at its mouth divides itself into several arms, and irrigates several charming gardens.'*

After these geographical notices,—which have not been collected without great labour, so deficient and often contradictory is the testimony of travellers, and so utterly unsatisfactory the statements of most geographers,—we may proceed to look more nearly for the situation of the two cities of Taanach and Megiddo. The testimonies, or rather hints, on the subject are few, meagre, and indefinite ; and the exact position of these cities can, of course, no longer be determined.

In regard to Megiddo, all traces of its site whatever have perished ; nor is there any hint respecting it in any ancient geographer or traveller. All that we can arrive at, therefore, in regard to its site, is by way of deduction from other data. In Zech. 12: 11, the city of Hadadrimmon is said to be in the *vale of Megiddo*. Jerome affirms, in the beginning of the fifth century,† that it was the same place, which in his day was called *Maximianopolis* and lay in the plain of Megiddo. The author of the *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum*, composed in A. D. 333, places Maximianopolis at seventeen Roman miles from Cesarea, and ten from *Stradela* or Jezreel ; which last, he

* Rosenmueller Alterthumsk. Bd. II. Th. 1. p. 204.—Brochard, a monk who travelled in the 13th century, says that the waters which flow from the eastern side of Tabor, form another Kishon, which runs into the Sea of Galilee. This has been repeated by most modern geographers ; and has even been affirmed to be the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome ; which however is not the fact. No modern traveller gives a hint of any such thing ; and the nature of the country as above described, shews that it would hardly be possible. The work of Brochard is appended to Euseb. Onomast. ed. Cleric. q. v. p. 176.

† Hieron. Comment. in Zach. XII. *Adadremmon*—urbs est juxta Jisraëlem, quae hoc olim vocabulo nuncupata est, et hodie vocatur *Maximianopolis*, in campo Megiddon.

says, is twelve Roman miles westward from Scythopolis. We must therefore infer, that Hadadrimmon in the vale of Megiddo, was situated seventeen Roman miles or about five and a half hours from Cesarea, and twenty two miles or about seven hours from Scythopolis. As these two points are definitely known, this causes us to place the site of Hadadrimmon, and of course the vale of Megiddo, as well as also the city of Megiddo, in the *western* or *southwestern part* of the great plain of Esdraelon.

Of Taanach, Eusebius in the beginning of the fourth century says, that it was then a village three or four Roman miles (both are specified) from *Legio*.* This last is a place not mentioned in the Scriptures, but rendered important from the fact, that both Eusebius and Jerome make it a point of departure for the distance of all the neighbouring places. In speaking of Nazareth, they say that Nazareth is a village over against (*απέναντι*) Legio, about fifteen miles from it towards the eastern quarter near Mount Tabor. Legio therefore is probably the place called by Abulfeda *Ladjun*,† and by Maundrell *Legune*. The latter in his journey from Acre to Nablous, came upon this place, which he describes as an old village with a large *Khan*, about three hours and a half southward from the Kishon. He probably means, that it was at this distance from the spot where he crossed the Kishon. It lies near a small brook, and from it one has a view over the whole plain of Esdraelon. Maundrell remarks that he saw Tabor and Nazareth, at the distance of six or seven hours in an easterly direction.‡ All this tallies with the account of Eusebius and Jerome; and goes to fix the site of Legio towards the southwestern part of the plain of Esdraelon. Taanach, we have seen, was three or four miles distant from it.

The probable conclusion then is, that the vale or plain of Megiddo comprehended at least, if it was not wholly composed of, the prolongation of the plain of Esdraelon towards Mount Carmel; that the city of Megiddo was of course situated here; and that Taanach lay at a short distance farther east or south-east. It is also a necessary conclusion from these views, that the waters of Megiddo are the stream Kishon in that part of its course.

* Euseb. Pamph. Onomasticon Urbium et Locor. SS. rec. J. Clericus, Amst. 1707.

† Tabula Syr. p. 8.

‡ Rosenm. Alterthumsk. Bd. II. Th. 1. p. 102.

Here then we must suppose the fiercest part of the conflict to have taken place; whether we consider it as having begun here; or whether, as is more probable, Barak drove the enemy before him from their first position on the plain into this narrower part of it, where in their efforts to cross the swollen stream, many were swept away. Indeed this last would seem to be the necessary conclusion; because in Ps. 83: 10, it is said that Sisera and Jabin, i. e. their host, perished at *Endor*. This city lay in the plain, on a small stream, about three hours distance east of south from Nazareth.*

I have dwelt thus long upon these geographical details, because upon most of the modern and best maps of Palestine, from D'Anville to Butler and Klöden, Megiddo and its plain are placed a short distance E. S. E. from Cesarea, in what is properly the plain of Sharon. That this is a manifest error, the whole of the preceding discussion goes to shew. Whence the error should have arisen, I am utterly at a loss to conceive; unless it be because this city is said in Josh. 17: 11 to belong to Manassch; while they have not adverted to the fact, that it is also there expressly said that it lay within the territory of Issachar. Indeed all the maps are exceedingly unsatisfactory in this part of Palestine. That of D'Anville, from which Butler's is mostly copied, is on the whole the best. Of the geographers, Bachiene and Rosenmueller are the most full and correct. The latter has copied largely from the former.

Michaelis objects to the application of the term *waters of Megiddo* to the Kishon; † chiefly because, as he affirms, the words מַי מְגִדּוֹ must be applied not to a living stream, but to a lake. He understands therefore here the *palus Cendevia*, the source of the Belus. But that מַי is not thus necessarily confined to the waters of a lake, is apparent from the following phrases; מַי מְרִיבָה Num 20: 13. Deut. 33: 8. Ps. 81: 8; מַי צִיֵּן Josh. 15: 7; and especially מַי יְרֵחוֹ Josh. 16: 1, spoken of the brook near Jericho.—Hamelsveld, and also the translator of Bachiene, inclines to favour the supposition of Michaelis, on the authority of Shaw; who however has evidently confounded the two streams Kishon and Belus. ‡

* Burckhardt p. 500.

† Suppl. ad Lexx. Heb. p. 339.

‡ Biblische Geograph. Th. I. p. 521. Hamb. 1793.—Anmerk. zu Bachiene Th. I. § 73, 74.—Shaw's Travels p. 331 seq. French ed. II. p. 13. See on Shaw, Paulus' Anmerk. zu Maundrell, Sammlung von Reisen etc. I. p. 321.

We return again from this discussion to the consideration of the text. It will be found, however, that the above investigations will contribute much to lighten our further labours.

קָצַעַתְּ בְּזָבָה, *lucrum, gain, here spoil, plunder*. The enemy had been accustomed to carry off much booty; but now they obtained none. Schnurrer and* Hollmann prefer the Arabic sense of the word, *frustum, fragment, piece*, on the authority of R. Tanchum. They translate, *not a piece, coin, particle of silver did they take*. This is however contrary to the Hebrew *usus loquendi*, which it is not here necessary to lay aside.

VERSE 20. For the sense of this verse, see above v. 4. p. 583. The stars are here the *host of heaven*, צְבֹאֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם, Is. 40: 26. Jer. 33: 22. Deut. 17: 3. 2 K. 21: 3, 5. It is the same as if we should say, *the heavens fought*, etc. Josephus narrates (Ant. V. 5. 4.) that a tempest of hail, rain, and wind discomfited the Canaanites. If this was not an historical fact, handed down by tradition, we must at least suppose it to have been a traditional interpretation of the passage before us in the age of Josephus. It certainly accords well with chap. 4: 15, where it is said *the Lord discomfited Sisera*, etc.—The word נִלְחַמְנוּ may here be taken impersonally, *they fought*, for *pugnatum est*;* or by placing the Athnach on כּוֹכְבֵימַיִם, that word may be taken as the nominative here, and then understood again before the next verb. The former mode seems the more poetical.

VERSE 21. For the river *Kishon*, see on v. 19. The words נַחֲלַת קְרוֹיִמַיִם have sometimes been taken as a proper name; so the Syriac, Vulgate, Theodotion, and Luther, but without sufficient reason. It is more probably an epithet of the Kishon, and signifies either *river of antiquity*, or *river of battles*. The first meaning is adopted by the Septuagint, and English; the latter by Schnurrer, Dathe, and most modern commentators. The form קְרוֹיִמַיִם occurs no where else; and we may derive either signification from the verb קָדַם and its cognate noun קָדָם. The latter meaning, especially, comes from the verb as used in Ps. 18: 6, 19. Both significations are in like manner supported by the Arabic; see Hollmann in loc. I have preferred the latter, because the epithet *ancient* belongs just as well to any other stream. Perhaps after all, the Chaldee presents the best sense, uniting in a measure both significations: *rivus in quo facta*

* Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 793 seq. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 500.

sunt Israeli signa et fortia facta ab antiquis. The plain of Esdraelon is well adapted to battles, and was the seat of many conflicts in a later age; e. g. of Gideon and the Midianites, Judg. 6: 33, coll. 7: 1; of Saul and the Philistines, 1 Sam. 29: 1, coll. 31: 1; of the Israelites and Syrians, 1 K. 20: 26; of Josiah and the Egyptians, 2 Chr. 35: 22. So Judith 7: 18. It is still a favourite field of battle among the Arabs in their frays.* It was therefore, in all probability, renowned of old for sanguinary conflicts; like the plains of Saxony at the present day. תְּדַרְכֵי נַפְטָי עוֹ The prophetess in view of this destruction of the enemy, breaks forth into exultation: *O my soul, thou hast trodden down the mighty!* lit. the strong one, or strength. Jerome remarks, that she speaks here in the person of all Israel. The Vulgate takes this in an imperative sense, as an exclamation of the prophetess at the time: *conculca anima mea robustos.* Herder takes עוֹ adverbially: *tritt, meine Seele, mit Kraft einher!* In a similar manner Justi. But all these interpretations are less direct and less simple, than the one which I have adopted.

VERSE 22. A most vivid image of hasty and rapid flight and hot pursuit! The word אַבִּירָיִי expresses properly *their brave, valiant riders.* The verb דָּהַר signifies *to press forward rapidly*; so כּוֹס דָּהַר Nah. 3: 2. Hence the noun here, *haste, speed.*

VERSE 23. The prophetess abruptly turns to curse the inhabitants of Meroz. Of the history or site of this city there is no trace whatever. We may suppose it to have lain in the territories of Issachar or Naphtali; and that its inhabitants, having an opportunity to destroy the flying Canaanites, neglected to improve it. Thus much would seem probable; because the conduct of Jael is immediately contrasted. The *messenger of Jehovah* may be here either an *angel* as usual; or it may be the *prophetess* herself; comp. Hagg. 1: 13. Mal. 2: 7. The chief point is, that it is Jehovah who commands this curse.

VERSE 24. For the history of Heber and Jael, see 4: 11, coll. 1: 16. Num. 10: 29. 1 Sam. 15: 6. For תְּבַרְךָ מְנַשִּׁים, compare εὐλογημένη ἐν γυναίξι, Luke 1: 28, 42. The phrase בְּאֵדָה, as applied here in reference to the wife of a wandering *nomad* who had no settled place of residence, seems strictly to desig-

* Hasselquist's Reise nach Palaestina, Rostock 1762. p. 180.

nate women of the same class or character, viz. the women of those tribes who dwell only in tents. The suggestion of Hollmann, that it means *women who remain at home*, in opposition to those who go abroad, seems in the present case to be without any good support.

As to the morality of the action for which Jael is here applauded, we have no right to bring it to the test of modern principles and occidental feelings. We must judge of it by the feelings of those, among whom the right of avenging the blood of a relative was so strongly rooted, that even Moses could not take it away. Jael was an ally by blood of the Israelitish nation; their chief oppressor, who had mightily oppressed them for the space of twenty years, now lay defenceless before her; and he was moreover one of those, whom Israel was bound by the command of Jehovah to extirpate. Perhaps too she felt herself called to be the instrument of God in working out for that nation a great deliverance, by thus exterminating their heathen oppressor. At least Israel viewed it in this light; and in this view, we cannot reproach the heroine with that as a crime, which both she and Israel felt to be a deed performed in accordance with the mandate of Heaven.

VERSE 25. Compare 4: 19. The word חֵמָה has usually been translated *butter*; but this is entirely out of place here, as well as in most of the instances where the word occurs. The parallelism obviously requires that it should designate something *liquid*. In Gen. 18: 8, R. Sal. Jarchi says this word means not *butter*, but *cream*, *pinguetudo lactis quam de ejus superficie colligunt*. See also Vitranga in Esaiam 7: 15. T. I. p. 188. Niebuhr also informs us that the Arabs of the present day make use of cream, which they call *cheimak*.* I see therefore no strong objection to adopt this as the sense of the word here.—But on the other hand, the Arabic verb خَبَّ signifies *to coagulate, to curdle*, as milk; and according to this etymology, we may translate, as I have done, *curdled milk*; which also answers well in the other passages where חֵמָה is used. I have preferred this interpretation, because we know that *sour or thick milk* is a common and favourite beverage of

* Beschreibung von Arabien, p. 52. Comp. Michaelis Suppl. in Lexx. Heb. p. 807.

the Arabs;* and because Josephus also affirms that Jael gave to Sisera *γάλα διεφθορός ἤδη*, *milk already sour*.† It is not however to be denied, as suggested by Gesenius, that *חָמֶץ* sometimes in poetical parallelism is probably not different from *חֵלֶב*, *milk*.

R. Tanchum and D. Kimchi among the Rabbins, as also Michaelis (ad 4: 19) and Schnurrer, suppose that Jael gave him sour milk, and especially camel's milk, as an intoxicating drink, in order to produce a stupifying sleep. But there is no evidence that such is the character of milk in this state; and the evidence of Niebuhr is directly the contrary, who says that camel's milk is esteemed as more cooling than the milk of cows.‡ The Kurds do indeed prepare an inebriating drink from milk, called *cumyss*; but this is by distillation.§

VERSE 26. *יָתֵד* is the *pin* either of iron or wood, by which the cords of the tent are fastened to the ground. The form *הִשְׁתַּיְתֵדוּ*, as it stands, is the 3 fem. plural, instead of the singular. We must refer this to an anomaly of number, where a nominative singular takes a plural verb; as in Ex. 1: 10. Job 17: 16. Is. 28: 3. Obad. 13; or we may either read with Lud. de Dieu *הִשְׁתַּיְתֵדָה*, *as to her hand, she laid it*, etc. or regard the present punctuation as an irregular one, instead of this latter.||

VERSE 27. *כָּרַע*. It is not necessary to understand this word of the violent convulsions of the dying chieftain, as Schnurrer does. We have only to suppose, as is highly probable, that he was sleeping on a bed or *divan*, elevated somewhat above the floor, from which he would naturally fall upon the latter. The word *כָּרַע* signifies *to sink upon the knees*, either in reverence, or as *inchoative* of falling; so in 2 K. 9: 24 *וַיִּכְרַע*, *and he sunk down in his chariot*.

VERSE 28. By a prosopopeia no less abrupt than beautiful, the mother of Sisera is now introduced as looking from her lattice, in anxious impatience for the return of her lingering son.

* Jowett's *Christ. Researches*, Bost. 1826. p. 210.—Niebuhr, *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien*, II. p. 373.

† Ant. Jud. V. 5. 4.

‡ Reisebeschr. I. 314.

§ Oedmann's *Sammlungen aus der Naturkunde*, Th. VI. p. 142.

|| Gesenius *Lehrgeb.* p. 800. Hollmann in loc.

She consoles herself with the idea, that his delay is occasioned only by the division of the booty; and here is shewn the deep insight into human nature which the sacred writer possessed,—an insight especially into the frivolity of the oriental female character. Her consolation springs not from the hope of his triumphant return as a warrior and conqueror, and public benefactor; but arises from the slaves, the versicoloured garments, the splendid ornaments and attire, which will fall to his share.*—In the mouth of the exulting Hebrew poetess, this is a burst of keen and scoffing irony against a foe who never dreamed of defeat, and awaited only the spoils of victory and the rejoicings of triumph.

וְחִיבָב, fut. from Piel חִיבָב, a word ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in Hebrew,

but the same in Arabic, viz. حَبَّ clamavit, vociferatus est, etc. It probably corresponds to the Hebrew words רִיַן and הִרִיעַ, signifying to cry out, either in joy or sorrow. Here it is spoken of the anxious inquiry or cry of the mother of Sisera; hence the Vulgate not improperly, ululabat.

בְּצֵד אֲשַׁנֵּב, through the lattice. The word אֲשַׁנֵּב occurs only here and in Prov. 7: 6. It comes from a root i. q. Arabic

شَبَّ to be cool, spoken of the day, etc. and hence signifies a lattice, blind, which admits the cool air. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader, that in the east, the windows of all female apartments are thus constructed with lattices.

בִּשְׁשׁ, 3 praet. Polel from בִּישׁ, lit. why does his chariot shame [us] in coming; i. e. why does it delay, linger. So also Ex. 32: 1. The form אַחֲרִי is Piel for אַחֲרִי; so יִחַמֵּי for יִחַמֵּי Gen. 30: 39; יִחַמֵּי for יִחַמֵּי Ps. 51: 7.†

VERSE 29. חֲכֵמוֹת שְׂרָרֵיהֶּן. These words may properly be rendered, her wise ladies, i. e. her noble female attendants; as חֲלוֹקֵי אֲבָנִים, Job 41: 7; חֲלוֹקֵי אֲבָנִים, smooth stones, 1 Sam. 17: 41.‡ The form חֲעֲנָה, is 3 sing. fem. fut. with fem. suffix, referring to a plural nominative taken distributively.|| Several manuscripts read חֲעֲנָה, in the plural without a suffix; but this is less well.

* Compare Lowth's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry, Lect. XIII.

† Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 170. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 142. c. 2.

‡ Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 678. Stuart ib. § 425.

|| Gesenius ib. p. 713. Stuart ib. § 476, coll. 487.

זָה הִיא הַשִּׁיב אֶמְרֵיהָ לָהּ. The Vulgate refers *היא* here to one of the attendants, who is supposed to utter the following words. So also Michaelis and others. The word, however, obviously refers to the mother of Sisera herself; and so the Septuagint has taken it; as also Schnurrer and most modern interpreters. She recalls her former desponding exclamations; and proceeds to express brighter hopes, and a more pleasing cause for Sisera's delay. By referring the suffix in *אמריה* and *זה* to the attendants collectively, we may translate: *yea, she also returns answer to them*; so Hollmann. But it seems to me far stronger and more poetical to refer these suffixes to the mother of Sisera, and render: *yea, she returned her answer to herself*; comp. Prov. 22: 21. In this way this *στίχος* becomes parallel to the preceding one. Or we may here render *תשיב* directly, *she recalled*, sc. her former words; compare Num. 23: 20. Esth. 8: 5, 8. This is preferred by Schnurrer.

VERSE 30. *הלא*, literally, *is not?* and then through the force of the interrogation, *lo! surely*, etc. Gesenius Lex. art. *לא*.—For the rhythm in this verse, see p. 578 above.—The spoils here spoken of are such as are accounted most precious in oriental nations. Female slaves held the first place in the estimation of the orientals, and also of the Greeks; compare Num. 31: 18. Homer Il. I. 111 seq. Stores of clothing formed too one of the chief articles of wealth and consideration; Judg. 14: 12. Is. 3: 6, 7, where comp. Gesenius Comm. in loc.

רקמה I construe here in apposition with *צבעים*, or as governed by the force of *שלל* implied. The verb *רקם* signifies both in Hebrew and Arabic *to diversify, make variegated*, sc. in colour; and is not necessarily applied to *needle work*.* Hence *רקמה* is *any thing variegated, striped*, etc. So also the dual *רקמתים* is to be construed in the same way; or both this and *צבע* may be in apposition with the preceding *שלל*.

לצוארי שלל. The best and most obvious interpretation here is, to regard *שלל* as put for *איש שלל*; an ellipsis of ordinary occurrence.† We may then translate: *garments for the neck (person) of the spoiler*, i. e. Sisera. So the Syriac and Arabic versions. The Septuagint and Vulgate give here words without meaning. Schnurrer takes *שלל* in its proper sense for *plunder*,

* Hartmann's Hebräerinn III. p. 148. Gesenius Lex. sub voce.

† Gesenius Lehrgeb. p. 648. Stuart's Heb. Gr. § 444, note.

and understands captured animals, which he supposes to have been usually led in triumph decorated with trappings and ornaments upon their necks. In this sense of לִלְבָּשׁ, it might perhaps be better referred to the decorations of the female slaves. For an untenable suggestion of De Sacy, see Hollmann in loc.

VERSE 31. The prophetess does not stop to say that all these hopes of Sisera's mother were dashed to the ground; but implies this in another abrupt apostrophe, in which she invokes like destruction upon all the enemies of Jehovah. This abruptness makes a far more vivid impression, than any language.—The particle כִּי refers, not to what is expressed, but to what is thus implied, the frustrated hopes and wailings of the mother and her attendants, over the slaughter of her son and the destruction of their people.—In the next clause the person is changed; although the Syriac, Vulgate, and two Mss. read אֱהָרִיב. For the attribute of *strength* here applied to the sun, compare Ps. 19: 5, 6.—On the whole of this closing apostrophe, see above on p. 569.

This last sheet was already in the hands of the printers, when I received from Germany the first number of the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1831, conducted by Professors Umbreit and Ullmann. This number contains an article by Professor Köster of the University of Kiel, on the *Strophes, or Parallelism of Hebrew Poetry*. His object is to show, that "the verses of Hebrew poetry are regulated by the same law of symmetry, as the members of the verses; and that consequently this poetry is, in its essence, composed of strophes, i. e. its verses are arranged in symmetrical divisions." This position he undertakes to demonstrate, by the exhibition of several Psalms and other poetical pieces, divided into their several supposed strophes.

That this theory has some foundation in fact, is unquestionable. Indeed the refrains in Psalms XLII. and XLIII. leave no doubt on this point. But whether the theory is true to the extent proposed by Professor Köster, we may be permitted to doubt. In many instances he has made strophes, where, for ought we can see, so far as it regards symmetry, he might just as well have made them in any other place.—I might rather say, perhaps, that his theory, as he reduces it to practice, *must* be true; for he professes to make the strophes every where coincident with the divisions of the sense; and thus, leaving

symmetry practically out of view, he gives the name of *strophe* to that which we have been accustomed to call *paragraph*.

My only object in mentioning the article of Professor Köster, is simply to remark, that he has also there given a version of the Song of Deborah. The translation coincides in most particulars with that which I have given. The only important difference is, that he separates verse 12 from all connexion with either the preceding or following verses; just as I have separated v. 23. He supposes that these two verses are exclamations thrown in by the poetess, which serve the purpose of dividing the larger sections or strophes from each other. He thus makes three larger divisions or strophes; viz. verses 2—11, the exultation of victory; verses 13—22, the conflict and triumph; and verses 24—31, the death of the hostile chieftain. The two first strophes are composed of ten members each; the last only of eight.—It seems to me, that a comparison of these three so called strophes is sufficient to shew, that a theory which applies to them the terms *symmetrical*, *parallel to each other*, etc. must be founded in part at least on shadows.—The suggestion of making verse 12 a separate exclamation or apostrophe, strikes me favourably; and had not the sheets been already printed off, I should have made the change.

NOTE. It should have been mentioned on p. 563, that the Commentary on Judges V. there attributed to Jeromo, is supposed by the editor of his works not to be genuine, and to have been composed not earlier than the seventh century.

LITERARY NOTICES.

There remains only room to give the titles of a few recent publications.

ROSENMUELLER, Scholia in V. T. Pars IX. Scripta Salomonis complectens, II Tom. Lips. 1830. (Vol. I. contains Proverbs. Vol II. Ecclesiastes and Canticles.)

———— Scholia in V. T. in Compendium redacta, Vol. III. Psalmos complectens. Lips. 1830.

———— Biblische Alterthumskunde, Band IV. Leipz. 1830. (Vol. I. of Nat. Hist.)

WINER, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms; 3te ganz umgearbeitete Ausgabe, Leipz. 1830.

THOLUCK, Commentar über den Römerbrief, 3te Ausg. Berl. 1830.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. IV.

OCTOBER, 1831.

ART. I.—THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

*Part IV. Directions for Theological Students entering the
University of Halle. Published by the Theological
Faculty of that University.*

Translated by the Editor.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

IT was at first the Editor's intention to have closed his remarks on the state of theological education in Germany, with the article in the third Number of this work. When that and the preceding article on this subject were written, he sought in vain among his papers for the pamphlet, the title of which is given in the note on the next page. He was obliged, therefore, to draw in a great measure from his own recollections; and thus, while it was his endeavour to state nothing for which he could not vouch from his own personal knowledge, he was perhaps led to pass over some points, on which it would have been desirable to have given information. The pamphlet alluded to has since been found among the papers of a friend; and as it was prepared and published by the theological faculty in Halle, for the express purpose of affording information to students of theology in regard to the general course of studies, the order and method in which those studies ought to be pursued, the aids and encouragements held out by the university, and the duties and obliga-

No. IV.

78

tions imposed upon them during a residence there,—the Editor has thought he could in no way so appropriately conclude the whole subject, as by laying this pamphlet in a translation before his readers. The object and contents of it are more fully specified in the Introduction. The pamphlet itself is understood to have come from the pen of the late Chancellor Niemeyer.

EDITOR.

DIRECTIONS FOR THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS, ETC.*

Introduction.

Experience has long taught, that very many persons commence the study of theology, without bringing to it any clear idea of its extent, of the mutual connexion of its parts, and of the best method of becoming acquainted with each of those parts. Very few, moreover, before their departure from the preparatory schools, have any opportunity of acquiring this important preliminary knowledge. Hence we find so much uncertainty and mistake in the choice of lectures; so many instances of wrong judgment in regard to what is more or less important; so much want of plan in regard to study, even in connexion with the greatest diligence. Hence too the frequent complaints of students at the end of their academical years, that they have seen *too late*, how very differently these years might have been employed!

Besides this, many students are also too little informed in regard to the external aids, societies, and other regulations, established by law or custom; or, in the prevailing carelessness respecting the special objects of a university life, they become acquainted with these only by accident; so that they first perceive all the advantages of them, and learn the obligations which devolve on themselves, when it is now too late to reap the benefit of the former, or to fulfil the latter.

All this induces us to place the following pages in the hands

* Anweisung für angehenden Theologen, zur Uebersicht ihres Studiums und zur Kenntniss der vorzüglich für sie bestimmten Bildungsanstalten und anderer academischen Einrichtungen auf der königl. Preussischen vereinigten Halle- und Wittembergischen Friederichs-Universität. Herausgegeben von der theologischen Facultät. Halle, 1827.

of every theological student, who joins this university. He will find therein information on the following topics.

I. A brief enumeration of the *particular* sciences which constitute the *whole* course of theological study; together with a short specification of the object and extent of each and of their relation to each other. In like manner, hints respecting the *auxiliary* sciences chiefly to be recommended to a theologian, in reference to his future destination. All this with constant adaptation to the usual arrangement of the theological lectures in this university.

II. An account of the existing *Seminaries*.

III. Suggestions in regard to the other existing *aids* and *institutions*, so far as they are particularly important for theological students.

IV. Information respecting several academical *arrangements and regulations*, and in regard to what is legally requisite in particular cases, especially on entering and leaving the university.

I.

General View of Theological Study.

1.

The study of theology, considered as a department of learning, presupposes, like the other great departments, a variety of preliminary knowledge and a certain general cultivation of the mind. These we may reasonably expect to have been already acquired at the higher schools, [and in this country, at the colleges,] which, so long as they adhere to their original destination, and are earnestly desirous of promoting a thorough mode of study, limit themselves to instruction in languages, history, and the mathematics. For the future theologian, the study of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages, and of history in general, is a preparation so indispensable, that any neglect in regard to it forbids us to expect either a thorough or a liberal course of theological study.

2.

These studies of the schools are continued at the university; but are regarded in a higher point of view, and are increased by others. However different all these studies may be in their nature, still they are all included, according to ancient academical usage, under the name of the *philosophical sciences*, taken

in the widest sense of this term ; and the teachers of them constitute the *philosophical faculty*. Most of the sciences in this department, aside from the great interest which they must have for every student, are of the highest importance particularly for the theologian, partly as preparatory and partly as auxiliary to his theological course. This is true especially of *philosophy* in its stricter sense, of *philology*, and of *history*.

3.

The great object of an academical course of the study of theology properly so called, is no other than this, viz. to elevate that *popular religious knowledge*, which, for the sake of its practical influence, ought to be found in a certain degree in every reflecting person, into a *scientific department* of knowledge. In this way teachers of religion are to be formed ; who will indeed in future live and act in very different degrees of standing and influence, but from whom without exception, if they are to be held in any estimation, it may be expected, that either as members of the learned community, or as teachers, they will be distinguished by the thoroughness and scientific character of their theological knowledge, from those who are either destitute of all higher intellectual culture, or who have devoted themselves to other departments of learning.

4.

But the science of theology, considered as a *whole*, is made up of various subsidiary sciences and branches of knowledge, which are all mutually connected with each other. A complete view of all these, with an explanation of the notion, character, extent, and object of each in particular, is given in the so called *Theological Encyclopaedia* (*Εγκυκλοπαιδεια*) ; with which, at the same time, it is usual to connect a course of *Methodology*, or advice in regard to the best method of studying the different branches. With these two subjects it is proper that every one should begin his theological course ; and opportunity for this will hereafter be afforded at this university every semester. Meanwhile we give here a brief description of the field of theological learning, intended however only as a first glance at it ; and the following may therefore be regarded as a brief outline of such a course of *Encyclopaedia*, so important in its bearing upon all the subsequent studies.

5.

The whole range of theological science may be conveniently divided into *four* parts. Indeed theology itself, in accordance with this division, has received a fourfold appellation, viz. *exegetical, systematical, historical, and practical* theology.

6.

Exegetical Theology embraces all those branches of knowledge, that are requisite for the correct understanding of the writings of the Old and New Testament, in which are contained the holy records of the Christian religion. This department is also called *biblical philology* (*philologia sacra*), in distinction from *classical philology*; with which, in other respects, it coincides as to object, character, and method. The following may be regarded as the principal subdivisions of exegetical theology.

I. *The historico-critical Introduction to the books of the Old and New Testament.* This occupies itself with the history and form, both of the whole collection of biblical writings, i. e. the *canon*, and also of the particular books; and contains investigations respecting their age, origin, contents, and character. Consequently, the most appropriate place for this branch of study also, is at the commencement of the theological course.

NOTE. The lectures on Introduction usually occupy half a year on each part of the Scriptures. And since, for the most part, only a small portion of the Old Testament can be explained in the exegetical lectures, it is so much the more necessary to become acquainted, through these introductory lectures at least, with the contents of all the books of the Old Testament; inasmuch as a familiarity with the contents of the whole Bible is presupposed in all the departments of theology.

II. *Biblical Hermeneutics, Ἑρμηνευτική, or Theory of Interpretation.* This applies the general principles of interpretation, which are common to all writers, to the biblical writings in particular; and derives also special rules from those circumstances and characteristics which are peculiar to the Bible and its particular parts. In close connexion with hermeneutics stands also *biblical criticism* (*critica sacra*); in which it is usual to distinguish *verbal criticism*, which occupies itself with the judgment and restoration of the biblical text; and the so called *higher criticism*, which consists in investigations relative to the authenticity of the several books of Scripture.

NOTE. Both hermeneutics and criticism are treated of either separately, or in connexion with the Introduction to the Bible. When the lectures on the latter do not also include hermeneutics, it is very important to study this branch by itself.

III. *Biblical Exegesis, Ἐξήγησις.* This is the practical application of the principles of hermeneutics and criticism, to the grammatico-historical interpretation of the original text of the Scriptures.

NOTE. The thorough study of the contents of the New Testament, must constitute the foundation of all theological knowledge. Hence it is proper for young theologians to devote especial attention to *exegetical lectures upon the New Testament*; and not merely to content themselves with the regular course of two years.

In the Old Testament, the shortness of the academic course commonly affords opportunity to explain in lectures, only the most important of the historical, prophetic, and poetical books, viz. the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Psalms, Job, and portions of the writings of Solomon. But the interpretation of these serves to point out the way for the private study of the other parts of the Old Testament. The lectures on Introduction specify moreover the necessary aids.

A thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, which is but too often neglected, is also indispensable to the explanation of the New Testament; at least when one wishes to know for himself the grounds on which an interpretation rests. A grammatical acquaintance with this language, may reasonably be expected to have been acquired in the preparatory schools. For such however as have neglected this study, there are lectures on Hebrew Grammar and exercises in analysis and in the reading of easy historical books of the Old Testament (*Fundamentale Hebraicum*).

Whoever wishes to obtain a deeper knowledge of the Hebrew, must not neglect also the kindred oriental languages, viz. the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic.

Lectures upon the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, and upon the Apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments,—as also the private study of these writings,—afford an excellent means for acquiring an accurate knowledge of the peculiar character and idiom of the Greek style of the New Testament.

7.

Systematic Theology consists in the methodical and orderly exhibition, investigation, and proof of religious truths and propo-

sitions, or those connected with religion; all of which, when collected from the Scriptures, in which they lie scattered, and when united into one whole, constitute *the System of the Christian religion*.

All these truths and propositions regard either objects of knowledge and belief; or they regard that which is conformable to duty in our affections and actions. Hence the following distinction.

I. *Dogmatic Theology* or *System of Christian Faith* (*Theologia dogmatica, thetica*); i. e. the systematic exhibition or discussion of that which is taught in the Christian Scriptures and according to the creed of the Evangelical Church, in regard to God, his attributes, operations, and relations to us. In this view also we further distinguish between *biblical* theology (*bibliche Dogmatik*), which examines closely the doctrinal passages of the Holy Scriptures, and derives the system of doctrines exclusively from the Bible; and *ecclesiastical* theology (*kirchliche Dogmatik*), considered as the systematic exhibition of the biblical doctrines according to the creed of the Evangelical Church. Both these are usually treated of together, and in connexion with critical investigations; but they are also sometimes separately discussed.

NOTE. Lectures upon this science sometimes include also the *history* of the various modes in which particular doctrines of religion have been exhibited (*Dogmengeschichte*, see p. 621); or they undertake also to refute false exhibitions on the spot. This last is called *polemic* or *elenctic* theology. The history of doctrines however, together with the general history of Christian faith, and also polemics, are sometimes discussed as a science separate from dogmatic theology. So also *apologetic* theology, or the defence and confirmation of Christianity in general; which however is more commonly united with the lectures on dogmatics.

II. *Moral Theology* or *Christian Ethics* (*Ethica Christiana*); i. e. the systematic exhibition of that which is taught in the Scriptures, and especially in the New Testament, respecting the duties of mankind as it regards their affections and actions.

We must further make a distinction here, between the strictly *scientific* mode in which systematic theology is taught,—which puts in requisition all the aids of learning, in order to illustrate and establish the positions which it discusses,—and the manner in which the *popular* and *practical* doctrinal system is to be studied. This latter leaves out of view all that

which cannot be apprehended without strictly learned attainments; it avoids the technical language of the schools; and presents the doctrines of religion and morality in that light, in which the future teacher of religion must exhibit them for *practical uses*. At the same time, in view of the great diversity of religious opinions, as well as of religious wants, it applies the general principles of wisdom in teaching to those particular doctrines which have been most strongly controverted.

NOTE 1. In order to attend lectures with advantage on both *dogmatic* and *moral* theology, the student must have acquired some skill in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, upon which these sciences are every where grounded. Hence the study of exegetical theology should in all cases precede that of systematic theology.

NOTE 2. The study of dogmatics may be commenced with biblical theology; to which the ecclesiastical or scientific may then be superadded; as also the history of doctrines.

NOTE 3. To commence either dogmatic or moral theology in the middle of a year's course, is wholly unadvisable.

NOTE 4. The *philosophy* of religion and of morals is of advantage, partly by way of preparation, and partly for confirmation.

NOTE 5. The popular and practical dogmatic theology is so far from rendering the scientific or systematic study of theology superfluous, even for those who are to be simply pastors among the common people, that without the latter the former can never be fundamentally studied, and can only make superficial theologians. But on the other hand, not to become acquainted with the proper *method* of popular and practical teaching in doctrinal theology, can only be followed by the most deplorable consequences; especially in regard to the instruction, which is expected from future pastors and teachers of the young.

8.

Historical Theology includes all those branches of knowledge, which relate to the history of religion in the widest sense of the term, and of all that which stands in connexion with religion or has originated from it.

A *general* history of religion would properly develope and exhibit all the remarkable changes in the religious ideas and opinions, as well as in the religious worship, of all ages and nations, so far as they can be known.

For the Christian theologian the most important, by far, is the history of the Christian religion, and of that community which is united and governed by its influence, called the Christian church. The history of the Christian church, or ecclesiastical history

(*Historia ecclesiastica*), is at the same time of the greatest importance for all the other parts of theology, especially the systematical; and it affords likewise a view of the situation of theological science in every age. In consequence of the uncommon abundance of materials, this branch requires a course of at least a whole year.

NOTE. Under the name *Ecclesiastical History of the Old Testament*, was formerly understood the general history of the Israelites; because this is exhibited in the Old Testament in constant connexion with religious ideas, and there are elsewhere no other sources of this history which can be relied upon.

As particular subdivisions of historical theology,—the study of which no one, who does not confine his notions of theological learning within very narrow limits, will ever regret,—we may specify the following.

1. The *History of Christian Doctrines* (*Historia dogmatum*). In this the student is led to see for himself the gradual formation of the system of doctrines held by the church. In a similar respect also an acquaintance with the history of the fathers, or *Patristics*, and an attendance upon lectures having reference to this subject, is strongly to be recommended.

2. *Symbolical Theology*, or the historico-dogmatical explanation and illustration of creeds and confessions in the evangelical church (*Libri symbolici*). This should at the same time include a comparative exhibition of the systems of other Christian ecclesiastical denominations.

3. *Archaeology* or *Antiquities*, partly for the illustration of the biblical writings (*Archaeologia s. Antiquitates Bibliorum*); partly also as an exhibition of the primitive constitution of the Christian church (*Antiquitates Ecclesiae Christianae*).

NOTE. With the Hebrew archaeology it is now customary to connect also biblical history and geography.

4. *Theological Literature* or *Bibliography*. Without this a theologian must remain unacquainted with the most important works in his profession; or at most will only acquire a knowledge of a few, and usually the most recent works; which for this very reason are not always the most important.

9.

Practical Theology occupies itself with the whole circle of studies directly preparatory to the exercise of the sacred office

of a Christian teacher. It therefore presupposes a stock of knowledge already acquired, which the instruction now to be given is to work up, and bring into use, according to the different objects which students may have in view. For this reason, chiefly, practical theology belongs properly to the last year of the academical *triennium*.

I. The *general method* of popular and practical religious instruction, is usually taught in connexion with rules for a continued discourse, as in sermons, i. e. *Homiletics* (*Rhetorica sacra*); and rules for *catechetical* instruction. In these connexions, it teaches the best modes of treating of dogmatical, moral, and historical subjects; and of the proper manner of using the Holy Scriptures.

II. *Pastoral Theology* invites attention to the duties of the pastor, and to that prudence of conduct which it becomes him to maintain, in all the various business and occurrences of his office; and especially in reference to the different classes of persons in his congregation. It includes also the subject of *liturgies* (*Liturgik*), and his duties as director of the external worship or religious ceremonies; and moreover instructs him in the general principles to be followed in regard to the liturgy.

III. *Ecclesiastical Law* includes *generally*, all the laws and privileges having reference to religion, and in regard to the sources of which all Christian denominations are agreed. *Specially* it relates to particular ecclesiastical communities. Of the latter, the canon law and the German protestant ecclesiastical law are the chief kinds.

10.

All the sciences thus far enumerated, make out the circle of theological learning. It is indeed not to be expected of every student, that he should make equal progress in all these branches; nor that every one should pursue for himself the study of particular branches beyond what the lectures teach, up to the original sources. This however is the appropriate calling of every theologian, who wishes to form himself for an academical instructor. But the future popular teacher of religion must also not be wholly unacquainted with any of these sciences; and consequently none of the lectures above mentioned may be neglected, out of indifference or as something superfluous. Every student of theology, if he really regards the study as of any importance, ought to exercise his powers of mind in earnest in

some department or other of this science. To develop and excite those powers, is one great object of the universities.

11.

From the very nature and subjects of the various particular sciences, it is already evident, in what order they may most appropriately be pursued ; although it is not possible to establish any positive law on this point, because much is dependent on accidental circumstances, collisions of lectures, etc. In general, however, it is obvious, that the *first* year may be most advantageously devoted, first, to the *Encyclopaedia*, and then, to the unremitting study of the several philosophical and philological auxiliary sciences ; as also, in theology itself, to the study of the Holy Scriptures ; that the *second* year should, in like manner, be chiefly occupied with systematic and moral theology and ecclesiastical history ; and the *third*, devoted to practical theology, and to some of the higher and more difficult studies of philosophy and philology.

In all this however, it is to be understood as a matter of course, that neither the mere *hearing* of lectures, and still less the mere *mechanical writing down* of the words, can have any good influence on the culture of the mind ; unless these are followed up by private diligence, reflection upon what has been heard, eagerness for general knowledge, (which is precisely what a university life is best adapted to promote, as being a *universitas literarum*,) frequent intercourse and interchange of ideas among friends united in the pursuit of science, and often recurrence to the private counsel of the instructor. It is a great mistake, to hear too many courses of lectures at once and merely write them down, so as to be compelled to put off the careful repetition and review of them till another period. The student must strive to obtain on every subject clear ideas both of the parts and of the whole ; and must often take counsel, how he stands in this respect in regard to their mutual relations and connexions. An excellent opportunity for the trial and exercise of the mental powers and skill, as well as for the review and riper consideration of what has been heard, is afforded by the *Collegia examinatória et disputatória*.* They cannot be sufficiently recommended. He moreover who is in earnest in re-

* These are private exercises, held under the direction of a professor or private teacher. Ed.

spect to progress in knowledge and skill, will also do well, in connexion with these, to take part in some literary society intended for the mutual investigation and consideration of literary and scientific subjects.

Whoever thus pursues his course of theological study in earnest and with a definite plan, will never be in a situation to need special preparation for his examination before the consistory; nor to have recourse to those miserable auxiliaries, by which at the end of his course, he must strive to make up, through mere *mechanical* memory, that which he has before indolently neglected. By such a course of systematic and restless diligence, a student will have collected a far greater amount of knowledge, than will ordinarily be required of him at his examination.

13.

But at the same time, the theologian ought not to have reference solely to his destination as a teacher of religion. During his theological studies he ought never to leave out of view, that before he shall become a pastor, he may for years perhaps be usefully employed as an academical or family instructor. This is indeed very desirable; inasmuch as the teaching of youth is the best possible preparation for the instruction of a people.

14.

In order properly to fulfil this latter destination, it is necessarily constantly to connect with the more strictly theological studies, those other studies also, which are expected from teachers of youth, and of which the foundation has already been laid in the schools. No semester ought to pass away, without attendance upon some one or more courses of lectures on these subjects; besides what private diligence may be able to do. It is hardly necessary to remark, that the studies here to be chiefly recommended, are, theoretical and practical philosophy, philology ancient and modern, civil and literary history, mathematics, natural science and history, *aesthetics* or the science and culture of taste, cultivation of the mother tongue, and among the modern languages at least the French, together with practice in the fine arts, as music, drawing, etc. How far the student should venture himself upon the higher speculative sciences, for which only a small proportion even of the best heads have the proper organization, every one must try for himself. At any rate, no one should *begin* his course with these. In

that case he will learn only words and forms ; the result of which, as is shewn by daily experience, is only conceit and indifference towards many kinds of knowledge that are indispensable.

15.

It is moreover easy to have collected a very valuable stock of knowledge, without at the same time having the power to communicate it in the proper manner to others. Consequently the teacher of youth must be acquainted, not only in general, but also in their details, with the different *methods* of instruction, and be able to exercise a sound discretion and judgment in the choice between different modes. For this purpose the science of *didactics*, or the theory of teaching, gives the requisite directions.

16.

The case is the same in regard to *education* ; which, however much must first be learned respecting it from experience and practice, has nevertheless its general laws and principles, which are also generally acknowledged, either aloud or silently, and are more fully and systematically developed in the science of *paedagogics*, or the theory of education. The very general interest which has been excited within a few years on this subject among scientific men, would render it unpardonable in a person who offers himself to parents or seminaries as one acquainted with this department, if, up to the moment when he must reduce its principles to practice, he has never reflected seriously either upon the nature or upon the requisitions of such an employment.

17.

To promote the practical application of the general principles developed in the studies immediately preparatory both to the sacred office and to the employment of an instructor of youth, is the chief object of the various *seminaries*. They are partly means of culture, and of previous exercise in that employment which the student who has completed his university course, expects to pursue as his calling and business in after life ; and they act partly by exciting the student to independent thought and labour ; from which the mere hearing of lectures has a tendency to divert the mind.

II.

Of the Seminaries.

1.

The study of the *humanities* so called, i. e. of philology and elegant literature, has ever been of the greatest influence in producing a fundamental and liberal method of studying theology. In this view the seminary for *classical philology* is of the highest importance, not only for the future academical or private instructor, but likewise for every one who does not merely look forward to practical utility as a religious teacher, but has also some regard for theological learning. The regulations of this seminary are sufficiently known and approved. It consists of twelve members, was founded in 1787, and now stands under the direction of Professors Schütz and Meier.*

The *theological* seminary has existed, in different forms, ever since the establishment of the university. In later years, however, the arrangement of it has been changed and enlarged; and since the new organization of the pedagogical seminary in 1826, with which it was formerly connected, it has been placed on a separate and independent footing. It is divided at present into five classes; of which the first four are devoted to scientific theology, and the fifth to practical. The first class occupies itself with the exegesis of the Old Testament, under the direction of Prof. Gesenius; the second has the exegesis of the New Testament, under Prof. Wegscheider; the third, history of the church and of doctrines under Prof. Thilo; the fourth, systematic theology under Prof. Tholuck; and the fifth, practical theology under Prof. Marks and Dr Wagnitz.

In order to be admitted into the first four classes, it is requisite, that the applicant shall have pursued theological studies at least one year at some university, that he submit himself to a trial before the director, and that he produce a certificate of his standing and exhibit also a specimen of Latin composition. Every member is at liberty to take part in several classes at the same time; and he can also receive premiums in two classes, but not in more, at once. He cannot however enjoy the regular stipend as *senior* in more than one class. For admission into the fifth or practical class, it is necessary to hand in a German dissertation upon some theological subject, and a certificate of standing and of a two years' course at a university; and

* To these Professor Bernhardt is now joined. Ed.

further to undergo an examination before the director, in case the applicant is not supplied with a testimonial of having been a member, in good standing, of one of the first four classes. If he be thus provided, he enjoys a decided preference before all others in cases of competition.

Besides the literary and scientific advantages which accrue to the members of this institution, they enjoy also the following aids and privileges, for their excitement and advancement in their studies.

a) For stipends and premiums for the members of the exegetical classes, there is set apart semi-annually the sum of 57½ rix dollars (\$40); for the same purposes in the other three classes, the sum of 75 rix dollars (\$52 50). Of these sums the *senior* of the class for the time being receives 12½ rix dollars (\$8 75) as a half yearly stipend in advance; and the remainder is divided out as premiums to the authors of the best dissertations; in such a way, however, that never less than four, nor more than eight, premiums are given in one class.

b) In the distribution of other stipends established by the royal bounty, special regard is had to the members of the seminary.

c) Upon the particular recommendation of a director of the seminary, they can further have permission to visit the university library daily in the forenoon; and they are then also relieved from the limitation to which other students are subject, viz. that they can take from the library only one book at a time. The library of the seminary is exclusively appropriated to their use.

d) On leaving the university, their participation in the seminary and their contributions as members of it, are entered in their testimonials under a separate head.

III.

Of some other Institutions for study and practice, either directly intended for Theological Students, or particularly useful to them.

1.

The *public worship* of the university is held every second Sunday during the continuance of the lectures, under the direction of Prof. Marks, the university preacher.* Besides the

* Prof. Tholuck has since been appointed second university preacher, and officiates half the time. Ed.

general object and tendency of this exercise, to promote the common edification and the advancement of pure religion and morality among all the students, it may also be considered as a model and means of instruction for future preachers. In this view too may be recommended the homiletic and catechetical *society* established by Licent. Franke, for the purpose of exercise in these branches.

2.

Since the year 1792 there has been read annually, by the members of the theological faculty alternately, a course of public lectures founded by the deceased Lenz, Inspector at Hornburg near Halberstadt, and called the *Institutum Lenzianum*. The object of this course is to discuss such topics as lead to a more accurate understanding, judgment, and defence of the Holy Scriptures, and especially the historical part of them; or such also as have a near relation to the other courses of lectures.*

3.

For the excitement and reward of those theological students, who are distinguished for diligence and extent of knowledge, the theological faculty have, since 1800, given out subjects for *prize dissertations*. These are selected with reference to exegetical, historical, and systematic theology; and are always published on the black board † immediately after the 12th of January and 12th of July, on which days the dean of the faculty is changed. Up to the time limited, the dean receives the dissertations that may be offered, which must be composed in Latin and accompanied by a sealed paper containing the name of the

* Lenz had been a chaplain in the army, and was so struck with the prevalence, among the common soldiers, of profane mockery and a perversion of the narratives of Scripture, that he afterwards left a small fund for a course of public lectures at Halle, the object of which should be to prepare theological students to defend the Scriptures against this species of attack. The fund, if I am rightly informed, amounts to about \$21 per annum. The spirit of the foundation is however now so much neglected, that when Gesenius read the *Institutum Lenzianum* in 1827, he took for his subject Syriac Grammar. Ed.

† This is a large board painted black, on which all public notices are exposed. This arrangement is common to all the universities. Ed.

writer. They are then examined by the whole faculty, and the prizes adjudged to the two best. The first prize is 30 rix dollars (\$21); the second, 20 rix dollars (\$14).—At the same time there is also a homiletical prize. The sermons are examined by Prof. Marks, and the prize adjudged accordingly by the faculty.—Besides these the king has established, since 1824, a prize in each of the first three faculties, and two in the philosophical. The subjects are made known on the 3d of August in each year;* and the dissertations are to be given in by the 1st of the following May. The distribution of the prizes, each of 50 rix dollars (\$35), takes place on the next 3d of August. Should other dissertations be thought worthy of a smaller prize, they may receive 25 and sometimes 15 rix dollars.

4.

To the students of theology may also be recommended the private societies established by several of the university teachers; as that for philology by Prof. Reisig; for history by Prof. Voigtel, and also by Prof. Kruse;† and for mathematics by Prof. Scherk.

5.

Inasmuch as a knowledge of the French language is now commonly required of private teachers in families, students are recommended to attend the public lectures and exercises of Prof. Blanc,‡ and of the Abbé Masnier the French instructor. A certain number of students, in each semester, may take part in these *gratis*.

6.

In a similar view, the public instruction and exercises in the arts of drawing and painting, under the direction of Professors Prange and Weise, are worthy of attention. It is only necessary to ask the permission of these professors. The latter also exhibits the cabinet of engravings once a week.

* The birthday of the present king of Prussia. ED.

† Since the death of Reisig and the departure of Kruse to Dorpat, the societies under their care, which were merely private undertakings, have been discontinued. Similar ones, however, are often established by the professors and by private teachers. ED.

‡ Professor of the modern European languages and literature.

7.

For the promotion of a direct personal knowledge of the productions of nature, the cabinet of natural history under the care of Prof. Nitzsch is exhibited once a week ; and in like manner the cabinet of minerals, under the charge of Prof. Germar.

8.

For preparatory exercise in the instruction of the young, there are few cities that present so many opportunities as Halle. In the principal city school and in the German school of the orphan house, between sixty and seventy teachers are constantly employed. It is moreover, in this latter case, not an indispensable regulation, that they must reside in the orphan house. Besides this, whoever recommends himself to the directors of that establishment by his diligence, extent of acquirements, and good habits, can in like manner obtain the privilege of giving one or more lessons daily, when vacancies occur among the permanent instructors.—There are also several private institutions, in which quite a number of students find employment.

9.

For exercise in preaching there is frequent opportunity, both in the churches of the city and those of the adjacent country. For this purpose, it is necessary to obtain the permission of one of the Superintendents residing here, and submit to his inspection the sermon intended to be delivered.

10.

Opportunity for acquiring a general knowledge of books, and for the use of the more rare and costly works, is furnished here by three public libraries.

1. *The University Library.* This is open twice a week, Wednesdays and Saturdays, from one to three o'clock, P. M. Whoever wishes to take out books, must write the title of each upon a separate piece of paper [of the octavo form and size] and then apply to a professor *ordinarius* of one of the faculties, who knows him personally, for his signature and *cavet* [security]. He must then follow exactly the regulations, which are fixed up at the entrance of the library.

2. The library adjacent to St. Mary's church, on the market place, is usually open on Mondays from 11 to 12 o'clock.

3. *The Orphan House Library.* This is open twice a week to all; and public notice of the particular days is given every semester. In order to take out books, whoever is not personally known to the librarian, must produce a permission from the director of the orphan house. The library of the pedagogical seminary is in the same room.

Opportunity is also presented for reading the literary and scientific journals; with which, in the present state of learning, no one ought to be unacquainted. Indeed, no student can be considered excusable, who does not regularly read at least one of the literary gazettes and some of the theological journals; although on the other hand, while his judgment is not yet ripe, he should take care not to dissipate his mind by too great variety.

IV.

Information respecting several academical regulations and institutions.

1.

Most of the prescribed regulations and statutes of the university are, from the very commencement of the university course, applicable alike to theological and to other students. Such are the following.

1. Every student must be furnished with the regular testimonial, from that preparatory school in which he has been educated.

2. If for satisfactory reasons he has not undergone the regular school examination, he must submit himself to an examination before the commission in the university appointed by the government; inasmuch as any participation in the stipends, is made to depend on the certificate of his qualifications.* The time of this examination is made known publicly.

3. The student on his arrival reports himself, in the hours designated upon the black board, to the dean of the philosophical faculty, and receives the *signum depositionis*. He then reports himself to the prorector of the university for matriculation; from whom he receives a copy of the university laws. In the case of those who come from other universities, the former regulation falls away.

4. The academical *triennium* still remains fixed; and all

* For the character of these testimonials, see No. II. of this work, p. 207. Ed.

the prescriptions formerly established in this respect, have been renewed by the government.

5. Those students who wish to obtain access to a *free table*,* must follow the directions from time to time published by the overseers of the same; especially in regard to the certificates of their indigence, diligence, etc. Towards the end of each semester, the overseers give public notice, at what time

* *Freytisch*, a table, or sort of commons, supported by funds, or charitable contributions, to which indigent students are admitted, either wholly, or for a part of the time. The following is the usual mode of living practised by the students, and also by such professors and teachers as have not families of their own. In all the university cities, there are furnished lodgings to be let in private houses, consisting usually of a parlour and bed room. The furniture is sometimes quite handsome; and a sofa is a necessary part of it. Lodgings of course are of different prices, according to their size and elegance; and in the smaller cities are commonly not let for a shorter term than six months. In Berlin and Leipsic they can be hired by the month. The price of good lodgings of this sort in Göttingen is from \$25 to \$35 for half a year, including the attendance of servants. In Halle, where the accommodations are less good, the price varies from \$15 to \$25. In Berlin a good room, etc. may usually be had for \$10 a month; and sometimes at a less rate. The student is served with coffee every morning in his room by the servants, at whatever hour he may choose; and also with tea in the like manner at evening. The servants are also expected to do his errands. An account is kept of the cost of his tea, coffee, etc. which it is usual to settle once a week. Dinner is a separate affair. He may either have it brought from an eating house, and so dine in his own room; or he may go out to dine, which is the more usual course. *Restaurateurs*, or eating houses, are every where to be found; and he may dine as he pleases at an expense of from 8 cents up to \$1 or more; wine however being included in the last estimate. A very usual charge in ordinary but good houses, where one dines regularly, is 4 gro-schen, or 12½ cents. At the *table d'hôte* in larger and more expensive hotels, the price is 10 rix dollars a month, exclusive of wine; or about 25 cents per day.—The *free tables* above alluded to, furnish of course only dinners.

The occupying of a room in a private house, in this way, brings a person into no sort of connexion with the family. The mode of *boarding* in a private family, so common with us, is there almost unknown; and is a privilege granted only in extraordinary cases, and as a very great favour. Ed.

applications are to be handed in to the inspector ; and in like manner the time of the examination, and also the subsequent decision, are publicly made known ; and the regulations in regard to the free tables, are put into the hands of all those admitted to them.

6. Applications for stipends and other pecuniary aids, are to be made to the Curator Witzleben.* So far however as these stipends or aids arise from Wittemberg funds, application is to be made for them to Prof. Gruber. But the number of applicants is usually so very great, that all of them cannot be received ; and very few can hope to obtain any important aid.

7. For admission to the free table established, during the winter months only, by the late Prof. Vater, application must be made to Prof. Marks, before the beginning of the lectures. None can be admitted here on any condition, except those who, besides the certificate of their indigence, exhibit evidence of their private diligence by taking part in some one of the seminaries or societies above mentioned, where examinations, disputations, or other exercises, constitute the objects of attention.

2.

In particular reference to theological students, the following are the regulations of law and custom.

1. On his arrival every theological student, after matriculation, reports himself to the dean of the theological faculty, to have his name entered in the faculty register. On this occasion he receives a copy of these directions *gratis*, in order to be made acquainted with that, which every one ought to know at the commencement of his course.

2. Whoever stands in need of a faculty certificate, in order to obtain a stipend, writes upon a folded sheet of paper his name at length, his residence, how long he has studied, and the lectures he has already heard. This sheet he first brings to the professors whose lectures he has heard, with the request that they will add their testimony in the margin. He then brings it, with his *Anmeldebogen*,† to the dean of the theologi-

* Since resigned. His duties are now performed by the prorector and the university judge. ED.

† This is the sheet on which all the lectures which a student attends are entered, and certified by the respective professors. ED.

cal faculty, who certifies the genuineness of the signatures and adds the faculty seal.

3. When any student needs merely a private certificate, he has only to bring to the instructor from whom he wishes it, along with his *Anmeldebogen*, a sheet of paper on which are written his full name, residence, time of his sojourn at the university, and the course or courses of lectures which he has heard from the said instructor.

4. In regard to attendance upon the lectures, the following is proper to be borne in mind.

a) Every one who wishes to hear any course of lectures, is bound to make this known to the professor or teacher *before* the commencement of the same, in the hours designated upon the black board. Should he happen to arrive later, or be returning from a journey, he is expected to call upon the professor in like manner, before he begins to attend the course.

b) Those only who thus announce themselves at the proper time, can expect to receive the professor's attestation of their attendance.

c) Private courses of lectures therefore, leaving the attestation out of view, can be attended by those who have not thus called on the professor, only until the subscription paper has been circulated.† By this previous annunciation and subscription, the student pledges himself to a regular attendance and to the payment of the fee, in case this latter is not remitted.

d) Those students who are compelled from indigence to ask a remission in whole or in part of the professor's fee, must apply for the same on their first visit to the professor, producing at the same time the proper testimonials from the schools and also in regard to their indigence; and binding themselves moreover to future payment, if required, by a note of hand.

e) The proper form and character of a certificate of indigence, is prescribed in the printed regulations on this subject.

f) Whoever is not furnished with such a certificate must, according to the present regulations, pay the customary fee in advance; or he may request permission of the instructor to defer it for three months. If it be not paid in this interval, the whole

* This takes place usually two or three weeks after the commencement of the lectures. The paper is laid before every person present; who is expected either to sign it, or no longer to attend the lectures.

affair is put into the hands of the university quaestor ; of whose services, moreover, every professor is at liberty to avail himself at the outset, if he pleases.

g) The payment, delay, or remission of the fee, is also entered on the *Anmeldebogen* ; and the making out of the final university testimonial presupposes and includes a conscientious examination of this point.

5. In order to obtain the requisite testimonial from the faculty at the end of the university course, it is necessary to hand over to the dean a Latin *curriculum vitae*, a complete list of all the courses of lectures attended under instructors in the theological faculty, (those of each instructor upon a separate sheet,) the certificate of admission, and the *Anmeldebogen* on which are the certificates of the several instructors. The dean lays all these before the faculty ; who then make up their decision in regard to the applicant, according to their personal knowledge of his habits and diligence. It is necessary that the applicant appear personally before the faculty, in order that each professor may distinctly recognize him. Those instructors who are not members of the faculty, are requested to note down also their judgment in regard to the courses which the applicant has heard from them. In accordance with all these results, the *testimonium facultatis* is made out, including a specification of these latter lectures.

6. The course which a student must adopt at the end of his university life, in order to obtain the academical *testimonium morum*, and also the certificate of the philosophical faculty which he must lay before the prorector, is pointed out in the printed regulations above referred to (4. e). In those regulations it is also said, that according to the express directions of the government, every application for the necessary testimonials on leaving the university, must be made in person.

7. In order that the decisions of the faculty may not be too hurried, every student, except in extraordinary cases, must make a written application at least eight days before the time of making out the testimonials.

8. Should any student wish the support of the faculty, in an application to the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs for admission into the theological seminary at Wittenberg, he must make his wish known to the dean of the faculty, before the end of May in order to enter at Michaelmas, and before the end of September for admission at Easter.

9. Whoever wishes to obtain, at his departure, a recommendation for a place as an instructor in a public school or in a family, will do well to apply in writing, some months beforehand, to some member of the faculty, and state to him the course of his university life, his supposed attainments in languages, sciences, and the arts, and in what manner he has prepared himself for becoming an instructor of youth. Regard will then be had to this application, according to the circumstances; and the opportunity for such a recommendation is seldom wanting.

10. Those who wish to undergo here the *examen pro schola*, which is necessary in order to become an instructor in any school of learning, must apply to the director of the commission appointed by the government, from four to six weeks at least previous to their departure from the university.

APPENDIX.

The *Pedagogical Seminary*, which was formerly connected with the theological, retains for the present its usual organization. The object of it is the education of future teachers of schools, either of the higher order, or for the middle and lower classes. The director is the Chancellor and Senior Professor Niemeyer, with whom Professor Jacobs* acts as assistant director.

The director nominates the members. These are appointed without any regard to their circumstances as to property; but are selected only with reference to their diligence, talents, and unblemished moral character, as personally known to the director, or as certified to him by credible testimonials.

The business of the seminary is conducted by the director and his assistant, and consists alternately of theoretical lectures and practical exercises. Questions relative to teaching are discussed; disputations upon doubtful points in the various methods of education and instruction are held; extracts from the best writers are read and reviewed; and exercises in declamation are also held and criticised. Whoever frequents the seminary two years, either as a member or candidate for member-

* Both of these gentlemen are since dead. This seminary, and indeed the subject of *pedagogical* instruction in general, constituted a sort of hobby with the venerable Niemeyer. It is not known, whether the seminary still exists in the same form. Ed.

ship, will have the opportunity in this interval of taking part in all these different exercises.

The director has also charge of the library of the seminary, and it is his duty to see that it is well preserved and augmented. At present it is in the same room with the library of the orphan house, and open at the same hour. Books can be taken out only by order of the director or his assistant.

The following are the regulations in regard to the members.

1. There are twelve *ordinary* members; and also other *preparatory* members or candidates, *auscultatores*, whose number is indefinite, and depends on the circumstance, whether there are more or fewer who wish to join the seminary. All these latter may take part in the exercises; and have the preference over other competitors for all vacant places, on condition of distinguished diligence, skill, and good conduct.

2. The ordinary members can excuse themselves from no species of exercises, which may be required of them by the director or his assistant. The candidates have here more liberty. But their actual reception into the seminary, depends mainly on their voluntary labour and activity.

3. No one can be received as an ordinary member, before the close of the first year of his university course.

4. There may be two *seniors* of the seminary. But these places are only filled, when individuals are found who are particularly distinguished as teachers of youth, and especially for the extent and scientific nature of their knowledge in the department of education and instruction; and who may thus hold out the promise, either of being useful in promoting the further progress of their fellow students, or of qualifying themselves to become academical theologians, or principals of the higher schools and seminaries for teachers; and on this account may wish to prolong their residence at the university.

5. A senior receives 50 rix dollars (\$35) a year, in quarterly payments. Members of the first rank receive 40 rix dollars (\$28) annually; and those of the second, 30 rix dollars (\$21).

6. New members can be admitted regularly only at the beginning of a semester. If however a place becomes vacant in the interval, it may be filled.

7. Two members, or candidates, are entitled to lodgings free of rent in the house of the director or elsewhere.

ART. II. ON THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE GREEK
STYLE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Henry Planck, Professor of Theology in the University of Gottingen. Translated from
the Latin by the Editor.

PRELIMINARY NOTICE.

THE following article is a translation of the celebrated *Commentatio de vera Natura atque Indole Orationis Graecae Novi Testamenti*; which, in this short compass, has contributed more to illustrate and fix the character of the New Testament Greek, than any other work that has ever appeared. It was first published in 1810, on occasion of the author's becoming Professor Extraordinary in Göttingen; and was afterwards reprinted in the *Commentationes Theologicae* of Rosenmueller, Leips. 1825. The author is the son of G. J. Planck, also a professor in Göttingen, who has long been distinguished in Germany as an ecclesiastical historian. The younger Planck was born in 1785, was educated in his native university, became afterwards Repe- tent at the same time with Gesenius, was made Professor Extraordinarius in 1810, and Ordinarius in 1823. The present article then was written when he was twenty-five years of age; and a fairer pledge of future usefulness and celebrity has rarely been held out. It was the plan of the author to pursue his inquiries farther, and to embody the results of them in a work to be entitled: *Isagoge Philologica in N. T.* i. e. 'A Philological Introduction to the New Testament.' After the appearance of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon in 1812, his publisher applied to him to prepare a similar lexicon of the New Testament. This however he declined, thinking it more judicious to confine himself entirely to the Old Testament; but recommended warmly the younger Planck, as peculiarly qualified for such a work. It was therefore proposed to him and undertaken; and he has ever since been nominally engaged in it. But the fair fruits of early promise have all been blasted by repeated and habitual attacks of epilepsy, under which both body and mind have sunk into decrepitude; and it is only with feelings of unmingled sadness, that one can behold him in his lecture-room; whence not unfrequently he must be carried out in a fit. A few articles, as specimens of his projected lexicon, have occasionally been published; some of which we may here-

after present to our readers ; but the work itself has made little progress. The writer was informed by Gesenius, who had recently seen the collections and preparations which the author has made for it, that they all amount to little, and would be comparatively of no value in other hands. Indeed, Planck has published nothing of importance for the last ten years.

This is not the proper place to enter into an account of the contest, which was so long carried on in regard to the character of the Greek style of the New Testament ; which contest the present article seems to have put completely at rest. It is however within the Editor's plan, to give at some future time a history of this controversy. In the mean time the reader may be referred to Winer's *Grammatik*, 3d Ed. p. 11 seq. and p. 18; Amer. Ed. Planck's *Einleitung in d. theol. Wissensch.* II. p. 43 seq. Morus' *Hermeneut.* ed. Eichstadt. I. p. 216 seq.

The way first laid open by Planck in the following essay, has been followed out to a great extent by Winer, in his well known *Grammar of the New Testament*. Still the objects of these two writers are different. It was the design of the former to point out the *elements* of the later Greek as found in the New Testament, so far only as they relate to single words and forms of words ; and since he expressly excludes the Syntax, it is obvious that his plan embraces only those points which belong, not to grammar, but properly to the lexicon. Of course, out of the eight classes into which he divides the traces of the later language in the New Testament, only the *third* and *fourth*, which embrace the differences of *flexion* and *gender*, fall within the province of the grammarian. The main object of Winer was, upon the elementary materials thus collected by Planck, and augmented by his own long continued researches, to erect a grammatical system of the later Greek as exhibited in the New Testament ; including of course the deviations as to the form and flexion of words, but having regard chiefly to the syntax, or at least to the use of words in connexion, as well as to the structure of sentences. The first work of Winer on the subject appeared in 1823, and was translated and published by Prof. Stuart and the Editor in 1825. Another edition of the original appeared in Germany in 1826, which was soon followed by a second volume of *Excursus* on some of the more important topics of the work. In 1830 a *third* edition was published, in which both the former volumes are united,

and the subjects reduced to their proper order. In this edition the author has also given the further results of his continued studies; and especially those flowing from an attentive and systematic perusal of all the later Greek writers.—It is not too much to say, that the labours of Planck and Winer have produced an entire revolution of opinion in regard to the language of the New Testament; and have placed the character of it in a light so strong and definite, that its general features can no longer be mistaken or perverted.

At the close of the following article are annexed, by way of appendix, some remarks of Planck on the proper mode of conducting the lexicography of the New Testament. They are too valuable not to be generally known; while the *programm* to which they are prefixed, is not of a nature to interest the public generally. And in order to lay before the reader the whole subject of the Greek language at once, I have inserted in a subsequent article a spirited “View of the Greek Language and its Dialects,” from Buttmann’s larger Greek Grammar. It will be seen that his views coincide with and elucidate those of Planck and Winer.

EDITOR.

ON THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE GREEK STYLE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

Introduction.

There have been many writers on the subject of the Greek style of the New Testament; but their works, of course, are not all deserving of the same degree of estimation. Since the time when Henry Stephens, in just as it would seem rather than

* In regard to the marginal references appended to this article, the Editor has preferred to let them remain as in the original. Since the date of its first publication, the excellent edition of Phrynichus by Lobeck, has appeared; but as this is accompanied by a very complete index, it was thought better not to change the references, which are now adapted to the edition of De Pauw; because, by so doing, those who possess the earlier edition would have no good clue to guide them, while those who have the edition of Lobeck will find every facility in the index. So also with regard to the *Etymologicum Magnum*, and particularly Josephus; of whom there are perhaps more copies in this country in the Cologne edition, (the one quoted by pages,) than in that of Havercamp or Oberthür. Ed.

in earnest, pronounced the diction of the Scriptures of the New Testament to be pure Greek, and comparable in elegance even with the Attic, theologians know that there have ever been philologists, who have called in question this purity and inviolable chastity of the Greek of the New Testament. The contest has been long and attended with various success on both sides. In the course of the struggle, little attention has been paid to any correct explanation of the thing itself in question; for those who have tried their strength on this arena, have always attempted to shew, that the diction of the sacred authors was either wholly good Greek, or wholly barbarous and mixed up with Hebraisms. Those who maintained the former opinion, supposed they could not better accomplish their purpose and repel the charge of Hebraism, than by adducing from the profane writers, and chiefly from the poets, those passages which, either in the sense of the words, or in the composition, or in the construction, might seem in some manner reducible to the same appearance of Hebrew idiom. It was a more easy task for those who held the contrary opinion, to shew that the language of the New Testament is corrupted by many Hebraisms. But they too satisfied themselves, with merely pointing out in the sacred books that which is foreign to the genius of good Greek, and which may be referred to oriental usage. Hence it has arisen, that the whole controversy being thus brought to bear solely on the Hebrew colouring with which the diction of the sacred writers is tinged, the point which is of most importance for the correct interpretation of the sacred volume, was wholly left out of view, viz. the nature and character of that later Greek, which arose and flourished from the time of Alexander the Great, and of which so many traces are discoverable in the diction of the New Testament; though not without the trouble of laborious investigation. There are only three writers,¹ who have treated of the common language of the Greek in the periods after the destruction of Grecian liberty, whose labours can be cited with approbation. The first is Salmasius, who in his *Commentationes de Lingua Hellenistica*, and other works, has discussed the subject at large and elegantly. Fischer is the second, who deserves and receives even at this day the thanks of all theologians, for the aid which

¹ One work which Sturz quotes I have not been able to inspect, viz. Ge. Guil. Kirchmaieri Dissert. de Dial. Græcor. communi, Viteb. 1709, 4to.

he has afforded towards the correct interpretation of the sacred books in his *Prolusiones de Vitiis Lexicorum N. T.* To these a third has lately joined himself, viz. the learned Sturz, in his work *De Dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina*,² in which he has collected with great diligence and judgment the remains of this later language from the ancient sources.

Nevertheless—and I wish to say it without arrogance—the subject in question seems to me not yet to have been developed by these three writers, with all the accuracy and fulness of which it is susceptible. For in regard to Salmasius, although he entered upon the right way, and well observed that after the subjugation of the Grecian cities by the Macedonians the dialects which had formerly prevailed separately, now coalesced; and that thence there arose a mixed or common language, which passed over also into the foreign provinces subdued by the Macedonians; yet, nevertheless, he paid little attention to the nature and character of this common language, which is the foundation of the sacred Hellenism; but thought it enough to shew, in opposition to the followers of D. Heinsius, who made of the language of the New Testament a peculiar dialect, that whatever is common to all and brought together from all the dialects, can no longer be regarded as being itself a peculiar dialect. Fischer advanced farther. Following up the beginning of Salmasius, he endeavoured to shew by examples, that the diction of the Macedonians and Alexandrians, which after the times of Alexander began to prevail in common life and intercourse, differed much from the more ancient language, whose force and elegance are still visible in the works of Attic writers now extant. It is understood not to have been the purpose or wish of this author, to investigate fully those things in the language of the sacred writers, which approach nearer to the character of this later idiom. This fuller and more accurate investigation, although exceedingly desirable, could not well be expected of him in accordance with his plan. But there is also another thing wanting in him, which I would estimate as of no less moment, viz. an historical exposition of the causes and progress by which all the Grecian dialects became thus intermingled and confounded; for it is only by such an exposition, that the internal character and the prevalence of this later idiom can be rightly understood. In regard to the plan of Sturz, we have

² Lips. 1808.

given our opinion in another place, which it is not necessary here to repeat. He seems to us to have erred chiefly in this point, viz. that he has endeavoured to reduce this later mode of speaking to certain appearances characteristic of a dialect; and in this way has wished to constitute a peculiar Alexandrine dialect; an attempt which all see to be in itself impossible, who have had any right perception of the nature and origin of this common language.

There are also many other things peculiar to the later language, which have not yet been noted by interpreters, and which nevertheless are of such a nature, as to mark particularly the difference between the later diction and the good or Attic Greek. To this class we may refer, first, many *words* and *forms* of words in the New Testament, in which the later *usus loquendi* prefers a remodelling or change of form; examples of which however occur nowhere in approved Greek writers, but are often found in those authors who flourished after the times of Alexander. In respect to such instances, although it may not always be possible to judge with perfect accuracy in each particular case, whether a word or form first came into use at a later or an earlier period; yet by examining all the sources of which we are permitted to avail ourselves, we shall not be altogether destitute of some criterion, by which to distinguish with a great degree of probability the period, to which any such word or form belongs.

Another characteristic of the common language, which in like manner has been hitherto overlooked by all the writers on the Hellenism of the New Testament, lies in the use of those *tenses* and *moods* of verbs, which Attic writers have wholly avoided; either because of some harshness of sound by which the ear was offended, or on account of some ambiguity of sense by which they might interfere with other forms of similar sound, or from other causes which this is not the place to treat of more fully. Many examples of this kind might be adduced from the New Testament, which are not found in approved writers, e. g. *ἔζησα*, *ἐγέννησα*, *ἀκούσω*, *ἀμαρτήσω*, *ἐλευσομαι*, *δώη*, etc. and all these must be brought into the account, if we would rightly understand and estimate the genius and character of the later language.

Nor is less diligence and accuracy requisite in the investigation of the *Syntax* of the later diction; in which, if we look only to the use of the particles and to the employment of the

moods and tenses of verbs, we shall find many things which the more elegant writers have entirely rejected.

To have here suggested these things, is surely not superfluous. The interpreter of the New Testament who desires to be regarded as prepared and 'thoroughly furnished' for his work, must be acquainted with all those particulars, in which the style of the sacred writers differs from the pure Attic diction; and this he can never be, unless the character and *usus loquendi* of this later language be ascertained with the greatest possible degree of accuracy.—I pass over other particulars of the same nature, especially new significations of words, which frequently occur, and in defining which more attention and exactness are still desirable.

All these things however would occasion less difficulty, were it not for the almost incredible negligence of many interpreters, who even to the present day have paid no regard to this whole subject in their attempts to explain the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament. Many are ignorant both of the origin and nature of that Greek idiom, in which, in addition to the vestiges of the Aramaean language, the sacred Hellenism principally consists; they are ignorant of the criteria and marks by which it is distinguished from the Attic diction, which alone is taught in the schools and in grammatical books; they are ignorant in short of the sources,—and are therefore incapable of estimating them,—whence that *usus loquendi* is chiefly drawn, to which, as to a supreme law, all the grammatical relations of the New Testament are to be referred.

I could here easily multiply examples of such negligence, were it not that I wish to spare time and paper. A few therefore may suffice, which lie near at hand. Doubts have very recently been started respecting the authenticity of the first epistle to Timothy;³ and one ground of doubt among others has been drawn from a multitude of words, which, except in this epistle, are not found in the writings of Paul. How little the epistle in question differs in this respect from the other epistles of Paul, we have abundantly shewn elsewhere; but then the author of this doubt would never have fallen upon this species of argument, had he sufficiently comprehended the nature and extent of that later *usus loquendi*, of which a tendency to

³ Schleiermacher, Sendschreiben über den sogenannten ersten Brief an den Timotheus, Berlin 1807.

employ new words and forms of words must be regarded as the chief characteristic.—Still greater errors have been committed in regard to single words, and in establishing the sense of them, by interpreters who have failed to perceive the true character of the sacred Hellenism. Thus the same learned writer, who has called in question the genuineness of the first epistle to Timothy, has preferred to understand the verb *παιδεύειν* 1 Tim. 1: 20, in the sense of *teaching*, instead of *chastising, punishing*.⁴ But it was not only understood in this latter sense by the fathers, but was thus employed throughout in the common idiom of the later age, as is testified by Phavorinus and by all the books now extant written in this common dialect. I pass over the sentiment which the apostle intended to express, and which seems to admit only the interpretation of the fathers; but who would doubt, even though the other explanation may not be without a pertinent sense, that the *usus loquendi* of the later period ought to be preferred before that which the Grecian classic writers have followed?—In a similar manner Paulus has made a mistake in his Commentary on the passage Mark 15: 43. His words are quoted below.⁵ It would seem hardly possible to err more widely, than he has here done. Who does not see, that the object of the Grammarians was to vindicate the more ancient meaning of the word *εὐσχήμων*, which obtained among Attic writers, against the practice of the common people, who had begun to employ it in reference to riches and wealth. The words of Phrynichus leave no doubt: *εὐσχήμων τούτο μὲν οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ πλουσίου, καὶ ἐν ἀξιώματι ὄντος τάττουσιν. οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπὶ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ συμμέτρου.* ‘The common people apply

⁴ Ibid. p. 37, 59.

⁵ Commentar Th. III. p. 863. “*εὐσχήμων*, not *wealthy*, (against this are the express declarations of Suidas, Phrynichus, Etym. Mag.) but rather *respected, honestus, honourable*, Rom. 13: 13. Sept. Prov. 11: 25 *οὐκ εὐσχήμων, who does not behave well.*” I wonder how any one could write thus, who understands the manner of the Grammarians so well as Paulus does; as appears from a passage in the same Commentary, Th. II. p. 825. “This very judgment [of Eustath.] induces us to prefer *ἐννάτην* as the orthography of the Palestine Greeks; just as any word which is marked as inelegant by the scholiasts, so often quoted in this connexion by Wetstein, is ever to be regarded as the regular one in the Alexandrine Greek, and still more in the Palestine Greek of the New Testament.”

εὐσχήμων to one who enjoys wealth and consideration; the ancients used it of beauty and symmetry.⁷ And that Suidas and the author of the *Etymologicum Magnum* did not mean any thing else, is clear in itself.⁶ Where then are we to rank the sacred writers, and by what law are we to judge of their style? Are they not to be classed among the *ἀμαθῆς*, whom Phrynichus charges with having changed the primitive sense of this word, and transferred it to other objects? Hence it of course follows, that their language is to be referred, not to the laws of Attic diction, but to the later and common mode of speaking; and that we are to look in their writings not so much for what the Grammarians may have approved, as for what they have disapproved. In this example moreover, there is another consideration which serves to strengthen the charge of negligence against the commentator. In the parallel passage, Matt. 27: 57, we find: *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας*. Hence it is to be inferred, that in the Aramaean gospel which the three first evangelists seem to have had before them, there was a word expressing the notion of *opulence*, and therefore Mark could have applied *εὐσχήμων* to Joseph in no other sense.—To these we may add a third example, which occurs in the same Commentary.⁷ The words *τὰ γενέσια* Matt. 14: 6, the author chooses not to explain as meaning *birth-day*, because according to the Grammarians the Attics used *τὰ γενέθλια* to express this idea.⁸ But there occur innumerable instances in the writers of a later age, whom the Grammarians call *τοὺς κοινούς*, where they employ *τὰ γενέσια* in the sense of *birth-day*.⁹ There is therefore no sufficient reason, why we

⁶ Suidas: *εὐσχήμων οὐχ ὁ πολλὰ κεκτημένος καὶ πλούσιος, ἀλλ' ὁ κόσμος καὶ πειθόμενος τοῖς νόμοις καὶ συνιστῶν*.—*Etymol. Mag.* *εὐσχήμων ὁ κόσμος καὶ πειθόμενος τοῖς νόμοις. παρὰ τοῦτο ἡτέον, οὐχ ὁ πλούσιος καὶ πολλὰ κεκτημένος*.

⁷ Paulus Commentar Th. II. p. 61.

⁸ Phrynichus p. 18. *Γενέσια οὐκ ὀρθῶς τίθεται ἐπὶ τῆς γενεθλίου ἡμέρας· γενέσια γὰρ Ἀθηνησιν ἑορτὴ λέγειν οὐν δεῖ, τὰς γενεθλίους ἡμέρας, ἢ γενέθλια*. Thom. Mag. p. 186. *Etym. Mag.* p. 225, 230. Zonaras p. 430. Ammonius de *Differentia Vocab.* h. v. Hesych. Suidas.

⁹ Alciphron III. Ep. 18, 55. Dio I. 47. p. 385. I. 58. p. 688. Xiphilin. p. 230. *τὰ γενέσια*; Joseph. Ant. XII. 4. 7. *γενέσιος ἡμέρα*. The words of Phavorinus, *οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ γενέσια λέγουσι*, scil. for *γενέθλια*, are to be understood as spoken with reference to the later *usus loquendi*.

should here recede from the usual interpretation of this word ; an interpretation which, besides the aptness of the sense, would seem to be the more properly retained, because the same *usus loquendi* is frequently exhibited by other writers of the later age.

Thus far of interpretation. Nor have less important mistakes been made, in regard to the criticism of the text of the New Testament. These seem for the most part to have proceeded from an ignorance of the later orthography, and of several moods and tenses of the verb, which existed in the common idiom. Compare Matt. 25: 36, where the received text, which the edition of Griesbach as yet follows, exhibits the reading ἦλθετε, against the authority of the best manuscripts,¹⁰ all of which have ἦλθατε. This mode of forming the second aorist after the analogy of the first, is not only sufficiently frequent in the Septuagint ;¹¹ but is also distinctly attributed by the Grammarians to the later idiom. We know from Heraclides,¹² that it was in use among the Cilicians who spoke Greek ; from whom, as Sturz¹³ has already observed, it seems to have passed in their mutual intercourse to the Alexandrians. This single example, if there existed no other, is enough to admonish critics, how carefully they ought to investigate the nature and genius of the later language, and to collect all those things which are shewn by the testimony of the Grammarians or the constant usage of later writers, to have been peculiar to that idiom, both in regard to the forms and the construction of words. But there are not wanting other instances also, where for the same reasons the reading of manuscripts is to be preferred to the received text. In Acts 22: 7, instead of the usual ἔπεσον, the Codd. Alexandrinus, Laudianus, and some younger ones, read ἔπεσα, which Griesbach has not yet ventured to adopt. Without any doubt, however, it ought to be received as the genuine text ; for the transcribers have very frequently changed unusual forms of this sort, and substituted for them those which were employed in a purer style. For this reason such manu-

¹⁰ ABDFL. Mt. B.

¹¹ 1 K. 10: 14 εἶδαμεν. 2 K. 10: 14 εἶδαν and ἔφυγαν. 17: 20 εὔραν. 19: 42 ἐφάγαμεν. 23: 16 ἔλαβαν, etc.

¹² Cited by Eustath ad Od. ξ. p. 1759, 10.

¹³ De Dial. Alex. p. 62.

scripts have no weight of authority, although their number may be greater, if the vestiges of a more unusual reading are preserved in others, even if they be but few. Hence also we do not doubt but that in Acts 11: 28 we ought to read *λίμον μεγάλην* instead of the common *μέγαν*; for it is the reading of the best manuscripts,¹⁴ and is more unusual; since it appears from the Grammarians,¹⁵ that not the Attics but the Dorians made *ἡ λῖμος* in the feminine gender. And since many things have evidently passed from this Doric dialect into the common language of the Greeks, the same judgment is also to be held in respect to another passage, where in like manner an adjective of the masculine gender is joined with *λίμος*, viz. Luke 15: 14, *ἐγένετο λῖμος ἰσχυρός*, for which on the authority of manuscripts¹⁶ *ἰσχυρά* ought to be restored; for, if you hold the received reading to be genuine, it is not possible to comprehend how this other reading could have crept into the manuscripts.

In regard to the later orthography, we have a remarkable example in 1 Cor. 13: 2, where for the received *οὐδέν* not only very ancient manuscripts, but also some of the fathers,¹⁷ have *οὐθέν εἰμι*; a mode of writing very rarely found among the Attics, but frequent among the later Greeks, according to Phrynichus¹⁸ and Thomas Magister.¹⁹ The same holds true of another passage, viz. Matt. 17: 24, where several manuscripts, written in large characters,²⁰ have *τὰ διδράγμα*; which I hold to be the genuine orthography on the authority of Thomas Magister, who directs to write *δραχμήν, οὐ δραγμήν*,²¹ whence it appears, that the latter was current in the common language. Interpret-

¹⁴ AD** 27. 29. 40. Mt. d.

¹⁵ Phrynichus, p. 80. *Τὴν λῖμον Δωριεῖς, σὺ δὲ ἄρστικῶς τὸν λῖμον φάθει.* Phavorinus h. v. Etymol. Mag. p. 366, 10. Aelius Dionys. ap. Eustath. ad Od. α. p. 1390, 56.

¹⁶ ABDL. Veron. Corb. Vind.

¹⁷ ACI et alii. Clem. Ephr. Bas. Macar. Damasc. Oec.

¹⁸ Page 76. *Οὐθεῖς, διὰ τοῦ ϑ, εἰ καὶ Χρῆσιππος καὶ οἱ ἀμφ' αὐτὸν οὕτω λέγουσι, σὺ δὲ ἀποτρέπου λέγειν· οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι διὰ τοῦ θ λέγουσιν οὐθεῖς.* [See Lobeck ad loc.]

¹⁹ Pag. 661. In Thucyd. VI. 60, 66, many manuscripts exhibit *οὐδεῖς* instead of the printed *οὐθεῖς*.

²⁰ DEGHL. alii. Veron. German. 1. For. Corb. 2. cet.

²¹ Page 250. *Δραχμή, οὐ δραγμή.*

ers remark also, that it is found in Josephus,²² and in Hesychius in the various readings under *παχελη*. In regard to a third passage, where the true reading depends on the later orthography, I perceive that Fischer²³ has already given a decision. It is in Luke 2: 24, where the received text has *δύο νεοσσούς*; for which that learned author properly supposes the reading of several manuscripts²⁴ *νοσσούς* ought to be restored; inasmuch as the Grammarians shew, that the letter *ε* was omitted in this word by the later writers.

After these explanations, which are not far-fetched, but present themselves close at hand, it will easily be understood, that a full and accurate discussion of the common or later *usus loquendi* of the Greeks, so far as the vestiges of it exist in the sacred books, can by no means be regarded as foreign to our studies and object; but may on the contrary be of the highest use and advantage to those, who are occupied in explaining or illustrating the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament. Hence we have supposed it would not be inappropriate to the present place and time, to offer here some views and observations upon this whole subject. We propose therefore now to treat of the *nature and character of that later Greek idiom, of which very frequent traces are found in the New Testament.*

This discussion may be divided into two parts, viz. one, in which the origin and progress of this language shall be investigated, at what time and from what causes it arose, and from what sources it is to be made out; the other, in which those particulars in the diction of the sacred writers peculiar to that language, shall be brought into view and reduced to certain classes. Under each of these divisions we shall study the greatest possible brevity; since the subject is of such importance, that it would be utterly impossible to discuss it properly within the bounds to which this essay is necessarily limited; and since also we intend at a future day to do fuller justice to it, in a particular work to be entitled *Isagoge Philologica in Novum Testamentum*. For these reasons, we shall here dwell chiefly upon those things which have not been already noted by Fischer and Sturz, and the way in which we suppose they ought to be explained.

²² Page 622. C. 644. D.

²³ Proluss. de Vit. Lexicor. N. T. p. 676.

²⁴ BEGHS. alii.

PART I.

Origin and Progress of the later Greek Language.

Those who have undertaken to treat of the nature and character of the sacred Hellenism, ought in my opinion to have set out with the position, that the books of the New Testament are written, not in the cultivated and polished style of learned and elegant authors, but rather in that which prevailed in daily use and in the intercourse of common life. Nor would I except even Paul; for although by the reading of classic writers and especially the poets, he would appear to have added something of ornament and elegance to his style; yet he seems never to have paid sufficient attention to the grammatical study of the Greek language, to be ranked among the authors of classic reputation. In respect to the other sacred writers, the thing speaks for itself. To them, besides the common mode of speaking to which they were accustomed, a better or more classic style appears to have been unknown. Those then who have treated of this topic, should have begun with this common idiom; and those who neglected to do so, could not but fall into error. Indeed, without a careful examination of this whole ground, it is not possible to advance a step, either in the proper interpretation of words, nor in the correct designation of the sources for determining the *usus loquendi*. We then, in attempting to give a new exhibition of the style of the New Testament, must necessarily first of all turn our attention to this later language.

To investigate the nature of the Greek language of common life, such as it was in ancient times, is a work of great difficulty. It was not a uniform language, but on the contrary differed much among the different tribes; nor are there sources enough extant, from which a more accurate acquaintance with it can be drawn. Except the occasional observations of the Grammarians in which they mention the vulgar *usus loquendi*, and fragments of comic poets who employed the diction of ordinary life, we have only inscriptions and decrees of magistrates; which although they have come down to us complete, do not nevertheless illustrate every thing. Hence it has happened, that among those who in modern times have written on the diction of the New Testament, there have been none who have treated generally of the origin and nature of the common language prevalent at the time when the sacred authors flourished. And if

there have been any, who have observed in the New Testament traces of a later *usus loquendi*, they have been contented, either with adducing those passages of the Grammarians where a particular word or form is attributed to the later idiom; or with simply noting those things, of which they were not able to produce similar examples from classic authors. In the outset, therefore, we will here offer some general views in regard to this whole subject.

The ancient Grammarians, who have given precepts respecting the Ionic, Doric, Æolic, and Attic dialects, are, by the common consent of all, to be understood not of the common and familiar language of those tribes, but as referring to the diction of authors who cultivated their native dialects in their writings. The Grammarians have enumerated four dialects, not because the Greek language had no more diversities; but because they found these four only to be in use among writers. All their arguments respecting the nature and difference of these dialects, have been drawn from these writers. Hence it is a mistake to suppose, that from their precepts concerning the dialects of Greece, any information can be derived in respect to the language of the vulgar and its diversities. That many more dialects of tribes existed, we know from the testimony of Hesychius and others; who have noted many things appropriate to particular states, both in the forms of words and peculiarities of signification.—From all this it is apparent, as several distinguished writers of our times have already remarked, that the names of those four nations, under which all the tribes of Greece are frequently arranged, do not so much refer to the diversities of language that were current among them, as rather to the differences of origin that were ascribed to them, to the different methods in which their governments were administered, and to the social ties by which they were bound together, either through the bonds of relationship or the laws of the sovereign power. But we can only suggest this thought in passing, without pursuing it any further.

After the times of Alexander the Great, there occurred great changes both in the dialects of the tribes and in the language of writers. I begin with these latter. Before the subjugation of Greece, there were in all the tribes authors, who exhibited in their works the dialects and idioms of their own districts, and fashioned them for the general use of writers. I refer here to those who wrote in prose; for no one is now ignorant, that the poets,

even from the earliest times, neglected altogether the use of their native dialects, and adopted a diction which had been ennobled by illustrious examples in any particular class of poetry; or that, if they condescended to employ the language of their own district, they did not exhibit it in its purity, but augmented it by forms borrowed from the other dialects. But at the period referred to, the whole of Greece being now brought under the dominion of one conqueror, almost all writers began also to conform to one dialect. This was the Attic; which at that time was so remarkable for its elegance and for the multitude of distinguished writers who had employed it in their works, that it had come to be accounted the most polished language of Greece. Hence it was soon adopted as the general language of all written works; and every author supposed himself unable to obtain the praise of elegant diction, except in the Attic dialect.

This community of use, however, so far from adding any thing of elegance and splendor to the Attic tongue, was the source whence, through the carelessness of authors, the greatest blemishes were contracted. Indeed it was not possible, that all should follow with equal diligence and equal zeal the examples of the best writers; so as to avoid every thing which was peculiar either to the ancient dialects, or to the new *usus loquendi* which had begun to creep into the usage of common life and familiar intercourse. Hence the grammarians have given to this later diction employed by writers after the times of Alexander, the appellation *ἡ κοινή* or *Ἑλληνική*; both as being in common use among all, and as exhibiting a mixture and sprinkling of various dialects and idioms of speech. But these things I pass over, as being already well known. It was however requisite to mention them; because in estimating the sources from which the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament is to be determined, those writers whom the Grammarians call *οἱ κοῖνοι* are of more weight and authority, than those who have employed the pure and uncorrupted Attic diction. Nor, as we shall see in another place, are they to be regarded as unprofitable sources for investigating and defining the nature and character of the vulgar idiom, in which is contained the element of the sacred Hellenism.

The other change effected after the times of Alexander the Great, was in the dialects of the tribes; and this is particularly worthy of our attention, inasmuch as the whole investigation of the sacred Hellenism depends upon the language used among the common people. When Greece was deprived of its liber-

ties by the Macedonians, it was not possible but that the dialects which had hitherto obtained separately among the different tribes, should become intermingled with each other and corrupted. What formerly, when Greece was free, would have seemed probable to no one, viz. that states and cities entirely dissimilar in manners and customs, as well as in the laws and institutions inherited from their ancestors, should ever come to the common use of one uniform language,—this was now effected, along with the overthrow of the ancient forms of government, by the dominion of a foreign people. Many causes may be pointed out, as operating to produce this confusion of the dialects. First of all was the destruction of liberty; which, so long as it was preserved, contributed to prevent particular tribes from coming to a unity of language or of government, on account of their different rights, laws, and forms of public administration. But as it had already been usual for any nation which had obtained the sovereignty, to diffuse their own language among the subject tribes;²⁵ so now it was to be expected that the Macedonians, having widely extended their empire, would do the same thing. Alexander himself collected his armies out of every tribe and nation; and his successors in Europe, by their continual wars and the destruction of the more important states and cities, greatly augmented this confusion and amalgamation of the dialects. Thus much in Europe; nor was the case different in the regions out of Europe, to which the dominion of the Macedonians had been extended. Where every thing was held by force of arms, the language of the victorious nation in a short time necessarily prevailed; by no means pure indeed, but formed through this confluence and jumble of nations. Then too came the colonies recently established; either by Alexander himself, as Alexandria; or by his successors in the sovereignty of Asia, as Seleucia, Ctesiphon, Antioch. In these cities the Greek inhabitants were collected from every people and tribe, and had lost their own peculiar dialects; so that in Asia and Africa from this time onward, no pure and distinct dialect can be regarded as having any longer existed.

²⁵ So Strabo VII. p. 388, speaking of the empire of the Dorians in Peloponesus: *σχεδὸν δ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν κατὰ πόλεις ἄλλοι ἄλλως διαλέγονται· δοκοῦσι δὲ Δωριεῖν ἅπαντες διὰ τὴν συμβασαν ἐπικράτειαν.*

From these considerations it is obvious, what must have been the nature and character of that common language, which prevailed throughout all the Grecian provinces after the time of Alexander the Great. It had something from every quarter; and this variously compounded and mingled, according to the diversity of places and external circumstances; yet so that the dialect or language which had formerly obtained in a particular region, continued to serve as the basis of the new language in that region, and might be regarded as a corrupt dialect, deformed by many new accessions. So in Attica, where before the fall of Greece, the Attic dialect was prevalent, the new language abounded most in Atticisms; in Peloponesus and other places where the Dorians had exercised dominion, it admitted much from the Doric dialect. In every region, however, it had this common characteristic, viz. that it was composed from several dialects. Hence it is apparent, that after the time of Alexander, the term *dialect*, understood in its proper sense, could no longer be employed; and consequently there could strictly be no Alexandrian dialect. At Alexandria the common language was in use, tinged no doubt by many peculiarities both in its composition from the ancient dialects, and in certain new accessions which it had recently adopted. But the nature of a dialect has been defined by learned men to consist in this circumstance, viz. that it is a certain diversity or idiom of a common language, employed in some certain place and among some certain people, by which they are distinguished from other tribes or nations *of the same race*.²⁶ So also the ancient grammarians teach.²⁷ This being the fact, it is apparent that the language of the Alexandrine Jews, which a learned author has recently wished to call a dialect in this sense,²⁸ cannot be properly brought under that name; because the *χαρακτήρ ἔθνικός* is altogether wanting to it. They who used it were Jews by birth, not Greeks. But if, as likewise many have done

²⁶ Sturz de Dial. Macedon. et Alex. p. 18.

²⁷ Schol. Aristoph. ad Nub. 317. *διάλεκτός ἐστὶ γωνῆς χαρακτήρ ἔθνικός*.

²⁸ Sturz de Dial. Mac. et Alex. p. 22. "Certum igitur est, Judaeos istos peculiarem quodammodo certisque finibus circumscriptum, et ab aliis populis distinctum populum Alexandriae fuisse; neque adeo dubitari potest, quin eorum lingua dici recte *dialectus* possit."

in our age, the *χαρακτήρ ἑθνικός* being wholly left out of view, you apply the name of dialect simply to some diversity of language, whatever it may be ; then truly there existed many later dialects of the Greek ; more in number indeed than the ancient ones ; because, under the Macedonian dominion, a new idiom or *usus loquendi* arose in almost every place. But all these diversities of the later language, as I have already said, always preserved this one point of mutual resemblance, viz. that they intermingled every where the peculiarities of the ancient dialects among themselves in the most diverse modes, and added to them still new accessions. Vestiges of all the ancient dialects are found in the common language, except the Æolic ; which, it is probable, was in that age no longer extant in ordinary life and language. The fewest vestiges are found of the Ionic ; which seems at a still earlier period to have disappeared by degrees from the daily intercourse of life, or to have coalesced with the language of the Attics. But as this topic cannot be fully developed without extensive preparation, I am unable to pursue it further here.

In regard to the name of this later language, the Grammarians have left us no information. Nor was this to be expected from them ; inasmuch as in their commentaries their object was to treat only of the language of authors and of the learned. In our day, two names have been applied to this later idiom ; the one by Fischer, who calls it the *Macedonic and Alexandrian* dialect ;²⁹ the other by Sturz, who prefers the appellation *ἡ κοινή*, i. e. *the common*.³⁰ As to Fischer, in the first place, he seems to have thought the double name which he employs convenient, partly because it was in consequence of the Macedonian dominion that the dialects of Greece were thrown into confusion, which confusion gave birth to a new form of the language ; and partly because the Jews of Alexandria exhibited this new idiom in writings, with which we know the apostles and evangelists to have been well acquainted. The Macedonians, at an earlier period, before their invasion of Greece, made use of a peculiar language, having many coincidences with the ancient Doric dialect, as the Grammarians relate ; and hence the ancient Macedonic language ought to be distinguished from the new or later

²⁹ Proluss. de Vit. Lexicor. N. T. XXX. XXXI.

³⁰ De Dial. Mac. et Alex. pp. 19, 29, 52.

Macedonic. The appellation *Alexandrian* dialect is too circumscribed; and is not competent to express in its full extent that which ought to be included. From this name one might easily be led to suppose, what is in no sense true, that the common language had taken its rise from Alexandria. That the Alexandrine Jews did employ this idiom in written works is true; but we know that it was a style not accommodated to the use of writers, but only to the common people; and hence the name cannot be made to depend on those few authors who have employed it in their written works. Further, the name adopted by Sturz, as it seems to me, is wholly to be rejected. We have seen above, that the grammarians employed the term *ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος* in a different sense, viz. to designate not the ordinary language of common life which came into use after the time of Alexander; but rather the language of writers, who almost all endeavoured to conform themselves to the Attic.—We are not, however, solicitous about the name; it is enough to have explained the thing itself with perspicuity.

Thus far of the nature and character of the later language in general. We turn now to the sources, whence a knowledge of this later *usus loquendi* is to be derived. These we may divide into three kinds; according to their different use and importance, in enabling us to distinguish the character and peculiarities of the later tongue. The first embraces the writers who are called *οἱ κοῖνοι*, i. e. those who wrote after the age of Alexander, and among whom the first in order is Aristotle. From all these, however, there is not much to be gained for the illustration of the character and force of the later idiom, inasmuch as they all are to be regarded as having written in the Attic dialect; though certainly not in its pure and uncorrupted form, but in that, into which both many new words and many new meanings of words had already been introduced from the vulgar tongue. All these are indeed to be regarded as corruptions in the diction of the *κοῖνοι*; and are by no means to be neglected, by those who wish to investigate and ascertain the common *usus loquendi*. I omit to produce examples at present; they will offer themselves spontaneously in another place. I only add here, that these writers, *οἱ κοῖνοι*, are by no means all of equal value, in regard to the fruit which is to be derived from their writings for the illustration of the later idiom. So far are they, indeed, from having all employed a similar style and diction, that while some have formed their style with the great-

est diligence on the most approved Attic models, others on the contrary have almost wholly neglected the precepts of a good Attic diction, and have corrupted their language by the admission of many new words and forms of expression. Of this latter class, as all acquainted with the subject know, are Artemidorus, Appian, and others; of the former, Arrian, Lucian, Aelian, etc. Of modern editors I know only one, who has noted the traces of the later idiom which occur in his author, with the proper diligence. I mean Irmisch, in his edition of Herodian. In regard to all the other authors of this class, no one has hitherto taken the trouble to register those things in them, which are to be referred to the *usus loquendi* of the later language.

A second kind of sources, from which the character of the later style is to be ascertained, is presented by those writers who have treated expressly of this style. Here belong first, the Grammarians, or Atticists; as Phrynichus, Moeris, Herodian, Thomas Magister, and others; who in their works have professed to correct in later writers those words and phrases which are employed by them contrary to Attic elegance, and to exhibit the corresponding expressions warranted by the pure Attic dialect. Next to these are the Scholiasts; in whose commentaries many things are preserved, that have reference to the later idiom. Lastly, we may adduce here the Lexicographers, as Hesychius, Suidas, Zonaras, Photius, Phavorinus; who have explained many Attic words by others peculiar to the later language. In what manner all these differ among themselves, and with what caution their testimony is to be examined, we have here neither time nor place particularly to investigate.

The third kind of sources, which consists in the writings which have come down to us composed in this later diction, is more important than both the others. Such writings are the Alexandrine version and the other Greek versions extant of the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Apocryphal books of the Old and New Testament, and the apostolical fathers; to which may also be added the remains preserved in inscriptions, on coins, in the decrees of magistrates, and in the fragments of comic writers of the later ages.

PART II.

Characteristics of the later Greek as found in the New Testament.

We proceed now to the second part of our discussion, in which we are to point out those traces of the later idiom which are to be found in the New Testament. In making these illustrations we shall constitute certain classes, to which the particular examples may be referred; and shall then adduce, both those things which appear to have passed over from the ancient *dialects* into the later usage; and also those which seem to be of a more recent origin. We do not propose to bring forward every instance; but only to give single examples. On similar grounds we also omit the syntax of the New Testament; because, although the sacred writers have in innumerable instances neglected the grammatical laws of the Greek syntax, this belongs rather to style, and not to the idiom of the language which they have employed. As therefore our business is solely with the elements of their language, it does not fall within our province to include also their syntax.

In regard then to that common language, which forms the basis of the Hellenism of the New Testament, its vestiges may be reduced nearly to the following classes.

I. *Words adopted into the Greek language from foreign sources.* This had already been done before the domination of the Macedonians, and especially by the Athenians; who, according to the testimony of Xenophon, possessed a mixed language made up from the languages of almost every Greek and foreign people.³¹ What then had thus formerly happened, would happen still more frequently, when the language of Greece had now become widely diffused among foreign nations. The wars of the Macedonians, and the new empires founded by them, introduced the Greek tongue into Asia and Egypt; and in this way it could not but happen, that among these new inhabitants the Greek should become intermingled with many foreign words. To this period succeeded the times of the Roman dominion; the influence of which went every where to conform the language of the subjugated nations to the Latin tongue. In the age of the apostles, we perceive that the common Greek which they employed, had borrowed many words peculiar to the Ara-

³¹ De Repub. Atheniens. II. 8. Comp. Pierson ad Moerid. p. 349.

maean and Latin; and some also from the Persian and Egyptian. Of all these, traces are to be found in the New Testament; and they are too obvious to require here examples.

II. *Words peculiar in their orthography and pronunciation.* The ancient dialects of Greece were exceedingly discrepant in this respect; and the causes of this discrepancy are also known. The later idiom adopted very many of these differences; and also formed new ones, before unheard of. Of all these some traces still remain in the New Testament; although in this particular very many changes have been made by copyists and grammarians; as must be obvious to every one who has himself inspected manuscripts. Indeed transcribers have almost invariably followed the orthography of the country in which they wrote; and hence Egyptian manuscripts exhibit one mode of orthography, those of Byzantium another, and those of the west a third. For this reason we claim as vestiges of the later language only those instances, which by the common consent of the best manuscripts may be defended as the genuine readings, and which also we know from the testimony of ancient Grammarians actually to have existed in the common language.³² We omit entirely all those as to which there can be doubt.

³² The Alexandrine orthography has been fully discussed by Sturz, p. 116 sq. who has followed the authority of the Alexandrine and Zurich manuscripts. Although the learned writer does not deny, that in these manuscripts there are many things of this sort which could have arisen only from the transcribers; and although he therefore would limit what he calls the *Alexandrine orthography*, to that alone which differs with some appearance of constancy from the orthography of other Greeks and from that of the ancient writers; still, I am not sure that his positions are even then correct; inasmuch as these manuscripts exhibit many things which unquestionably belong to the orthography and mode of writing of transcribers, who cannot be placed higher than the sixth century. And in regard to the books of the New Testament, it is beyond all question, that they cannot properly be all reduced to the orthography of any single Codex; since the sacred writers obviously did not follow one and the same standard of orthography; but wrote, as no one can doubt, according to the different places and countries in which they were educated and lived, John in one way, Paul in another, and Peter and James and others in still different ways, each employing his own method. For this reason I have preferred to stop short at those examples, which, by the consent of the best manuscripts and the testimony of the grammarians, may be regarded as peculiarities of the common language.

We produce here some examples of the several varieties of orthography. The most frequent are *Atticisms*; which is to be attributed to the general diffusion of this dialect itself, and also to the critical propensities of the transcribers. Of this kind are ὕαλος³³ Rev. 21: 18, and φιάλη³⁴ Rev. 5: 8; which words the Ionians and Dorians write with ε, ὕελος and φέλη. So also αἰτός Matt. 24: 28; for which the other Greeks write αἰετός.³⁵ Many other examples occur of a similar shortening of the vowels; but we cannot go into the details.

The *Doric* orthography is preserved in πιάζω John 7: 30 for πιέζω;³⁶ καμμύειν Matt. 13: 15. Acts 28: 27, for καταμύειν;³⁷ κλίβανος Matt. 6: 30, for κριβανος; which form also was often used by the κοινολ.³⁸ To the Doric also we must doubtless refer πανδοχείον Luke 10: 34, for which the Grammarians would put πανδοκεῖον,³⁹ a later orthography adopted by the Attics from the Ionians.

Paul follows the *Ionic* mode of writing in βάθμος 1 Tim. 3: 13, for which the other Greeks wrote βάσμος;⁴⁰ so also Luke in ἀναβαθμός Acts 21: 35, for ἀναβασμός.⁴¹ To the same Ionic method we may also refer ἐπιφαύω Eph. 5: 14 for ἐπιφάω, which, so far as I know, is found only in the New Testament. At least, in many other forms certainly, the Ionians inserted the letter υ after α; as αὐτάρ, δαυλός, ἰαύχε, for αἶαρ, δαλός, ἰαχε.⁴²

There are many words which bear the stamp of a *later* orthography. I pass over the forms γίνομαι and γινώσκω, for γίγνομαι and γιγνώσκω, of which Fischer and others have treated,⁴³ as also νοσσός, νοσσίον, for νεοσσός, νεοσσίον, which Fisch-

³³ Thom. Mag. p. 862. ibiq. Hemsterhuis.

³⁴ Moschopolus περὶ Σχ. p. 120. Moeris p. 389. ibiq. Inttp.

³⁵ Moeris p. 18. Etymolog. Mag. p. 51, 49. Eustath. ad Il. α. p. 21 sq.

³⁶ Etymol. p. 671, 30.

³⁷ Gregor. Cor. de Dial. p. 165. In another place, p. 290, he affirms that this was also the Ionic form.

³⁸ Phrynichus p. 76. Thom. M. p. 554. Athen. III. p. 110. C.

³⁹ Phrynich. p. 134. Thom. M. p. 676. Hemsterhuis ad Aristoph. Plut. p. 122.

⁴⁰ Phrynich. p. 142.

⁴¹ Thom. Mag. p. 46.

⁴² Eustath. ad Od. p. 1654, 27.

⁴³ Proluss. de Vitiis Lexicor. N. T. p. 674. Valckenaer ad Eurip. Phoen. 1396.

er and Sturz⁴⁴ have noted; and will only adduce a few new examples, which so far as I know, have not yet been noted in the New Testament. Of this kind are τὸ δίδραχμον Matt. 17: 24, the true reading for τὸ δίδραχμον; as to which I have already quoted the testimony of Thomas Magister in note 21 above. So σαλπικτής Rev. 18: 22, for σαλπικτής, the former being used only by later writers, according to the testimony of the Grammarians;⁴⁵ and also οὐθέν 1 Cor. 13: 2, for οὐθέν, in regard to which see the testimony quoted in notes 18 and 19 above. I pass over other examples; which however need to be more fully investigated.

III. *Peculiarities in the flexion of nouns and verbs*, belonging to the later language. As to flexion in nouns, there are in the New Testament no traces of any of the ancient dialects, except the Attic. This I suppose must be attributed, not to the fact that the later language was in itself free from any such confusion of the older dialects, but rather to the critical propensities of transcribers; who here, as in innumerable other cases, have aimed to preserve the Attic mode of writing. Of *Attic* forms of flexion in nouns, we have gen. τοῦ Ἀπολλῶ 1 Cor. 1: 12 from the nom. Ἀπολλῶς; also accus. τὸν Ἀπολλῶ Acts 19: 1; τὴν Κῶ Acts 21: 1; τὴν ναῦν Acts 27: 41, from the nom. ναῦς for which the Ionics wrote νηῦς and the Dorics νᾶς.⁴⁶—The *later* idiom is followed in the dative νοί for νῶ, 1 Cor. 1: 10. 14: 15. Rom. 7: 25, after the form of the third declension; of which, besides the New Testament, examples occur only in the fathers.⁴⁷ So also the accus. ὑγιῆ Acts 5: 11, 15. Tit. 2: 8, from ὑγιέα; for the Attics regularly contracted εα preceded by a vowel, not into ῆ, but into ᾶ;⁴⁸ as ὑγιᾶ, not ὑγιῆ. Other instances of later usage have already been given by Fischer;⁴⁹ such as the accusative plural of nouns ending in ες, as τοὺς γονεῖς, γραμματεῖς;

⁴⁴ De Dial. Alex. p. 185.

⁴⁵ Phrynich. p. 80. Moeris p. 354. Thom. Mag. 789. Compare Theophr. Charact. c. 25. Lucian. Tom. I. p. 720.

⁴⁶ Compare Matthiae's Gramm. § 85.

⁴⁷ Herodian ap. Hermann. p. 303. Fischer Animadv. ad Weller. II. p. 181.

⁴⁸ Moeris p. 375. Thom. Mag. p. 864. Eustath. ad Od. δ. p. 196, 11. Heindorf. ad Platon. Charmid. p. 64.

⁴⁹ In Proluss. de Vit. Lexicor. N. T. p. 666 seq.

the dative plural *δουσι*, instead of which the Attics employed the dual *δουῶν*; the contracted form of the genitive of the adjective *ἡμῖν*, viz. *ἡμῖσους* for *ἡμῖσος*, etc.

In regard to the flexion of verbs, there is more variety. The Attic dialect contributes here also the most examples; the Doric affords some; the Ionic none; while of later forms there are many. According to Attic usage,⁵⁰ the sacred writers give to the three verbs *βούλομαι*, *δύναμαι*, *μέλλω*, a double augment; as *ἡβουλήθη* 2 John 12; *ἡδυνήθησαν* Matt. 17: 16; *ἡμέλλε* Luke 7: 2; although in other places the common flexion with a single augment is also found, as *ἐβουλήθη* Matt. 1: 19; *ἐδύνατο* 22: 46; *ἐμέλλε* Luke 10: 1. The peculiarity of the same dialect is also followed in the second persons of the present *βούλομαι* and the future *ὑψομαι*, which the Attics contract into *βούλει*, *ᾔψει*, and not into *βούλη*, *ᾔψη*. So Luke writes *εἰ βούλει*, 22: 42; and Matthew *σὺ ᾔψει*, 27: 4. To the same mode of flexion, if the text is correct, is to be referred the form *παρέξει*, Luke 7: 4; for if this be taken in the second person, the connexion of the context is not interrupted; which would be the case, if the writer be supposed to pass from the third person into the first. But I am disposed to discard this reading, on the authority of the best manuscripts, which exhibit *παρέξη*, according to the common orthography.

To the Doric dialect the Grammarians⁵² refer the form *ἀφείωνται* for *ἀφείνται*, which is found only in the New Testament, Matt. 9: 5. 1 John 2: 12. Others regard it as Attic;⁵³ to which they seem to have been induced by the similarity of other forms, in which the Attics prolong the perfect by inserting the vowel *ω*, as *εἴωθα* for *εἴθα*, *ἀγήοχα* with a reduplication for *ἤχα*. To this same analogy, I also would not hesitate to refer the form in question, provided it could be proved by decided examples, that it ever existed among Attic writers.—The Dorics, further, make the imperative of the second aorist terminate in *ον* instead of *ε*, after the analogy of the first aorist.⁵⁴ So *εἰπόν*, which is the true reading, is found Acts 28: 26 for *εἰπέ*, unless—what un-

⁵⁰ Thom. Mag. p. 258. Fischer ad Well. p. 599 seq.

⁵¹ Schol. Aristoph. ad Plut. 40. Valcken. ad Phoeniss. p. 216. Brunck ad Soph. Oed. Col. 336. Ajac. 195.

⁵² Eustath. p. 1077, 8. Suidas h. v. Phavorin. s. v. ἀφείχα.

⁵³ Etymolog. Mag. p. 107, 1. Phavorin. s. v. ἀφείωνται.

⁵⁴ Koen. ad Gregor. Cor. p. 157. Fischer ad Weller. II. p. 382.

doubtedly seems to be nearer the truth—you choose to regard it as put for the imperative of the first aorist *εἶπα*. They employed also, in the imperative present of *εἶμι*, the form *ἦτω* for *ἔστω*, according to Heraclides;⁵⁵ which same form occurs also once in Plato.⁵⁶ It seems to have arisen from *ἔε, ἔέτω*. In the New Testament Paul uses this form, 1 Cor. 16: 22; comp. Ps. 104: 31.—The second person present of the passive ending in *σαι* is preserved in the New Testament, in *καυχᾶσαι* Rom. 2: 17, 23, for *καυχᾷ*;⁵⁷ and *ὀδυνᾶσαι* Luke 16: 25, for *ὀδυνᾷ*. This termination is retained by the Attics only in the perfect and pluperfect, and also in verbs in *μι*. It is manifest that this cannot be regarded as a new form; but as more ancient even than the Attic, which is shortened from it. We may therefore perhaps not improperly assign it to the Doric dialect.

To these peculiarities of the ancient dialects, thus mixed up and confounded, there are superadded several *new* forms of flexion in verbs, which were first introduced in the later idiom, and of which the vestiges are not rare in the books of the New Testament. The Grammarians have noted many of these; and in some instances have specified the place, where they suppose these new forms of verbs to have first arisen. We cannot indeed suppose that they were every where in use; but that various changes and modifications arose in various regions. The style of the New Testament exhibits many things, according to the different writers, which cannot be alone referred to the usage of those who spoke Greek in Palestine; but which were introduced from other sources into the language of the apostles. We can here exhibit only the more important examples.

And first of the termination *αν*, which the common language first introduced, in the third person plural of the perfect, for *σαι*; as *ἔγνωκαν* for *ἔ γνώκασαι*, John 17: 7; *εἰσηκαν* for *εἰσηκασαι*, Rev. 19: 3. This form is found much more frequently in the Alexandrine interpreters; e. g. *ἔώρακαν* Deut. 11: 7; *παρίστηκαν* Jer. 5: 29. It is easy to see whence the form arose; the peculiarity of the aorist is transferred to the perfect. The Grammarians affirm that this metaplasm was current at Chalcis⁵⁸ and at Alexandria.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Apud Eustathium p. 1411, 22.

⁵⁶ Republic. II. p. 215.

⁵⁷ Moeris p. 16. v. *ἀκροῦ*.

⁵⁸ Tzetzes ad Lycophr. 252.

⁵⁹ Sextus Empiricus adv. Grammat. § 213. p. 261. Fabr.

The common or later language affected also in another way, the termination of the third plural, both in the imperfect and the second aorist, viz. by inserting the syllable *σα*. Of this form the New Testament exhibits but one instance, *ἰδοῦσαν* Rom. 3: 13, for *ἰδοῦν*. The Septuagint however presents it much more frequently; comp. Ex. 15: 27. Ps. 47: 4, *ἤλθοσαν*. Ex. 16: 24, *κατέλιπον*. 18: 28, *ἐκρίνοσαν*, et alia. Heraclides attributes this form *τῇ φωνῇ ἈσIANῇ*;⁶⁰ Phavorinus calls it Doric;⁶¹ others refer it to the usage of the inhabitants of Chalcis,⁶² whom Aristotle mentions, *περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν*;⁶³ and that it was current at Alexandria is also testified in the passages cited. Hence we may draw the not improbable conjecture, that this widely diffused mode of speaking was perhaps first introduced by the Macedonians into the common language. Besides this too, as Fischer has well observed,⁶⁴ verbs in *μι* exhibit almost the same formation; and therefore this form is properly to be derived from the most ancient language of the Greeks.

The inhabitants of Cilicia are said by Heraclides⁶⁵ to have formed the second aorist after the model of the first; nor was this usage unknown also to the Alexandrians, since it frequently occurs in the Alexandrine version; e. g. *εἶδαμεν* 1 K. 10: 14; *εἶδαν* and *ἐφυγαν* 2 K. 10: 14; *εὔραν* 17: 20; *ἐφαγάμεν* 19: 42; et alia. In the New Testament I have no doubt that in many places this form ought to be restored, instead of the printed reading; not only according to the general authority of antiquity, but also by the consent of the best manuscripts; e. g. in Matt. 25: 36, *ἤλθατε*; Luke 7: 24, *ἐξήλθατε*; 11: 52, *εἰσήλθατε*; Acts 2: 32, *ἀνείλατε*; 7: 10, *ἐξείλατο*; 7: 21, *ἀνείλατο*; 12: 11, *ἐξείλατο*; 22: 7, *ἔπεισα*; et alia.

To these examples, which Sturz has already noted in the Alexandrine language, I subjoin several others in the singular of some verbs. First, the future *ἐκχεῶ* Acts 2: 17, found also in the Septuagint Ez. 12: 14. Ex. 30: 19. 4: 9. 29: 12; from the theme *ἐκχέω*; which form belongs properly to verbs having *λ, μ, ν, ρ* for their characteristic, but is here transferred by metaplasm to those who have not this character. Hence however

⁶⁰ Apud Eustath. p. 1759, 35.

⁶¹ Sub voce *ἐπίγισσαν*.

⁶² Tzetzes ad Lycophr. 21 et 252. Aristophanes apud Eustath. p. 1761, 30.

⁶³ Polit. IV. 3.

⁶⁴ Proluss. p. 681.

⁶⁵ Apud Eustath. p. 1759, 10.

it is plain, as Buttman has also observed,⁶⁶ how the Grammarians were led to assign a place to the *second* future in the paradigm of the regular verb.

The use of the second person of the present indicative *δύνῃ* for *δύνασαι*, is condemned by the Atticists.⁶⁷ It occurs Rev. 2: 22; also in writers called *οἱ ποινοί*;⁶⁸ and is found in the Septuagint, Job 33: 5. Esth. 6: 13. Attic writers employed it only in the subjunctive.⁶⁹

There remains further the augment in *ἤνοιξε*, John 9: 17, 21; *ἤνοιχθη*, Acts 12: 10; *ἤνοιγη*, Rev. 11: 19. 15: 5; for which the Attics employed the double augment; as *ἀνέψα*, *ἀνεώχθη*, *ἀνεώγη*.⁷⁰ In the Apocalypse we find this verb twice with a triple augment; viz. 4: 1, *θύρα ἠνεωγμένη*. 20: 12, *ἠνεώχθη*.

I subjoin here another observation, which seems to have been overlooked by all who have treated grammatically of the language of the New Testament. It has reference to some tenses of several verbs; which, although they exhibit nothing anomalous in their formation, are yet never found in use among approved writers. The cause of this seems to lie in the circumstance, that these tenses had in them something either unpleasant to the ear, or difficult in pronunciation; or else, from some similarity of sound with other forms, admitted a certain ambiguity of the sense; all of which the more ancient writers studied as much as possible to avoid. Such however was not the endeavour in the common language, nor among the later authors; in whose writings the Grammarians have noted many things of this kind, from which the classic authors entirely abstained. In the sacred writings, in like manner, there occur not a few things, which must be placed under the same category; and in which the style of the New Testament differs from the pure Attic. We adduce here some examples; with reference chiefly to the futures and aorists.

The future *ἐλεύσομαι* was never used by the Attics, either simply or in composition; but for it they employed *εἶμι*, *εο*.⁷¹

⁶⁶ Griech. Gramm. p. 175. 4th Ed. [§ 95. Anm. 16. p. 153. 13th Ed. 1829.]

⁶⁷ Phrynich. p. 158. Thom. Mag. p. 252.

⁶⁸ Synes. Ep. 80. Diog. Laert. p. 158. E.

⁶⁹ Plato in Phaedon. p. 132.

⁷⁰ Thom. Mag. p. 71.

⁷¹ Phrynich. p. 12. Moeris p. 16. Thom. Mag. p. 88, 336. Suidas v. *ἔξειμι* et *ἄπει*.

It is found only in Homer and some of the later writers.⁷² It occurs in both ways in the New Testament; e. g. Matt. 9: 15 *ἐλεύσονται*. 25: 46, *ἀπελεύσονται*. 2: 6, *ἐξελεύσεται*, etc.

The Grammarians give the same directions in regard to the futures *ἄξω* for *ἄξομαι*,⁷³ Acts 22: 5. 1 Thess. 4: 14; *καθίσω*, Matt. 25: 31, for which the Attics preferred the contracted form *καθιῶ*,⁷⁴ as they did in almost all verbs in *ίζω*; *σαλπίσω* for *σαλπίγξω*,⁷⁵ from the old theme *σαλπίγγω*, 1 Cor. 15: 52; *χαρήσομαι* for *χαιρήσω*,⁷⁶ Luke 1: 14. John 16: 20, 22; *πράξω* for *πράξομαι*,⁷⁷ Acts 15: 29. 16: 28; *παύσομαι* for *πεπαύσομαι*,⁷⁸ 1 Cor. 13: 8. Other instances also, which the Grammarians have passed over in silence, have been noted in a course of careful observation; e. g. *ἀκούσω*, Matt. 13: 14, 15; *γελάσω*, Luke 6: 31; *ἐπαινέσω*, 1 Cor. 11: 23; *σπουδάσω*, 2 Pet. 1: 15; *ἁμαρτήσω*, Matt. 18: 21; *κλαύσω*, Luke 6: 55; *κλέψω*, Matt. 19: 18; *ῥέυσω*, John 7: 38; *καλέσω*, Luke 1: 13; *κερδήσω*, 1 Cor. 9: 19; for all of which the Attic writers⁷⁹ employed the middle forms *ἀκούσομαι*, *γελάσομαι*, *ἐπαινέσομαι*, *σπουδάσομαι*, *ἁμαρτήσομαι*, *κλαύσομαι*, *κλέψομαι*, *ῥέυσομαι*, *καλοῦμαι*, *κερδανῶ*.

In like manner also the *aorists*, of which the sacred writers exhibit several unusual forms. The Grammarians condemn *γενηθεῖς* for *γενόμενος*,⁸⁰ Heb. 6: 4; *ἐγέννησα* for *ἐγεννησάμην*,⁸¹ Matt. 1: 2 seq. *ἔθρεψα* for *ἐθρεψάμην*,⁸² James 5: 5; *ἐγανάκτησα* for *ἠγανακτησάμην*,⁸³ Matt. 20: 24; *ἠμάρτησα* for *ἠμαρτον*,⁸⁴ Rom. 5: 14, 16; *ἠρπάγην* for *ἠρπάσθην*,⁸⁵ 2 Cor. 12: 2, 4. Here belongs also *ἐβλάστησα* for *ἐβλαστον*,⁸⁶ Matt. 13: 26.

⁷² Josephus B. Jud. VI. 6. 3. Chion. Ep. ad Platon. Chrysost. Or. XXXIII. p. 410. Maxim. Tyr. Diss. XXIV. p. 295.

⁷³ Thom. Mag. p. 7. Moeris p. 38. But Euripides has it, Iphig. in Taur. 1124.

⁷⁴ Moeris p. 212. Thom. Mag. p. 483.

⁷⁵ Phrynich. p. 82. Thom. Mag. p. 789.

⁷⁶ Moeris p. 403. Thom. Mag. p. 910.

⁷⁷ Moeris p. 293.

⁷⁸ Moeris l. c.

⁷⁹ Buttman Gr. Gram. p. 299. 4th Ed. [§ 113. 4. Anm. 7. p. 259. 13th Ed.] Matthiae Gr. Gram. § 184.

⁸⁰ Thom. Mag. p. 189.

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 416.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 420.

⁸⁵ Ibid. p. 424. Moeris p. 182.

⁸⁶ Matthiae Gr. Gram. § 227.

James 5: 18, which is found only in the later writers; and *ἐγάμησα* for *ἐγγημα*, Mark 6: 7, of which, out of the New Testament, no example is to be found, except 2 Macc. 14: 25.

There remain many other instances of the same nature, which we here cannot pursue in detail; as the imperative *κάθου* for *κάθησο*,⁸⁷ the perfect *οἶδασι* for *ἴσασι*;⁸⁸ the optative *δοίη* for *δοίη*;⁸⁹ the participle *ἀπολλύων* for *ἀπολλύς*;⁹⁰ etc.

IV. A fourth class is constituted by words that are *heterogeneous*, or employed by the later language in a *different gender*. The ancient dialects employed many nouns with a difference of gender; from which circumstance a great variety of usage was introduced into the later tongue. Thus the sacred writers use both *ὁ σκότος* in the masculine, Heb. 12: 18; and also *τὸ σκότος* in the neuter, Matt. 4: 16. 6: 23. 8: 12. Both were also in use among the Attics; the other Greeks had only the neuter.⁹¹ This promiscuous usage in the common language therefore, is to be derived from the Attic dialect. From the Doric comes *ἡ λιμός*, *famine*; for which the other Greeks said *ὁ λιμός*.⁹² In the New Testament it is twice found joined with an adjective of the feminine gender, viz. Luke 15: 14 *λιμός ἰσχυρά*; Acts 11: 28 *λιμόν μεγάλην*; which reading both Valckenaer⁹³ and Fischer⁹⁴ have judged to be preferable to the printed one, in which the adjectives are of the masculine gender. The Attics also said *ὁ βάτος*, *bramble*, in the masculine;⁹⁵ the writers of the New Testament with the other Greeks use it in the feminine gender, Mark 12: 26. Luke 6: 44. 20: 37. Acts 7: 35; which usage is also found in the *κοινοί*.⁹⁶—The Gram-

⁸⁷ Thom. Mag. p. 485.

⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 474.

⁸⁹ Phrynich. p. 152. Moeris p. 117.

⁹⁰ Moeris p. 12. Thom. Mag. p. 98.

⁹¹ Scholiast. ad Eurip. Hecub. 1. Inttp. ad Moerid. p. 354.

⁹² Phrynich. p. 80. Etymolog. Mag. p. 566. Ael. Dionys. apud Eustath. ad Od. α. p. 1390, 56. The feminine is employed by the Megarean in Aristophanes, Archanens. 743. Hence we need not listen to Sextus Empiricus when he affirms, (adv. Grammat. p. 247,) that the Athenians employed *τὴν σταμόν, θόλον, βῶλον, λιμόν, θηλυκῶς* i. e. in the feminine gender.

⁹³ Specimen Annot. crit. in locos quosd. N. T. p. 383 seq.

⁹⁴ Proluss. p. 672.

⁹⁵ Moeris p. 99. Thom. Mag. p. 148. Schol. ad Theocr. I. 132.

⁹⁶ Theophr. Hist. Plantar. III. 18. Dioscorid. IV. 37.

marians disapprove of τοῦς δεσμοῦς, because the Attic writers employ τὰ δεσμά.⁹⁷ That the former is an Ionic form, we may perhaps not improperly infer from the fact, that Homer had already exhibited this word in the masculine.⁹⁸ In the New Testament both are found; the Attic form in Luke 8: 29. Acts 16: 26; the Ionic in the writings of Paul, Phil. 1: 13.—Thus far in regard to idioms derived from the more ancient language; but the later usage also introduced other like examples, before unknown. We have a remarkable instance of this in the noun ἄλεος, which is employed by all Greek writers in the masculine; but stands as neuter in the New Testament, Luke 1: 50, 78. 1 Pet. 1: 3. Rom. 9: 23; in the Alexandrine version, Gen. 19: 9. Num. 11: 15; and in the ecclesiastical writers.

V. The fifth class of vestiges of the later language in the New Testament, is constituted by the peculiar forms of words; not only such as have passed down from the ancient dialects into the common language; but also those which were coined anew either according to previous analogy, or in other ways. Several of these have been noted by the grammarians; but many more may be discovered by personal observation. To begin with the source first mentioned; the style of the writers of the New Testament is distinguished by many forms of nouns and verbs, derived from the ancient dialects. The nouns ἀλέκτωρ for ἀλεκτροῦν, σκοτία for σκότος, βασίλισσα for βασιλῆς, were adopted into the common language from the Doric; as has been shown by Fischer⁹⁹ and Sturz.¹⁰⁰ I add also ἡ οἰκοδομή, for which the Attics, according to the Grammarians, employed οἰκοδόμημα.¹⁰¹ It is used in the New Testament by Matthew, 24: 1, and by Paul, Rom. 14: 19; also in the Septuagint, Ez. 17: 17. 1 Chr. 26: 27. In other Greek writers it is rarely found; and only among the κοῖνοι.¹⁰² I am disposed to refer it to the Doric on the authority of Suidas, who quotes a very ancient Laconic proverbial imprecation in these words: οἰκοδομά σε λάβοι. The word οἰκοδομή is a compound noun un-

⁹⁷ Moeris p. 127. Thom. Mag. p. 204. Phavorin. v. δεσμά. Eustath. ad Od. α. p. 1390, 56.

⁹⁸ Odys. δ. 296.

⁹⁹ Proluss. p. 673.

¹⁰⁰ De Dial. Mac. et Alex. p. 151 seq.

¹⁰¹ Phrynich. p. 186. Thom. Mag. p. 645.

¹⁰² Philo de Monarch. T. II. p. 223.

known to the Attics;¹⁰³ but Pollux testifies,¹⁰⁴ that it was employed by Alexis, a poet of the middle comedy, a native of Thurium, ἐν *Τυραντίνοις*, and also by Theano, γυνὴ Πυθαγόρειος, a female disciple of Pythagoras, in an epistle to Timareta. From these circumstances we may with reason conjecture, that it was current among the Dorians. It occurs Matt. 13: 27. 20: 1, et al. and also in Plutarch,¹⁰⁵ Sextus Empiricus,¹⁰⁶ and others.—To the *Ionic* dialect we may refer the verb ξυράω, Acts 21: 24. 1 Cor. 11: 5; which Thomas Magister¹⁰⁷ banishes from the Attic dialect, and establishes ξυρέω in place of it. It is found frequently in Herodotus,¹⁰⁸ and also in the κοινῶν.¹⁰⁹ That the Ionians often exchanged verbs in ᾠω for those in έω, it is hardly necessary to mention. The same is the case with the present of the verb ῥήσσω, which the Grammarians affirm should, according to Attic usage, be ῥήγνυμι.¹¹⁰ The form ῥήσσω is found Mark 2: 22. 9: 18; in the Septuagint 1 Chr. 11: 31; and in Homer;¹¹¹ whence we may draw the conclusion, that it was a form belonging to the Ionic dialect.

Thus far the forms from the ancient dialects. We turn now to those of later origin. That in process of time new forms of words should have come into general use, no one can wonder; for this is the common lot of all living languages. But it is a remarkable circumstance, that we find in the later tongue many nouns and verbs, formed after an analogy which was unknown in all the diversities of the ancient dialects, or which at least occurred very rarely; and that too, when other forms of the same signification were already extant. Respecting the causes of this formation, little is or can be known. We may indeed suppose that formerly, in the language used by the common people, there already existed forms similar to those which we now find in books written in this vulgar idiom. And

¹⁰³ Phrynich. p. 162. Thom. Mag. p. 645.

¹⁰⁴ Onomast. X. 21.

¹⁰⁵ De Placit. Philos. V. 18. p. 908. B. Probl. Rom. 30. p. 271. D.

¹⁰⁶ Physic. I. 122.

¹⁰⁷ Page 642.

¹⁰⁸ II. 65. 121.

¹⁰⁹ Palaephat. p. 84. 180. ed. Toll. Lucian. Cynicus, T. III. p. 547.

¹¹⁰ Moeris p. 337. Thom. Mag. 788.

¹¹¹ Iliad σ. 571.

much that must now be left unexplained, might doubtless be far better illustrated, did we but possess any full and certain information respecting the nature and character of that ancient idiom, which was the current language of the Grecian common people. Indeed, it is scarcely to be doubted, that far more was adopted from this popular idiom into the later language, than from the idiom employed by authors; of which alone the knowledge has come down to us established by sufficient documents. For these reasons we are able to exhibit under this category only the differences of the later tongue; without being able to assign the ultimate grounds of them. The following are examples.

I begin with *substantives*. Some less important variations occur only in single examples; as *μετοικεσία* Matt. 1: 11, comp. Jer. 29: 19. Ez. 12: 11; for which we find in Plato *μετοίκησις*,¹¹² and in Æschylus *μετοικία*.¹¹³ The verb *μετοικίζειν* occurs in Thucydides,¹¹⁴ from which it is derived after the same analogy as *δοκιμασία*¹¹⁵ from *δοκιμάζειν*; which seems in like manner anciently to have had the form *δοκιμή*.—The form *μαθητρία* Acts 9: 36, is reprehended by the Grammarians;¹¹⁶ who direct us to use *μαθητοίς* instead of it. The former occurs in Diogenes¹¹⁷ Petrus Siculus,¹¹⁸ and Palladius.¹¹⁹ I am not sure whether this termination in *τρια* was ever heard in the ancient language. *Ὀρχήστρια* for *ὄρχηστρίσις* is in like manner noted by Moeris.¹²⁰ But examples of this formation among the ancients do not occur to me. It might perhaps have been coined after the analogy of the Latin *magistra*, *sinistra*, etc. with the insertion of the letter *ι*; which could not be omitted without subjecting such words to be confounded with others of a different meaning; as *ὄρχηστρα*, *παλαιστρα*, etc.—There is more certainty in regard to the form of the noun *καύχησις*, which is several times used by Paul, Rom. 3: 27. 15: 17, al. and once by James, 4: 16. Except in the Septuagint, Jer. 12: 13. Ez. 16: 12, it scarcely occurs in any other writer.¹²¹ To

¹¹² De Legib. VIII. c.

¹¹³ Eumenid. 1016.

¹¹⁴ Lib. I. c. 12.

¹¹⁵ Aeschin. in Timarch.

¹¹⁶ Moeris p. 263. Thom. Mag. p. 593.

¹¹⁷ Lib. IV. c. 2. VIII. c. 42.

¹¹⁸ Hist. Manich. p. 52.

¹¹⁹ Histor. Lausiaca. p. 146.

¹²⁰ Page 279.

¹²¹ I have found it in the Etymolog. Magn. p. 400, 38.

this fact is also to be added the authority of the Scholiast on Pindar,¹²³ who affirms that it was not in use among the Attics, but that they employed rather the form *καυχή*. Similar forms in the ancient language cannot fail to occur to every one; e. g. *αὐξή*¹²³ and *αὐξησις*,¹²⁴ *βουλή*¹²⁵ and *βούλησις*,¹²⁶ and others, to the analogy of which the later form may be easily referred.

But especially to be noted is a class of nouns, which occur very frequently in the sacred writers; viz. nouns ending in *μα*, of which very many are not found in the ancient language, but instead of them, forms in *η, εια, σις*, with almost entirely the same signification. The following are the principal nouns of this kind in the New Testament.

Κατάλυμα, Luke 2: 7, *deversorium, inn*; for which the Attics said *καταγάγιον*, according to Moeris¹²⁷ and Thomas Magister.¹²⁸ There is also no example of the former extant in Attic writers; but only in the *κοινοί*. But in precisely the same signification Euripides¹²⁹ uses *κατάλυσις*; as also Plato in his Protagoras.¹³⁰ The verb *καταλύειν* is found in Thucydides.¹³¹

Ἀνταπόδομα occurs in the New Testament in the sense of *retribution, compensation*; both in a good sense, as Luke 14: 12; and in a bad one, as Rom. 11: 9. Except in the Alexandrine interpreters, as 2 Chr. 32: 25. Ps. 28: 4. Ecclus. 12: 2, this word is no where else to be found; it is not mentioned by the Grammarians, the Lexicographers, nor the Scholiasts. Thucydides¹³² has *ἀνταπόδοσις* in the same sense; as also Polybius.¹³³ There can be no doubt, but that it is of a later age. But similar instances of double forms with the same signification, are also extant in the earlier writers; as *ἐνδειγμα* and *ἐν-*

¹²³ Ad Nem. IX. 17.

¹²⁴ Plato Phaedr. p. 1211. D. 1225 B.

¹²⁵ Xenoph. Oec. V. 1.

¹²⁵ Xenoph. Hellen. VI. 4. 35.

¹²⁶ Eurip. Andron. 703. Thucyd. VI. 69.

¹²⁷ Page 241.

¹²⁸ Page 501. Pollux places this among the Attic words (I. 73); but in many manuscripts the word is wanting, so that it may not improbably be a gloss.

¹²⁹ Elect. 393.

¹³⁰ Page 220. D.

¹³¹ Lib. I. c. 136.

¹³² Lib. IV. c. 81.

¹³³ Lib. VI. 5. 3. XX. 7. 2. XXXII. 13. 6.

δειξίς in Demosthenes;¹³⁴ φρόνημα and φρόνησις in Euripides;¹³⁵ ἴαμα in Thucydides¹³⁶ and ἴασις in Sophocles;¹³⁷ ἔσθημα¹³⁸ and ἔσθησις, which last according to Thomas Magister¹³⁹ was the poetical form; ζήτημα¹⁴⁰ and ζήτησις;¹⁴¹ and also others.

Αἴτημα, *postulatio, petition*, Luke 23: 24. Phil. 4: 6; comp. Judg. 8: 24. Ps. 105: 16. Phavorinus after Suidas: αἴτημα ζήτημα καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία. It is cited only from the Epistle of Pseudo Socrates 14, and from the mathematical writers of the later ages. The form αἴτησις is enumerated among Attic words by Pollux, IV. 47.

Ἄντλημα in John 4: 11, denotes *haustrum, a bucket*. It is found in no Greek Grammarian or Lexicographer. I have met with it only in Dioscorides IV. 64, καὶ τὸ ἀντλημα δὲ αὐτῶν ἀντιληθὲν ὑπνοποιόν ἐστι. Manetho, or whoever is the author of the Ἀποτελεσματικά, uses τὸν ἀντλον for it, V. 424 ἀντλοῖς ὕδωρ φορέοντες; and this word, although it does not occur in this sense in the earlier writers, is nevertheless used in another signification by the Attics; e. g. Eurip. Hecub. 1040.

Ἀσθένημα, *infirmity, weakness*, is used by Paul, Rom. 15: 1. It is no where else extant. The Attics said ἀσθένεια; e. g. Eurip. Herc. Fur. 269.

Ἡττημα, *claudes, inferior state, worse condition*; so 1 Cor. 6: 7; and Septuagint, Is. 31: 8. In Thucydides we find ἦσσα, III. 109. VII. 72; in Xenophon ἦττα, Cyrop. III. 1. 11. A similar analogy we have had above (p. 668) in the noun οἰκοδόμημα, which the Attics made by prolonging the ancient οἰκοδομή, which is found in the Doric. In like manner αὔχη and αὔχημα, both of which occur in Pindar Nem. XI. 38. Pyth. I. 127. So also καύχη and καύχημα, *ibid.*

Ἀπόκριμα is employed by Paul, 2 Cor. 1: 9, in such a way, as to denote a sentence of condemnation; which other Greek writers usually express by κατάκριμα. It is, as it were, the *response of the judge*; and therefore in its primitive meaning does not differ from ἀπόκρισις, which is used by Attic writers, e. g. Eurip. in Fragm. 131. Isocrates, Plato in Philob. p. 76. A. The former word, besides this passage of the apostle, is found

¹³⁴ P. 423, 23. 505, 24. Ed. Reiske.

¹³⁵ Supplic. 862. Tem. Fr. 13.

¹³⁶ Lib. II. 51.

¹³⁷ Electr. 876.

¹³⁸ Eurip. Troad. 991. Sophoc. Elect. 266.

¹³⁹ Page 370.

¹⁴⁰ Eurip. Bacch. 1137.

¹⁴¹ Thucyd. I. 20. VIII. 57.

only in the glossaries of Suidas, Hesychius, Zonaras, and in the commentaries of the fathers; on which see Suicer.

Ψεῦσμα, a falsehood, Rom. 3: 7. Thomas Mag. p. 927 ψεῦδος λέγε, οὐ ψεῦσμα, εἰ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπαξ; 'say ψεῦδος, not ψεῦσμα, although the same writer uses it once in the same place.' He means here Aristides, whose words are quoted from his Opp. T. II. p. 335. Interpreters on this passage have supposed, that Thomas has without sufficient reason condemned a word which is found in the best writers. But the passages which they cite are all taken from writers of the later age; e. g. Lucian T. I. p. 94. Joseph. Antiq. XVI. 10. 7 sub fin. Philo p. 409. Symmachus, Job 13: 4. Ps. 60: 3. Aquila and Theodotion, Prov. 23: 3. There remains only Pollux, who has enumerated this among Attic words, Onomast. VI. 38.

But enough of this. We might indeed produce many more similar examples from the Alexandrine version; but our plan comprehends only those traces of the later language which are found in the New Testament. We now pass therefore to *adjectives*. Among these also there occur single examples, in which the later usage has only slightly changed the form; as ἀπειραστος, *intentatus*, and then also *qui tentari nequit*, James 1: 13. This is elsewhere extant only in Suicer, who quotes from Ignatius on Philippians, and Zonaras who explains it by ἀδοκίματος; in which latter place I should prefer to read with the Dresden Codex ἀπειλητον, or with Kulencamp ἀπειρατον, since it is evident from the interpretation, that the author of the gloss did not refer to the epistle of James. The earlier Greeks said ἀπειρατος, with an elision of the σ, as Demosth. p. 100. Pind. Olym. XI. 18. Nem. I. 33; or after the Ionic manner, ἀπειλητος, which is found in Homer, Iliad μ. 304. Of the same kind is the word βιαστής Matt. 12: 12; which orthography, besides the ecclesiastical writers, occurs only in Philo, de Agricult. p. 314. In Pindar we have βιατής, Nem. IX. 130.—Both the above forms, however, as all those acquainted with the subject know, are to be regarded as ancient, although they do not occur in Attic writers. They are formed in the manner of verbal adjectives from the aorists ἐπειράσθην from the theme πειράζω, Homer Od. ι. 281, (although I find ἐπειράσθην only in Heb. 11: 37, elsewhere ἐπειράθην,) and ἐβιάσθην from βιάζεσθαι, Xenoph. Hellen. VI. 1. 4 βιασθέντες. As very frequently happens, they were not employed in the language of books, and

were preserved in use only among the common people; whence we may properly reckon them among the vestiges of that common idiom, which have passed into the New Testament. The Attics retained the double form in *γνωτός* Soph. Oed. Tyr. 396, and *γνωστός* ibid. 361. Xenoph. Cyr. VI. 3. 2; in *ἀθέμιτος* Eurip. Ion. 1093, and *ἀθέμιστος* Xenoph. Cyr. I. 6. 6.— Other examples of adjectives in which the primitive form is changed, are *ἀμαρτωλός* for *ἀμαρτηλός*, and *ἔγκυος* for *ἔγκυμων*; which it is sufficient to have mentioned.

In like manner also new forms of adjectives have arisen by composition; e. g. *ἀκατάπαυστος*, *unceasing*, *indesinans*, which, except in 2 Pet. 2: 14, is found only in the *κοινοί*, Polyb. IV. 17. 4. Plutarch Opp. T. VI. p. 436. The Attics used *ἄπαυστος*, as Thucyd. II. 49, *ἄπαυστος δίψα*. So too the adjective *ἀριγέννητος*, 1 Pet. 2: 2; elsewhere extant only in Lucian, Dial. Marin. 12. 1 *βρέφος... ἀριγέννητον*. Pollux, Onomast. II. 8, directs to say *βρέφος νεογενές, ἀριγενές, ἀρίγονον, ἀρίτοκον*, all of which occur in Attic writers. There are other similar examples, which it is not here necessary to enumerate.

There are also certain adjectives, which the Grammarians reject from the Attic language, as having been introduced into use at a later period. An example of this occurs in the case of some oxytones in *ινος*, formed from nouns or particles with which there is connected a notion of time. Such in the New Testament are the following.

Καθημερινός, *quotidianus*, *daily*, Acts 6: 1. Moeris p. 45. Thom. Mag. p. 44. Galen. de Different. Febr. II. 8, *τὸ γὰρ καθημερινὸν ὄνομα τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν παρὰ τινῶν Ἑλλήνων γεγραμμένον. ἀμφημερινὸν δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα τὸ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ὡσαύτως ὀνομάζουσι* 'the epithet *καθημερινός* is not to be found in any ancient Greek writer; that which happens every day they in like manner called *ἀμφημερινός*.' Instead of it also Sophocles has *καθημέριος*, Electr. 1414. It is employed only in the *κοινοί*, as Plutarch T. VI. p. 533. Polyænus IV. 2. p. 216. Josephus p. 72 and 409. ed. Colon.

Ὁρθρινός, *matutinus*, in the various readings Rev. 22: 16; for which the Grammarians direct to use *ὄρθριος*. Phrynich. p. 16, *ὄρθρινός οὐκ, ἀλλ' ὄρθριος*. Thom. Mag. p. 656. But *ὄρθρινός* is also found in Antipater Sidonius in Brunck's *Analecta* T. II. p. 12. No. 26; and in other writers, who are noted by Sturz, *De Dial. Alex.* p. 186.

Πρωινός, *matutinus*, in the best readings, Rev. 22: 16. This

word indeed is distinctly condemned by no Grammarian ; nor yet does it occur except in writers of the later age, as Plutarch Tom. VIII. p. 899. Athenaeus I. The more ancient writers employed *πρώιος* and *πρώιμος*, as Xenoph. de Vectigal. I. 3. Oecon. XVII. 4.

That all these words belong to the later periods, is shewn by the *usus loquendi* and by the authority of the Grammarians. Still there was not wanting an analogy in the more ancient language, according to which these and other words of the kind are formed. Galen and Thomas Magister approve of *ἀμφημερινός* as Attic ; *ἡμέριος* and *ἡμερινός* are extant in Xenophon Oec. XXI. 3. Cyrop. I. 6. 19 ; *θερινός* in Pindar Pyth. III. 87 ; *μεσημβρινός* in Theocritus Idyl. I. 15. X. 48.

Other instances of later usage exist in the degrees of comparison. Fischer¹⁴² has treated of the form *τάχιον* for *θᾶπτον*. Compare *ἡδύς, ἡδιον*, which was not unknown in the Attic style ; as appears from Xenoph. Cyr. VIII. 3. 16. We may add also *σαισιτός*, which was not used by earlier writers. Thom. Mag. p. 794 *σαισιτός μέντοι, οὐ σαισιτός*. Herodian p. 473. ed. Pierson. *σαισιτούς ὄρνιθας, οὓς νῦν σαισιτούς λέγουσι*. It is read Matt. 22: 4 ; and also Joseph. Ant. VIII. 2. 4. Athen. XIV. p. 656. E. It is derived originally, no doubt, like other words of the kind, from an obsolete adjective *σαιός* ; of which however no traces are now extant.

We come now to *verbs*, and to the changes which arose in their forms. In these also analogy is the great law, by which every thing is regulated ; and only a very few occur in regard to which some certain analogy, either as to form or signification, is not found. This will not surprize us, if we bear in mind, that the Greek language even before the dominion of the Macedonians was cultivated to such a degree, and enriched with such a variety of forms, that there would not easily be found wanting some particular form, by which any certain kind or species of idea ought to be expressed.—Of the innumerable examples which occur in the sacred writings, we can adduce here only a few. The Grammarians condemn *ὀρθορῆεν* Luke 21: 38, and prescribe *ὀρθορεύειν* instead of it ; Moeris p. 272. Thom. Mag. p. 656. The Alexandrine interpreters have it, Gen. 19: 2. 20: 8. et al. and also the later Greek writers. Similar double forms are not wanting in the earlier Greek ; as *μοχθέω, μοχθί-*

¹⁴² Proluss. p. 672.

ζω; ὀρμέω, ὀρμίζω; and the like. But in this case the analogy does not hold good; because ὀρθρίζειν is used in an intransitive sense for ὀρθρεύω, which from its very termination is an intransitive verb; while verbs in ἰζω with few exceptions are almost always employed transitively.—So to employ γρηγορεῖν for ἐγρηγορεῖν is forbidden by Phrynichus p. 46, and Eustathius ad Od. v. 6. p. 1880, 26. His words are these: "Ὀμηρος μὲν τετρασυλλάβως οἶδεν, ἐγρηγορῶ οἱ δὲ ὕστερον, καὶ γρηγορῶ τρισυλλάβως, ὅπερ οὐ φιλεῖται τοῖς ῥήτορσιν. In the New Testament γρηγορεῖν is found many times, Matt. 24: 42. 25: 13. al. and also in the Septuagint Jer. 5: 6. 31: 28. We may compare ἐθέλειν and θέλειν, both in the best writers; as Xenoph. Cyr. I. 4. 10. Hellen. III. 4. 5.—In like manner the Grammarians condemn δεσμεῖν, Moeris p. 22. Thom. Mag. p. 821, whose words Phavorinus also adopts. The gloss of Hesychius: δεσμεῖν τὰς δεσμάς τῶν σταχύων sc. δεῖν, refers to Luke 8: 29, where the word is found in the New Testament; but it occurs no where else except in Etymol. Mag. p. 693, 38, and in Aquila Job 40: 20. The verb δεσμεύειν is frequent in the Attic writers in precisely the same signification; as Xenoph. de Re Equest. V. 5. Memorab. I. 2. 50. Hiero VI. 14. Eurip. Bacch. 616. The form δεσμεῖν was the more ancient, but had become obsolete; whence it is properly to be referred to the common language.

The verbs ἐξυπνίζειν and ἀνετάζειν seem also to be instances of new composition. The former is distinctly condemned by the Grammarians; who recommend ἀφυπνίζειν or διυπνίζειν instead of it. Phrynich. p. 96, ἐξυπνισθῆναι οὐ χρηρὴ λέγειν, ἀλλὰ ἀφυπνισθῆναι. Moeris p. 61. Herodian p. 448. Thom. Mag. p. 134. Except in the Scriptures, where it is read John 11: 11. 1 K. 3: 15. Job 14: 12, I have found it only in Plutarch, Opp. T. X. p. 75.—The latter verb exists in none of the earlier writers, who always employed ἐξετάζειν instead of it; as Herodot. III. 184. Xenoph. Cyrop. VI. 2. 11. Memor. III. 6. 10. Oecon. VIII. 15. Luke uses it in Acts 22: 24, 29; and the Alexandrine writers, 2 Macc. 7: 37. Hist. of Susann. 14.

Of a different character are the verbs ἀλήθω, κνήθω, νήθω, which are prolonged from the forms ἀλέω, κνέω, νέω, after the analogy of the verbs πλέω, πλήθω; which last is used by Herodotus II. 173. Sturz has already treated of the former, ἀλήθω; (De Dialecto Alex. p. 145;) the testimony of the Grammarians respecting the two others, remains to be examined. To be-

gin with *κνήθω*; Moeris says (p. 234) that it is 'Ἑλληνικῶς, *κνεῖν Ἀττικῶς*; and so also Thomas Magister, p. 538. Hesychius has it in the explanation of *κνεῖν*. It occurs only in writers of a later age, Aristotle, Lucian, and others. In the New Testament it is used once by Paul, 2 Tim. 4: 3.—On the third word, *νήθω*, Pollux gives his opinion, VII. 32, *οἱ Ἀττικοὶ γὰρ τὸ νήθειν νεῖν λέγουσιν*. Rightly, for the prolonged form is read only in later writers; in the New Testament Matt. 6: 28. Luke 12: 27; in the Septuagint Ex. 35: 25; and in the Anthol. II. 32. 17.

The Greeks of the later age seem to have had a particular propensity to employ forms of verbs ending in *ώ*; of which not a small number might be adduced from the New Testament alone. The cause of this is perhaps to be sought in the circumstance, that the Macedonian tongue was distinguished for many forms of this sort; according to the analogy of which many new ones were coined. That the Doric language, at least, delighted especially in these forms, we may gather even from Pindar, who uses many verbs in a double form, ending both in *ώ* and in other terminations; as *δαιδάλλω* and *δαιδαλόω*, *φαρμακεύω* and *φαρμακώω*, *χαλκεύω* and *χαλκώω*. In the New Testament the following are of this sort.

Ἀνακαινώω, 2 Cor. 4: 16. Col. 3: 10; elsewhere found only in the ecclesiastical writers. Isocrates has *ἀνακαινίζειν*, Areop. c. 3. This mode of formation is not foreign to Attic usage. Compare other Attic forms, as *σκοτόω* Soph. Aj. 85, and *σκοτιζώ* Eurip. Oenei Fragm. 5, 2; *ξενώω* Xenoph. Agesil. VIII. 5, and *ξενίζω* Cyrop. V. 4. 7.—Hence also comes the noun *ἀνακαινώσις*, Rom. 12: 2. Tit. 3: 5; for which Suidas has *ἀνακαινισις*.

Ἀφνυπνύω, ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, Luke 8: 23. It is found in the Septuagint only in the Aldine edition, Judg. 5: 27. There is no doubt but that it belongs to the later age. Attic writers frequently have *ἀφνυπνίζω*, e.g. Eurip. Rhes. 25; and this is also enumerated among the Attic forms by the Grammarians, Moeris p. 61. Phrynichus p. 56. Thom. Mag. p. 134. We find once *καθυπνύω* in Xenophon, Memorab. II. 1. 30.

Δεκατόω, twice read in the New Testament, Heb. 7: 6, 9. Septuagint Neh. 10: 37. A word wholly unknown to the more ancient writers, who used for it *δεκατεύειν*, Xenoph. Anab. V. 3. 10. Hellen. VI. 3. 9. Harpocration adduces it from the

rhetoricians. Pindar abounds in such forms, as we have just said above.

Ἀποδεκατόω is referred by Fischer (Proluss. p. 696) to the Alexandrine dialect; because, besides the Alexandrine version, Gen. 28: 22. Deut. 14: 22. al. and the books of the New Testament, Matt. 23: 23. Luke 18: 12, it is used particularly often by Philo. A form *ἀποδεκατεύω*, so far as I know, is no where extant.

Ἐξουθενόω, found once in the New Testament, Mark 9: 12, but very often in the Septuagint Judg. 9: 38. Ps. 53: 6. 15: 4. al. To this use of it the gloss of Hesychius refers: *ἐξουθενώσας, ἀπεδοκίμασος*. It is elsewhere found only in the Etymolog. Mag. p. 350, 24. Plutarch has *ἐξουθενίζειν*, Opp. T. VII. p. 228.

Κραταιόω from *κραταιός*, used by Luke 1: 80, and Paul, 1 Cor. 16: 13. Eph. 3: 16; elsewhere extant only once in the Septuagint 1 Sam. 4: 9. The Attics used *κρατύνω* in the same sense; comp. Eurip. Hippol. 1282. Bacch. 659.

Σαρώω is not to be employed, but *σαίρω*; so says Thomas Magister, p. 789. So also Moeris p. 356, *σαίρειν*, *Ἀττικῶς σαροῦν*, *Ἑλληνικῶς*. It is found in Luke 15: 8. Matt. 12: 44. Sturz has also noted it in Pamphilus in Geoponn. 13, 15, 4; and in Quintilius, ib. 14, 6, 5. I subjoin Lycophron in Cassandr. 309, and Etymol. Mag. p. 276, 29. 407, 27. 708, 56. *Σαίρειν* is frequent in Euripides, as Hec. 363. Andr. 166. Jon. 115. 121. 795. Cycl. 29.

Σθενόω, except in the glossary of Hesychius, is found only in the New Testament, 1 Pet. 5: 10. The Attics employed *σθενεῖν* in an intransitive sense; as Aristoph. Plut. 912. Eurip. Hecub. 295. The compound *ἀσθενόω* occurs in Xenophon, Cyrop. I. 5. 3.

These examples are sufficient. Of the rest, as *ἐνδυναμόω*, *ἐκρίζόω*, and others, I shall speak in another place.

There remain the *adverbs*; and in respect to these we may be brief. We find new forms both simple and compound. Fischer has already spoken of *ἐξάπινα* for *ἐξαπιναίως* or *ἐξαπίνης*, in his Proluss. p. 674. It is very rare in the later Greek writers; I have found it only in Zonaras VII. 25. X. 37. It occurs in the New Testament, Mark 9: 8; and in the Septuagint Josh. 11: 7. Num. 6: 9.—The form *πανοικί* is condemned by the Grammarians; Moeris p. 320, *πανοικησία*, *Ἀττικῶς πανοικί*, *Ἑλληνικῶς*. Thom. Mag. p. 676. Hesychius has it in

a gloss : *πασύρωσ' ἄρδην, πανοικί*. The gloss of Suidas, which Phavorinus has copied, relates to the New Testament : *πανοικί, ὄλω οἴκω*. It occurs Acts 16: 34; and in the Alexandrine writers, Ex. 1: 1. 3 Macc. 3: 27. It is also adduced from Josephus, Ant. IV. 4. 4. Philo de Joseph. p. 562. Æschines Socr. Dial. II. 1, and others; all of whom however are not to be accounted as having been masters of the pure Attic diction. Herodotus has *πανοικία*, VIII. 106; Thucydides *πανοικησία*, II. 16. III. 57.—A third example is *ἀλλαγόθεν* John 10: 1; comp. Esth. 4: 13. Thom. Mag. p. 37. *ἄλλοθι, ἄλλοθεν, ἄλλοσε, δοκιμώτερα ἢ ἀλλαγόθι, ἀλλαγόθεν, ἀλλαγόσε*. Moeris is more moderate, as it would seem; p. 11, *ἄλλοθι, ἄλλοσε, ἄλλοθεν, Ἀττικῶς ἀλλαγόθι, ἀλλαγόθεν, ἀλλαγοῦ, καινότερον Ἀττικῶς καὶ Ἑλληνικῶς*. But that it belongs to the later Atticism I do not doubt; since only writers of a later age are found to have used it, as Aelian Var. Hist. VI. 2. VIII. 7. Galen de usu Partium IX. Simplicius in Epictet. p. 255. Appian Punic. p. 129. Plutarch Fab. p. 178. Themistius p. 15. C. Eustathius ad Iliad. κ. p. 719, 31.

Of new compound forms, a particular one is *πάντοτε* for *ἐκαστότε*, respecting which Sturz has already adduced all that is to be said, de Dial. Alex. p. 187. 59.

VI. The sixth class comprehends words, *either peculiar to the ancient dialects*, which have been brought together in the common language, or those *altogether new*, which have been first introduced by the later Greeks. The occurrence of both of these, is consistent with the nature of the subject under investigation. New words and new modes of speaking spring up in every tongue, so long as it flourishes in daily use and as a living language. That the style of the Greek tongue was particularly diversified by peculiar words, or idioms, according to the various countries in which that language was spoken, is unknown to no one who has in the slightest degree considered the nature and mutual relation of the dialects. The confusion and intermixture of the tribes was followed by the confusion of the dialects; so that what was before peculiar to a single dialect, was now employed promiscuously in the later language. This is manifested in the books of the New Testament, in the Alexandrine version, and in the other works written in the common idiom; in all of which Ionic, Doric, and Attic words are promiscuously used. The following are examples. One is *ἐκτρομα* 1 Cor. 15: 8; which was used only by the *Ionics* and writers of the

later age ; while the Attics said *ἐξάμβλωμα*, according to Phrynichus, pp. 88, 128. The different writers in whom it is found are accurately noted by Fischer, Proluss. p. 701, and Sturz, p. 164.—*Γογγύζειν* John 7: 32. Matt. 20: 11 ; *γογγυσμός* John 7: 12, and the same in Phrynichus p. 158 ; where he says they are Ionic, and adduces a passage from Phocylides of Miletus, who uses the compound *περιγογγύζειν*, while the Attics, he says, employed *τονθρύζειν* and *τονθρυσμός*. With this agree Thomas Mag. p. 856, Suidas, Hesychius, Phavorinus, who all explain this verb by *τονθρύζειν*. Pollux, Onomast. V. 89, refers these words to the cooing of doves ; which seems to have been the proper signification. They occur only in the *κοινοί* ; e. g. *γογγύζειν* in Lucian Opp. T. X. p. 94. Antonius de se ipso l. fin. II. 21. Arrimann Epict. III. 26 ; and *γογγυσμός* in the same Antonius l. c. IX. 37. Nicetas in Andronic. Commen. I. 11. Add Sept. Num. 14: 1. Ex. 16: 7. The writer of Jude, v. 16, calls false teachers *γογγυσταί*, an example of which word I find cited only once, viz. from Theodotion, Prov. 26: 21.—To the Ionic dialect also we may refer the verb *σκορπίζειν* John 10: 12. 16: 32 ; of which Phrynichus says, p. 94, *σκορπίζεται Ἐκαταῖος μὲν τοῦτο λέγει Ἰώνων οἱ δ' Ἀττικοὶ σκεδάννυται φασί*. The other Grammarians do not note the word ; with the exception of the author of the Etymologicum Mag. p. 719, 17. Valckenaer remarks that it came into use after the time of Alexander the Great. The simple verb is found nowhere, except in the Alexandrian version 2 Sam. 22: 15. Ps. 17: 16. al. Several compound forms occur ; but only in writers of the later ages. So *διασκορπίζειν*, besides in the New Testament Matt. 26: 31. John 11: 52, and Sept. Zech. 13: 7, is also read in Aelian Var. Hist. XIII. 46. Polyb. I. 47. 5 ; for which Sophocles has *διασκεδάννυμι*, Oed. in Col. 620, 1341. Also *ἀποσκορπίζειν*, 1 Macc. 11: 55 ; *ἐσκορπισμός* Plutarch T. VII. p. 507.

Thus far the Ionic words ; nor are others wanting, which appear to have been adopted from the *Doric* dialect. *Κοράσιον* and *κολλυβισιής*, as we have seen above, are referred by the Grammarians to the Macedonians. To these we may add *ἀγορέλαιος*, Rom. 11: 17, 24 ; which the Grammarians affirm to be put with less elegance for *κότινος*. Moeris, p. 237, *κότινος*, *Ἀττικῶς* *ἀγορέλαιος*, *Ἑλληνικῶς*. Thom. Mag. p. 551, *κότινος*, *οὐκ ἀγορέλαιος*. So also Aelius Dionysius in Eustath. ad Od. ψ. p. 818. The Grammarians explain other words by this, as

if it was common and well known to all. Hesychius: *κότινος ἀγριέλαιος*; and so Suidas. Pollux I. 241, *ἡ δὲ αγριέλαια κότινος καλεῖται*; and so even Dioscorides himself I. 137, *ἀγριέλαια, ἣν ἐνιοὶ κότινον καλοῦσιν*. Theophrastus also has it, Hist. Plant. II. 3 and 4, and several others; but all of the later ages. It appears to be Doric; as we may gather from the fact of its being used by Theocritus, Idyl. XXV. 21.—We may reasonably conclude, that many other words extant in the New Testament were in like manner adopted into the later language from the ancient dialects; although, from the silence of the Grammarians, we are not able to refer them to their proper origin.

We come now to words entirely *new*, and which first began to be used in the later language. These may be reduced to three kinds. The first sort embraces those, which the ancient Grammarians have expressly asserted to be peculiar to the common language. The second kind are those, which, although not expressly condemned by the Grammarians as not admissible in a good style, are nevertheless found only in the later writers, *τοῖς κοινοῖς*. The third sort includes those, which are extant only in those authors who have in their writings employed the language of common life; as the apostles, the Alexandrine interpreters, the writers of the Apocryphal books, the ancient fathers, the authors of glossaries, etc. It is obvious, however, in respect to the whole class of words in question, i. e. new words, that they must not all be regarded as having been formed and introduced into the language after the time of Alexander the Great. By no means. Many of those words which the Grammarians reprehend, may already have long existed in the language, unemployed indeed by good writers, but by no means discarded from the usage of common life. Many of those, moreover, which are no longer found in Attic writers, but only in the *κοινοῖς*, are unquestionably to be considered as ancient and of approved authority. Although, indeed, they do not occur in the earlier writers, still the cause of this may probably lie in the fact, that we no longer possess all those authors who wrote in the earlier ages. The same is true also of the third species of words above mentioned; among which there probably are many that were anciently known and approved of. Nevertheless, it would I think be of great utility, if in reference to these three divisions, interpreters would endeavour accurately to ascertain what belongs to the language of more ancient writers, what to those of a later age, and what to the usage and idiom of common life.

We should then not only have something more definite in respect to the sources of the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament writers, which we have so often seen to be either wholly neglected or improperly applied; but should then also be able to gain some more perspicuous views of the nature and character of the style of the New Testament; in which, hitherto, no accurate distinction has been made, between what was to be regarded as Attic, what as appropriate *τῇ κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ*, and what as peculiar to the idiom of the common people. Indeed, the study of the Greek language in general would unquestionably be much promoted, if the character and *usus loquendi* of the *κοινοί* were accurately ascertained and described, so as to mark how far and in what respects they have departed from the Attic diction. But this can only be accomplished by taking up all the authors one by one, and investigating the style of each writer separately; so as to shew in detail what is Attic, and what is not Attic. Our plan is limited to the books of the New Testament; in respect to which we will endeavour accurately to determine what is appropriate to each of these three divisions.

To return then to the point whence we have digressed—to those words which were first used in a later age, either by writers of learning, or by those who employed the language of common life. That many of these were then newly formed, no one will deny. This is manifest from the analogy of all languages, which, so long as they remain living tongues, are continually augmented by the addition of new words. Nor are there wanting here certain criteria, by the application of which the old may with sufficient probability be distinguished from the new. We may establish *three* such criteria. The *first* has respect to the thing to be expressed. If this appear to be new, and unknown to the men of former days, then the word also is probably of recent origin. So *ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος*, 1 Pet. 4: 5; *ἀνθρωπάρεσκος*, Col. 3: 2; *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*, Luke 8: 41; *ἀρχιελῶνης*, Luke 19: 2; *δωδεκάφυλον*, Acts 26: 7; *εἰδωλατρεια*, 1 Cor. 10: 14; *εἰδωλατρης*, 1 Cor. 10: 7; and the like. That these words are new, no one can doubt, who recollects that the things which they were invented to express, were peculiar to the Jews and unknown to the Greeks.—The *second* criterion has respect to words which designate things not unknown to the ancients, but which had other names in the ancient language. *Μερισμός* and *διαμερισμός* are condemned by the Grammarians; the latter by Pollux VIII. 136, *ὁ γὰρ διαμερισμός ὑπόφανλον*; the former by Thom-

as Magister p. 49, *ἀναδάσασθαι, οὐκ ἀναμερίσασθαι. Καὶ ἀναδάσμος, οὐ μερίσμος*. Correctly, as I suppose; for they are both extant only in the *κοινοί*, viz. *μερίσμος* in Josephus Ant. VII. p. 249. Theophr. de Caus. Plant. I. 13. Hist. Plant. I. 2. Polyb. IX. 34: 7; and *διαμερίσμος* in Plutarch, T. VIII. p. 592. Diod. XI. 47. Earlier writers employed *δάσμος* and *ἀναδάσμος*. So *ἀγαθοσύνη*, which Paul uses Rom. 15: 14. Gal. 5: 22, I find in no other author, except the Alexandrine interpreters and the ecclesiastical writers. The Attics said *χρησιότης*, according to Thomas Magister p. 921, *χρησιότης, οὐκ ἀγαθότης, οὐδ' ἀγαθοσύνη*. So in very many other examples; as *ἀποκεφαλίζειν* for *κατατομῆν*, *κράββατος* for *σκίμπος*, *σαροῦν* for *σαίρειν*, *ἐξυπνίζειν* for *ἀφυπνίζειν*.—The third criterion of a later origin I refer to those words which, either in their formation or signification, follow an analogy wholly new and unknown to the ancient language. Of this kind is *ὀρθρίζειν* for *ὀρθρεῖν*, which I have noted above, p. 675. Another example is *δυναμόω*, used by Paul Col. 1: 11; comp. Ecc. 10: 10. Dan. 9: 27; which according to analogy ought to be derived either from a noun of the second declension in *ος*, as *δουλόω* from *δοῦλος*; or in *ον*, as *περόω* from *περόν*; or from the genitive of the third declension, as *πυρόω* from *πῦρ, πυρός*. But there is no root of this kind extant from which to derive either *δυναμόω* or the compound *ἐνδυναμόω*; which, like the simple verb, is found only in the writers of the New Testament and in the Alexandrine version, as Heb. 11: 34. Phil. 4: 13. Ps. 51: 7. To these we may add *σπλαγγνίζεσθαι*, which appears to be a verb of recent origin from its signification; since the earlier Greeks did not use *τὰ σπλάγγνα* in the sense of *miseriordia*, but this usage passed from the Hebrews to the Jews who spoke the Greek language. It is found Matt. 9: 36. al. and in Symmachus, Deut. 13: 8. The Septuagint has the compound *ἐπισπλαγγνίζεσθαι*, Prov. 17: 5. Here too belongs *πολύσπλαγγνος* James 5: 1; which seems to be no where else extant.

The modes in which new words could be formed, were of course not uniform, but exceedingly various. Some arose in connexion with new and unknown things; examples of which have been given above, and of which innumerable instances occur in the later writers. Others again, although not employed to express new ideas, owed their origin to some regular analogy, by which the men of a later age were guided in the formation of them. Words of this kind appear every where. Thus no an-

cient author would have written *καταλάλλα*, according to Thomas Magister, p. 565; while *λαλία* and *προσολαλία* and *προλαλία* were of approved authority. We find this word in 2 Cor. 12: 20; but elsewhere only in the Alexandrine writers, Wisd. 1: 11; and in the fathers, as Clem. Alex. p. 556. Basil T. II. pp. 247, 497. The verb *καταλαλεῖν* occurs in Aristophanes, Ran. 752. So *ἀγαθοσύνη* and *μερισμός* have just been noted (p. 683); in which there is nothing contrary to good analogy.—Others still would seem to be formed after the manner of foreign languages. Such are *ἀνθύπατος*, Acts 13: 7; *ἀνθυπατεύω*, Acts 18: 12; *ἀλεκτοροφωνία*, Mark 13: 35; *προσωποληπτιώ*, James 2: 9; *προσωποληπτης*, Acts 10: 34; *προσωποληψία*, Rom. 2: 11; in all of which the traces of the Latin and Hebrew languages will be apparent to every one. In others, lastly, conciseness of expression would seem to have been the object, and they would appear to have been formed by way of compendium; as *αἰχμαλωτίζειν* Rom. 7: 23, and passive *αἰχμαλωτίζεσθαι* Luke 21: 24; for which the Grammarians direct to use *αἰχμάλωτον ποιεῖν* or *αἰχμάλωτον γίνεσθαι*, as Phryn. p. 192. Thom. Mag. p. 23. So *ἀναστατοῦν*, Acts 17: 6. Gal. 5: 12, which, although the Grammarians are silent respecting it, is yet nowhere found except in the versions of the Old Testament, Ps. 58: 11. Is. 22: 3, and in Harpocration who explains the verb *ἀνασκευάσασθαι* by the verb *ἀναστατωθῆναι*. The Attics appear to have said *ἀναστατον ποιεῖν*, as Xenoph. Hellen. XI. 5. 35. Sophoc. Antig. 687. Trach. 39. Isocrates Panegy. c. 31. We may also perhaps properly refer the verb *βεβηλώω* to the same genus; which, besides Matt. 12: 5. Acts 24: 6, is found only in the Alexandrine interpreters; as Ex. 31: 14. Ez. 43: 7. al. Whether the Greeks said *βέβηλον ποιεῖν* or something similar instead of it, I am not able certainly to affirm. Indeed this whole subject can be treated of only in single examples; in which we can here no longer delay.

VII. The seventh class of vestiges of the later language occurring in the New Testament, consists in those *significations of words*, which, not being found in the more ancient language, appear to have been either later introduced, or not of good authority. It is the duty of an interpreter of the New Testament to be master of all the sources of the *usus loquendi*; but this cannot be done, unless the new powers and meanings of words, both in the works of later writers and in the language of common life, are accurately noted and distinguished. To note all

these properly is a matter of no little difficulty ; not only in avoiding to assume as a new signification that which is in fact only a new sense* ; but also in developing the connexion in which the new power of a word stands related to the usual meanings of it. In this particular branch there remains yet very much to be done in order to arrive at accuracy.—In my view, new significations of words may arise in a twofold manner ; either by amplification or transfer. *Amplification* takes place, when you superadd to the notions or ideas already expressed by a word, another notion, which hitherto has not been connected with them. The following examples will illustrate this. The verb *παρακαλεῖν* is said to be used incorrectly in the sense of *asking, beseeching* ; since the earlier and purer writers employ it particularly in the sense of *exhorting* ; so Thomas Mag. p. 684 ; and with him coincide Suidas, Phavorinus, and Hermogenes *περὶ μεθόδου δεινότη.* c. 3. p. 519. ed. Laurent. The case is just this ; the ancient writers did not yet refer, as was done in a later age, the kind of exhortation expressed by this verb to those things, which we wish to have done by others for ourselves and for our advantage. There arose out of it in this way an *exhortation to do that which corresponds to our prayers*, i. e. a real petition, which, conceived of in this manner, might easily be called *παρακλήσις*. The verb *παιδεύω* furnishes another example ; which, according to Thomas Magister, is found in the sacred books only in the sense of *chastising*. The following are his words, p. 729, *ὡσαύτως οὐδέ παιδεύειν ἀντὶ τοῦ κολάζειν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ μόνῃ τῇ θεῖᾳ γραφῇ τοῦτο εὐρίσκεται.* See Heb. 12: 7. Luke 23: 16. How this signification came to be attributed to the word, is easy to be conceived, if we recollect that education was connected with chastisement. Frequently too that which is newly added in the thought, is also distinctly expressed in the words. So *χρόνον ποιεῖν*, Acts 15: 33. 18: 23 ; in which phrase we find a use of the verb *ποιεῖν* unknown to the more ancient language ; which never refers it to time, but employs *διατρίβειν* in this sense. All these are instances of new significations from amplification. Others arise also from *transfer*. I call that transfer, when we attribute to words a new power or meaning derived from a foreign language, which meaning these words do not originally possess

* See the Appendix to this article, no. 2. p. 690.

in the vernacular tongue. Instances of this sort are innumerable in the writings of the New Testament. Many Greek words have there received new significations after the model of the Hebrew; in such a way, namely, that if a Greek word coincides with a Hebrew one in some certain signification, we find also the other significations of that Hebrew or Aramaean word transferred to the same Greek word. I purposely omit examples; as they must be familiar, in all the parts of speech, even to those who have paid the slightest attention to the subject.

Besides the writers of the New Testament, the Alexandrine interpreters have also transferred from the Hebrew *usus loquendi* new significations to many Greek words. The cause of this some have supposed—and not without a semblance of truth—to lie in the poverty of the Hebrew;¹⁴³ whence it has happened, that since one word in that language often serves to express several ideas, the same variety of signification has been transferred to a Greek word, which perhaps properly corresponded to it only in one signification. But if we consider the subject attentively, this mode of explanation will appear to be true only in part. It is indeed true that the Hebrew language, when compared with the Greek, contains very few words. But, on the other hand this very fewness of words shews, that the ideas which the Hebrews had acquired by reflection and which they expressed in words, were also circumscribed within far narrower limits than among the Greeks; and that therefore it was not possible in this manner, to hide as it were a variety of things under this poverty of language. All this will be surprising to no one who reflects upon the history of this people, and their disinclination to all intercourse with other nations. Nor is it easy to understand, why the sacred authors should be induced by the poverty of their vernacular tongue, to despise the riches of the Greek and prefer to use Greek words in a foreign sense, rather than to employ instead of these, other words in their proper sense. We must therefore look for some other and more probable reason, which operated to produce this transfer of signification; and I think we shall not err, if we look for it in a certain negligence, and in the little accurate knowledge which the apostles had of the Greek language. This seems indeed to have been the sole cause; and it sprang from their erroneous modes of thinking; since they seem to have taken it for granted, that the same

¹⁴³ Leusden, *De Hebraismis* N. T. p. 32. ed. Fischer.

force and the same power were inherent in the Greek words, which they had found by experience to exist in their vernacular ones. They were unacquainted with grammatical studies, and could not therefore be accurately skilled in the Greek language, nor familiar with its nature and character.—From all these circumstances it is obvious, that new significations of this kind, which thus arise by transfer or translation, do not enrich but rather corrupt a language; and that they cannot be introduced, except by authors who are only slightly versed in the grammatical structure of languages.

VIII. It remains in the eighth class to treat of the instances where the *usus loquendi*, and this alone, has been subjected to change. The *usus loquendi* is defined to be *the custom of expressing a certain thing by a certain word*.¹⁴⁴ To this I think it would not be out of place to subjoin, that *this usage is introduced both by writers and the study of them, and by the intercourse of common life*. Hence the *usus loquendi* of books may be one thing; and that of common life another. From this law however we find the later Greeks to have widely receded, both in their writings and in their language of common intercourse; employing many words to express things, in connexion with which the ancient Greeks never used those words. In regard to the language of books, this is testified by the monuments of antiquity; in respect to the language of common life, although direct testimony is wanting, yet we may well assume the fact, inasmuch as this species of language is in itself variable and fixed by no certain laws. In the style of the New Testament, the *usus loquendi* of both the earlier and later writers, ought to be carefully distinguished from that of the common spoken language; because if this distinction be overlooked, we cannot treat in any proper manner of the sources of the *usus loquendi*. Fischer and Sturz have already collected many examples under this head; and there remain other instances still unobserved. But it has hitherto been the common fault of all interpreters, with the exception of these two individuals, that in determining the *usus loquendi* of the sacred authors, they have very rarely had regard to the kind of writers from whom they drew parallel passages; whether they were of approved authority, or whether of a later age, when the purity and chastity of the earlier Greek diction was no longer preserved undefiled. Hence it has happened, that they

¹⁴⁴ Morus Hermeneut. I. p. 34. ed. Eichstädt.

have frequently attributed senses to words, which a reference to time would shew that they could not possibly have. Some examples are given above; and I subjoin here some others, in which the vestiges of the later idiom have not yet been noticed. Almost all the Atticists affirm that the word *μάμμη* is not used of a *grandmother*, but of a mother; Phryn. p. 52, *μάμμην, τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ μητρὸς μητέρα οὐ λέγουσιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, ἀλλὰ τίτθην. μάμμην μὲν οὖν καὶ μάμμιον τὴν μητέρα. ἀμαθὲς οὖν τὴν μάμμην ἐπὶ τῆς τίτθης λέγειν.* Dionys. Ael. ap. Eustath. Moeris p. 258. Thom. Mag. p. 846. Helladius ap. Phot. Bibl. p. 1579. Schol. ad Aristoph. Acharn. 39. Photius p. 180. But Hesychius and Suidas, who explain it by *τὴν μητέρα τῶν γονέων* and *τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ μητρὸς μητέρα*, have express reference to the New Testament usage, and are not to be regarded as interpreters of the Attic diction. The same may be affirmed of Pollux, who says Onomast. III. 7, *ἡ δὲ πατρὸς ἢ μητρὸς μήτηρ τίτθη καὶ τὴν μάμμην δὲ, καὶ μάμμιν, ἐπὶ ταύτης παραληπτέον*, which words I suppose are to be understood rather with reference to his own time, than to antiquity. Paul uses this word for *grandmother*, 2 Tim. 1: 5; a usage acknowledged only by the *κοινοῖ*; Plutarch Tom. I. pp. 797, 804. T. II. p. 704. Philo p. 601. Josephus p. 351.—The verb *εὐχαριστεῖν* Pollux rightly observes, Onomast. V. 32, was only employed *ἐπὶ τῷ δίδόναι χάριν, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ εἰδέναι*, i. e. in the sense *to gratify*, and not in the sense *to give thanks* (Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 18); and to this precept must we reduce the opinions of the other Grammarians, e. g. Phrynich. p. 8, *εὐχαριστεῖν οὐδεὶς τῶν δοκίμων εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ χάριν εἰδέναι.* Thom. Mag. p. 913. Many citations have been heaped together by Kyrke, Alberti, and others; but the authors from whom they quote are of the later age, and are therefore not of an authority sufficient to do away the censure of the Grammarians. The word is used in the former sense by Demosthenes pro Coron. p. 122; in the latter by the writers of the New Testament, Matt. 15: 36. Luke 27: 16. 2 Cor. 1: 11.—Of the verb *βρέχειν* the same Grammarians affirm, that the Attics never used it in reference to rain, for which they said *ὑεῖν*; Phrynich. p. 121. Phavorinus. Thom. Mag. p. 171, *βρέχει, οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχαίων εἶπεν ἐπὶ ὑετοῦ, ἀλλὰ ὑεῖ.* Phrynichus cites a certain Telclides, a comic writer, as having used it in this sense; but seems to be in doubt about the real author of the fable, from which the example is quoted. I have not been able to find it

in this sense in any approved prose writer. The passage of Anacreon¹⁴⁵ which Triller has adduced in order to weaken the authority of Thomas Magister, is entirely consistent with the precepts of the Grammarians; for *βρέχομαι* and *βραχεῖσα* are there used passively, which passive use of the verb seems not to be reprehended by them. There remains the passage in Pindar,¹⁴⁶ where the active form is once employed in reference to *snow*; but it is hardly necessary to remark, that the *usus loquendi* of poetry and of prose are often very different. I omit other examples; which could not well be explained without going largely into particulars.

N. B. For an Index to this article, see the end of the volume.

APPENDIX.

*On the Lexicography of the New Testament.**

There are three things, a careful and accurate distinction of which is essential to the full illustration of every word.

1. The first regards the *history* of a word, and its *age*. The latter must be distinctly specified, on account of the different mode of treatment which will be required, according as the word is known to have been already in use among the earlier Greeks, or to be peculiar to the later language. Those of the

¹⁴⁵ Od. III. 12.

*Βρέχομαι δέ, κ' ἄσέληνον
Κατὰ νύκτα πεπλάνημαι.*

Also a little farther on, v. 26.

Βλάβεται βραχεῖσα νευρή.

¹⁴⁶ Olymp. VII. 63.

*ἔνθα ποτὲ
Βρέγε θεῶν βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας
Χρυσαῖς νιφάδεσσι πόλιν.*

* The following are the introductory remarks to a Programm published by the author at Pentecost, 1818, reprinted in Rosenmueller's *Commentationes Theologicae* I. p. 171. The body of the Programm consists of three lexicographical articles on the words *ἀγάπη*, *ἀγιασμός*, *πνεῦμα*. See the Preliminary Remarks above, p. 640.

former kind do not need to be further taken into the account in an historical description of the later Hellenism ; for they come down, of course, quite to the commencement of the *κοινή διάλεκτος*, and on this account require no farther explanation than the mere statement of their ancient signification and use ; the testimonies and sources of which have been collected with great diligence, and are extant in other works, accessible to all who pursue the study of the language. Those of the latter kind, on the contrary, both the words themselves and their later forms, require a wholly different mode of treatment ; since neither the history of them, nor the appropriate meaning and usage, has hitherto been determined ; but is still to be investigated and established by the authority of competent witnesses. Hence, not only the sources in which the first traces of such words occur, but also the senses and significations which seem to be the most ancient, ought to be fully and accurately described. The complete exhibition of the significations of a word, depends very frequently on a full exhibition of its history ; inasmuch as in this way only is its real origin and primitive sense to be correctly recognized.

2. The second important point to be regarded in treating of a word, is a true and perfect exposition of its *signification*. This depends, in the first place, in my judgment, very much on a close and accurate distinction of the primary notion of a word from those significations, which have arisen either from a later *usus loquendi*, or from its being variously transferred and applied to express other objects. And in the next place, the same method should be followed in regard to the derived significations, which should be illustrated in a similar manner, and their consistency and correspondence with the ultimate root, under every variety of usage, be pointed out and established. In this way the error into which interpreters of every age have hitherto very frequently fallen, may be most certainly avoided, viz. the failure to distinguish between the *signification* and the *sense* of words. In a language where religion and religious things are the chief subjects of discourse, there is of course the greatest danger of committing errors of this sort ; since every thing relating to God and to the divine nature, can be apprehended, either in thought or external expression, only when represented under some imagery ; and the choice of this imagery and the method of transferring it to express that which is divine, affords perpetual occasion to give a

new sense to words ; which, however, is something very different from a new signification. This latter arises and assumes its place in the language, when the thing which it designates is itself new, and is not merely employed by way of comparison, as an image, to signify some other thing. On the other hand, a new and different *sense* arises in words, when they are not employed to designate things in themselves new, but are only transferred and applied to a new comparison of that which they have hitherto designated, with something else. These two things ought certainly in no language to be more carefully distinguished, than in that which relates to religion ; because here the objects to which all the signs of language refer, remain immutable, and only the forms and images under which they must be apprehended by the mind, can be subject to novelty and change. Hence, therefore, they present occasion for the rise of new *senses*, but not of new *significations*.

3. The third point which requires particular attention in the explanation of words in the later Hellenism, has regard to *the anomalous use of words*, either by themselves, so far as they suffer any change in sense, or as standing in connexion with other words. Whatever is found in either case, contrary to the usual rules of grammar and sense as they obtained in the more ancient language, may be much more conveniently treated of in a *Lexicón* than in the *Grammar* ; since it can refer only to single examples, and not to the circle of the whole language. That a multitude of such anomalies have migrated into the diction of the sacred writers, can be matter of doubt to no one who is thoroughly acquainted with the history and nature of the Jewish Hellenism. There is besides another cause, which cannot but be followed by similar anomalies and departures from good usage. I mean the particular usage, both as to grammar and sense, of individual writers. This could not well have been otherwise ; since they appear to have been regulated by no common law, but rather by accident and individual taste, in thus transferring the *usus loquendi* of their own tongue to the Greek language. For these reasons I propose, after giving under every word a review of its significations, to add in the third place a brief illustration of its use, both in general and by particular writers, so far as it may seem to deviate from the customary rules of the language.

ART. III. GENERAL VIEW OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND ITS DIALECTS.*

From Buttmann's Greek Grammar. Translated by the Editor.

1. The Greek language (*φωνή Ἑλληνική*) was anciently spread abroad not only over Greece, but also over a large portion of Asia Minor, Southern Italy, Sicily, and still other regions, where there were Greek colonies. Like all other languages, it had its various dialects (*διάλεκτοι*), all of which however may be referred back to two principal ones, viz. the *Doric* (*ἡ Δωρική, Δωρῆς*) and the *Ionic* (*ἡ Ἴωνική, Ἴας*), which belonged to the two great Grecian tribes of the like names.

2. The Doric tribe was the largest, and sent abroad the most colonies. Hence the Doric dialect prevailed in the whole interior of Greece, in Italy, and in Sicily. It was harsher, and made upon the ear, in consequence of the predominant long *α*, an impression which the Greeks call *πλατειασμός*, broad pronunciation. It was on the whole a less cultivated dialect. A branch of it was the *Aeolic* (*ἡ Αἰολική, Αἰολῆς*); which, particularly in the Aeolic colonies of Asia Minor and the neighboring islands (Lesbos etc.) arrived early at a considerable degree of refinement. This however did not probably extend beyond the limits of poetry.

3. The Ionic tribe in the earlier ages chiefly inhabited Attica, and sent out from thence colonies to the coasts of Asia Minor. These colonies took the lead both of the mother tribe and of all the other Greeks in general improvement; and hence the names Ionians and Ionic came to be applied chiefly and at last exclusively to them and their dialect; while the original Ionians in Attica were now called Attics and Athenians.—The Ionic dialect is the softest of all, in consequence of its many vowels. The *Attic* (*ἡ Ἀττική, Ἀτθῆς*) which also was afterwards cultivated, soon surpassed in refinement all the other dialects; avoiding with Attic elegance and address both the harshness of the Doric and the softness of the Ionic. But although the Attic

* See the Preliminary Remarks prefixed to the preceding article, p. 640. The following article has been already translated and published by Professor Patton, as an Appendix to his edition of Thiersch's Greek Tables.

tribe was the real mother-tribe, yet the Ionic dialect of these Asiatic colonies is regarded as the mother of the Attic dialect; inasmuch as it was cultivated at the period when it varied least from the old Ionic, the common source of both.

NOTE 1. The elegance and address of the Attic dialect is most visible in the Syntax, where it is distinguished, not only above all the other dialects, but also above all other languages, by an appropriate conciseness, by a most effective arrangement of the constituent parts, and by a certain moderation in asserting and judging, which passed over from the polite tone of social intercourse into the language itself.*

NOTE 2. Other minor branches of these dialects, such as the *Boeotic*, *Laconic*, *Thessalian*, etc. are known only from single words and forms, and through scattered notices, incriptions, etc.

* Another source of the charm of the Attic language lies, where very few look for it, in its *individuality*; and in the feeling of affection for this and for *nationality* in general, which the Attic writers possessed. However well adapted for the understanding, and for the internal and external sense of beauty a language may be, which every where exhibits a correct logic, follows a regular and fixed analogy, and employs pleasing sounds, still all these advantages are lifeless without the charm of individuality. This however consists wholly in occasional sacrifices of these fundamental laws, especially of logic and general analogy, in favour of idioms or modes of speech which have their source partly in certain traits of national character, and partly also incontestably in an apprehension of those ground rules, not exactly conformed to the usage of the schools. In this way anomalous forms of expression had arisen in the Attic, as in every other language; and these the cultivated writers did not wish to change, out of respect to antiquity and for the ear of the people which had now become accustomed to such forms and turns of expression; and also, as above remarked, out of a cherished regard for individuality. When in other languages irregularities of style occur, we see at once that they result from inaccuracy or want of skill; while among the Attics, who are so distinguished for address and skill, we perceive that they did not wish to make the correction. Indeed they felt, that by removing anomalies they should deprive their language of the stamp of a production of nature, which every language really is; and thus give it the appearance of a work of art, which a language never can become. It follows here of course, that intentional anomalies, by which a language is made to assume the appearance of a mere plaything, can never be taken into the account; however ready the older grammarians often were with this convenient mode of explanation.

4. As the common source of all the dialects, we must assume an ancient original Greek language; of which, however, it is only through philosophical investigation, that any definite forms of words can be made out, or, to speak more correctly, presupposed. Each dialect naturally retained more or less out of this ancient language; and without doubt, each for itself must have continued to possess from it much that was by degrees lost in the others. In this single consideration we have at once an easy explanation, how the Grammarians can talk of Doricisms, Aeolicisms, and even Atticisms, in the old Ionic Greek of Homer. Generally, however, it was customary to call that which was usual or frequent in any one dialect, by the name of that dialect; even when it happened to occur in the others. In this way must be explained, e. g. the so called Doricisms in Attic writers, and the Attic forms in writers who otherwise did not employ the Attic dialect.*

5. To the same ancient language belong also, for the most part, the so called *poetic* forms and licenses. It is indeed true that the poet contributes to the formation of a language; and that through him a language first becomes cultivated, i. e. is formed to a melodious, expressive, copious whole. Nevertheless, the poet does not derive the innovations, which he finds necessary, simply from himself; for this would be the surest way to displease. The earliest Greek bards merely *selected* according to their wants from the variety of *actual* forms, which they found already existing. Many of these forms became obsolete in common usage; but the later poet, who had these old bards before his eyes, was not disposed to yield his right to these treasures. In this way, that which was originally a real idiom of the language, came to be poetic peculiarity or the so called poetic license, and is therefore properly to be reckoned among the dialects.†

* E. g. The Doric future in *σοῖμαι, ξοῖμαι*; the Attic form of declension in *ως* etc. the 'Attic' *ξὺν* for *σύν*, and the like.

† This is however not to be so understood, as if every single word which occurs in the older poets, was also once used in common life. The privilege, which also the modern poet even in the most copious language retains, of forming new words and of remodelling old ones, must have belonged in a still wider extent to the ancient bard in those times of poverty. His only restriction was, that the material *from* which, and the form *in* which he modelled his inno-

6. In all cultivated nations, some one of their dialects usually becomes the foundation of the common written language, and of the language of good society. Among the Greeks this was not at first the case. They began to improve in culture, while they were yet divided into several different states, separated both by geographical position and by political relations. Hence, until about the time of Alexander, each writer employed the dialect in which he had been educated, or that which he preferred; and thus were formed Ionic, Aeolic, Doric, and Attic poets and prose writers, of whose productions more or less are still extant.

NOTE 3. Only the great works of poetic art, which excited universal attention, such as epic and dramatic poetry, constitute here an exception. The first authors in these walks, it is true, made use of the dialect of their own country; but still, an imitation of them in any other dialect,—not to say that this would have required an almost equal degree of creative talent,—would not have been successful; because the Greeks of all the tribes were now familiarised to *these* sounds in *this* species of composition, and were no longer able to separate the one from the other. That dialect therefore in which the first master-pieces of any particular species were written, remained the dialect of that species. See Text 10, 11.

NOTE 4. To the Ionic dialect belong the earliest poets, Homer, Hesiod, Theognis, etc. whose language nevertheless has more of that apparently mixed character, which approaches nearest to the ancient language, and which afterwards continued to mark the language of poetry in most of its species. The proper though later Ionic dialect is found in the prose writers, of whom Herodotus and Hippocrates are the principal; though both were of Doric origin. The Ionic dialect had already in their time acquired, in consequence of its peculiar softness and early culture, a certain degree of universality, especially in Asia Minor, even beyond the limits of poetry.

NOTE 5. Among the poets of that period the *lyric* writers were at home in all the dialects. The earliest and most celebrated were the Aeolic lyric poets; and of these the chief were Sappho and Alcaeus; from whom however only a few fragments have come down to us. Anacreon sung in Ionic; of him also we have only a few remains, and these partly mere fragments, and partly of

vations, must be drawn not from himself, but from the existing stores and analogies of the language. Of course also the right of softening down the usual forms, which belongs even to the man of common life, cannot be denied to him in whom melody is a duty, and who is moreover fettered by metre.

doubtful authenticity. The other lyric writers were mostly Doric ; and each created at will, as it were, his own language out of the copious variety of forms in this widely extended dialect. Of these last, Pindar is the only one from whom any thing entire has come down to us.

NOTE 6. Of Doric *prose* there is very little still extant, and that chiefly relating to mathematics and philosophy.—For the *Attic* writers, see the following notes.

7. In the mean time Athens had raised herself to such a pitch of political importance, that for a while she exercised a sort of sovereignty (*ἡγεμονία*) in Greece ; and at the same time became the centre of all literary and scientific culture. The democratic constitution, which was no where else so pure, secured to the popular eloquence of Athens, and to the Attic stage, entire freedom ; and this it was, in connexion with other advantages, which raised to the highest point of perfection not only these two branches of literature, but also the sister ones of history and philosophy ; and at the same time gave to the Attic language a completeness and comprehensiveness, to which no other dialect attained.

NOTE 7. The principal *prose* writers of this golden period of Attic literature are Thucydides, Xenophon, Lysias, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and the other Orators. For the Attic poets, see 10 and note 11.

8. Greeks from all the tribes repaired now to Athens to obtain an education ; and even in those parts of literature which were most cultivated, the Athenian master-pieces were yet considered as models. The consequence was, that the Attic dialect, which now took rank of all the others, became, in those kingdoms which arose out of the Macedonian monarchy, both the court language and the general language of books ; and was henceforth almost exclusively employed by the prose writers of all the Grecian tribes and countries. This language was now also taught in the schools ; and the Grammarians decided, according to those Attic models, what was *pure* Attic, and what was not. The central point of this later Greek literature, however, formed itself under the Ptolemies at Alexandria in Egypt.

9. Along with this universality of the Attic dialect, began also the period of its gradual decay. On the one hand, writers mingled with the Attic much that was derived from the dialect of their own country ; on the other, instead of anomalies peculiar to the Athenians and expressions which seemed farfetched, they

employed the natural and regular formation; or, instead of a simple primitive word which had fallen more or less into disuse in common life, they introduced a derived one which was now more usual.* This the Grammarians (this class of whom are called *Atticists*) sought to hinder, often indeed with pedantry and exaggeration; and proposed in their books, over against those expressions which they censured or accounted less elegant, others selected from the older Attic writers. And thus arose the usage, that the term *Attic* was understood to include only that which was sanctioned by the authority of those early classic writers, and, in a stricter sense, that which was peculiar to them; while, on the other hand, the ordinary language of cultivated society, derived as it was from the Attic, was now called *κοινή*, *common*, or *Ἑλληνική*, *Greek*, i. e. common Greek; and even the writers of this later period were now called *οἱ κοινοί* or *οἱ Ἕλληνας*, in opposition to the genuine Attics. Here however we are never to imagine a peculiar dialect; for this *κοινή διάλεκτος*, in all its principal characteristics, was and continued to be the Attic; and consequently every ordinary Greek grammar has the Attic language for its chief object.

NOTE 8. It is easy to conceive, that under these circumstances the appellation *κοινός*, *κοινόν*, became itself a term of censure; and that although it strictly signifies that which was *common* to all the Greeks, the genuine Attics themselves included, yet in the mouth of the Grammarians it designated that which was *not pure Attic*. On the other hand, however, that which was called *Attic*, was not all for that reason exclusively of the pure Attic form, not even among the genuine Attics themselves. Many an Attic idiom was not entirely usual even in Athens, but alternated with other forms in general use, e. g. *φιλοίη* with *φιλοῖ*, *ξύν* with *σύν*. Many Ionic forms were also not unusual among the Attics, (e. g. uncontracted forms instead of contracted ones,) of which therefore the writers, who every where consulted their ear, could avail themselves. Nevertheless, this approach to the Ionic furnishes the chief criterion of the *earlier Attic* in the strictest sense; in which e. g. Thucydides wrote; while Demosthenes belongs to the *later Attic*, which forms the transition to the *κοινοί*.

NOTE 9. To draw an exact and appropriate line of division, we must make the later period, or the *κοινοί*, begin with the earliest of those authors who wrote Attic without being themselves Athenians. Here belong Aristotle, Theophrastus, Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch,

* E. g. *νήχασθαι* for *νεῖν* to swim, *ἀροτριᾶν* for *ἀροῦν* to plough

and the other later writers ; among whom nevertheless were many who strove with great diligence to make the earlier Attic language their own ; as was the case particularly with Lucian, Aelian, and Arrian.

NOTE 10. Among the dialects of the provinces, which mingled themselves to a considerable degree with the later Greek, the *Macedonian* is particularly conspicuous. The Macedonians were a nation related to the Greeks, and reckoned themselves to the Doric tribe. As conquerors, they therefore introduced the Greek culture into the barbarous countries which they ruled. Here also the Greek language was now spoken and written ; but not without peculiarities, which the Grammarians designate as Macedonic forms ; and as the principal seat of this later Greek culture was in Egypt and in Alexandria its capital, the same forms are included also under the name of the *Alexandrine* dialect.—Moreover the other inhabitants of such conquered countries, who were not Greeks by birth, began now also to speak Greek (*Ἑλληνίζειν*) ; and hence an Asiatic, Syrian, etc. who thus spoke Greek, was called *Ἑλληνιστής*. From this circumstance has arisen the modern usage, according to which the language of such writers, mixed as it is with many forms that are not Greek and with many oriental idioms, is called the *Hellenistic* language. It is easy to conceive, that the chief seat of this language is to be found in the Greek works of Jews and Christians of that age, viz. in the version of the Old Testament by the Seventy, and in the New Testament ; whence it passed more or less into the works of the Fathers.—New barbarisms of every kind were introduced in the middle ages, when Constantinople, the ancient Byzantium, became the capital of the Greek empire and the centre of the contemporary literature ; and hence arose the language of the Byzantine writers, and finally the present modern Greek.

10. In this general prevalence of the Attic dialect, however, poetry formed an important exception. Here the Attics were models only in one department viz. the *dramatic*. Since now dramatic poetry in its very nature, even in tragedy, can only be the elevated language of real life, it was natural that on the Attic stage only the Attic dialect should be admitted ; and this was afterwards retained by all the other Greek theatres.* The dramatic poets moreover, in those parts of the drama which consisted of dialogue, and especially in those composed of trimeters or senarii, allowed themselves, with the exception of a freer use of apostrophe and contraction, only a very few of the so called poetic licenses and exchanges of forms.

* See note 3 above.

. NOTE 11. The comic poets did this least of all, as one would easily suppose. On the other hand, the tragic senarius readily adopted many Homeric forms.—It is however to be remarked, that in the department of the drama, only the works of genuine and early Attic writers have come down to us; viz. the tragedians Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides; and the comic writer Aristophanes.

11. For the remaining species of poetry, especially those which were composed in hexameters, as the epic, didactic, and elegiac, Homer and the other old Ionic poets who were read in the schools, continued to be the models; and along with them, the old Ionic or Homeric language continued also in vogue, with most of its peculiarities and obsolete forms. This became therefore, (just as the Attic for prose,) the prevailing dialect or universal language for these species of poetry; and remained current even in the Alexandrine and later ages, when it was no longer understood by the common people, but a learned education was necessary to the full understanding and enjoyment of such poetry. All that belongs under this head may be best included under the name of *epic* language; since it took its rise wholly from epic poetry.

NOTE 12. The most celebrated poets of this class are, in the Alexandrine period, Apollonius, Callimachus, Aratus; and later, Nicander, Oppian, Quintus, etc.

12. In the mean time, the Doric dialect was not entirely excluded from poetry, even in the later periods. It maintained itself in some of the minor species, especially in rural and sportive poems; partly because there were even here certain earlier models; and partly also because, in many of these poems, it was essential to imitate the tone and language of the countryman and of the lower classes, whose dialect was almost every where the Doric, in consequence of the very general spread of the Doric tribe. Comp. 2 above.

NOTE 13. Hence the works of the *idyllic* writers, Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus, are Doric; but their later Doric differs much from that of Pindar. The ancient *epigrams* were partly Ionic, partly Doric; but the Doric was here far more simple and dignified, and confined itself to a small number of characteristic Doric forms, which were familiar to the educated poets of every tribe.

13. It remains to observe, that the language employed in the *lyric* parts of the drama, as the choruses and passages of deep emotion, is also generally called Doric. This Doric however consists of little more than the prevalence of the long α , espe-

cially for η , which belonged generally to the old language, and was retained in solemn poetry on account of its dignity, while in common life it remained current only among the Dorians.* In other respects this lyric dialect approached also, in many particulars, to the epic language above described.

ART. IV. GENUINENESS OF ISAJAH, CHAP. XL.—LXVI.

From Hengstenberg's "Christologie des Alten Testaments." Translated by the Editor.

GENERAL INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.†

The second part of the Book of Isaiah is one of the most splendid, and for us most important portions of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. No part of these Scriptures contains so little that is local and temporary; none sets before us so distinctly the connexion between the preparatory institutions and the grand ultimate dispensation; none dwells with such delight on the descriptions of the time, when, after the great separation between the impious and the godly portions of the ancient covenant people, the latter shall be united with Gentile nations into one consecrated and happy people of the Lord; none presents the sublime founder of the new covenant—a covenant not limited like the old to a single people—both in his state of humiliation and of exaltation, so clearly to our view.‡

We have seen in the General Introduction to the whole book that Isaiah probably lived for a time under Manasseh. If we

* See 2 above. Doricisms in the strict sense, however, are not to be found in these theatrical choruses; viz. infinitives in $\epsilon\nu$ and $\eta\nu$, accusatives plur. in $\omega\varsigma$ and $\sigma\nu$, and the like.

† For a notice of Prof. Hengstenberg, see No I. p. 21. This article is inserted in the present number, to the exclusion of two others (one of them original) already prepared, in order to accommodate particularly the studies of the Junior Class in the Theological Seminary.

‡ Jerome says, with particular reference to the second part, *Praef. ad Jesaiam*: "Non tam Propheta dicendus est, quam Evangelista. Ita enim universa Christi ecclesiaeque mysteria ad liquidum persecutus est, ut non putes eum de futuro vaticinari, sed de praeteritis historiam texere."

assume that Isaiah composed this second part during these last years of his life, then the character of this portion of his prophecies becomes more easy of comprehension, and all its peculiarities susceptible of easy explanation.

1. In this way we may account for *the different modes of representation*, which are obvious in the first and second parts. Between the second part and the latest prophecy of the first part, there lies an interval of 14—20 years. But in the progress of years, there is always a change, not only in a person's views and feelings, but also in his mode of writing. And although the second part is in no way inferior to the first in the beauty of the representations; yet the whole exhibition is more flowing, and the tone softer and more gentle. Instead of the compactness and conciseness of the former part, where the writer seems to struggle with language, and, merely pointing as it were to his figures, passes rapidly from one to another, we have in the latter part an agreeable diffuseness; all the pictures are completed, and painted with the loveliest colours even to their minutest details. There exists an essential unity amidst the greatest diversity of allusions and objects; and in this respect the difference between the first and second parts, is analogous to that which exists between the book of Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch; or between the epistles of John, which he probably wrote in his old age, and his gospel.

2. On this supposition we may also explain the *point of view*, or *station in time*, which the prophet has taken. In his old age, we may presume that Isaiah left all active exertions in the theocracy to his younger associates in the prophetic office. He himself transferred his contemplations from the joyless present into the future; he now lived only in and for the future; certain that the period would one day arrive, when the legacy which he should leave to future times would bear the fruits, which he, in his own personal exertions for the present, had so often failed to realize. He takes his station therefore in the period so clearly foretold by him in former prophecies, when Jerusalem has now been already conquered by the Chaldeans, when the land is now desolate, and the people from the distant regions of Babylonia sigh for their native home. He thinks, feels, and acts, only in this period; it has become to him like the present, a point from which he contemplates the nearer, more distant, and remotest future; but still in such a way, that his view not unfrequently wanders back and fixes

itself upon the real present. He directs his language to the unhappy people in exile ; he warns, reprovcs, and also consoles them, by laying open a prospect of a happier futurity.

3. We may also in this way explain the *arrangement* of the second part. The first part is made up of those prophecies, which Isaiah uttered during the period of his activity in behalf of the present. These are single prophecies, published at different times and on different occasions, afterwards indeed brought together into one collection, but still marked as distinct and single, either by the superscriptions or in some other obvious and known method. But in the second part, which was occasioned by no external circumstances, it is not so easy to distinguish in like manner between the different parts. The whole is more like a single gush of prophecy. The proof of the unity of the second part, lies in the mere exhibition of its contents. The objects of prophecy are in general the same throughout. Even the language and modes of representation have far less diversity, than in the pieces of the first part. And although it may be, that the prophet did not receive and commit to writing, at one and the same time, all the revelations contained in this second part ; still it is certain that no great length of time could have intervened between them ; and the prophet doubtless did not publish to the people these communications singly, but preferred to leave the whole together as a legacy to posterity.

To the prophets, all was exhibited in vision, and not revealed in words ; to them therefore all seemed to belong to the present ; the time of fulfilment, whether remote or near, was in general not known to them. Hence it comes, that events connected by some intrinsic resemblance, although they may in reality be separated by long intervals of time, often seem in the prophets to border closely on each other, or even to flow into one another ; and these therefore must be separated by the interpreter, who is able to compare the prophecy with the fulfilment, and can thus distribute to the different periods to which it respectively belongs, that which was exhibited to the prophet himself without any of the relations of time. Whoever shall approach the interpretation of the second part of Isaiah, without having first laid as the foundation of his efforts this remark, so deeply grounded in the nature of the whole range of prophetic vision, will find throughout nothing but darkness, where, if guided by this principle, the clearest light would break in upon him.*

* See the note on p. 709 below.

The prophecies of the second part refer chiefly to a twofold object. The prophet first consoles his people by announcing their deliverance from the Babylonish exile; he names the monarch whom Jehovah will send to punish the insolence of their oppressors, and lead back the people to their home. But he does not stop at this trifling and inferior deliverance. With the prospect of freedom from the Babylonish exile, the prophet connects the prospect of deliverance from sin and error through the Messiah. Sometimes both objects seem closely interwoven with each other; sometimes one of them appears alone with particular clearness and prominency. Especially is the view of the prophet sometimes so exclusively directed upon the latter object, that filled with the contemplation of the glory of the spiritual kingdom of God and of its exalted founder, he wholly loses sight for a time of the less distant future. In the description of this spiritual deliverance also, the relations of time are not observed. Sometimes the prophet beholds the author of this deliverance in his humiliation and sorrows; and again, the remotest ages of the Messiah's kingdom present themselves to his enraptured vision; when man, so long estranged from God, will have again returned to him; when every thing opposed to God shall have been destroyed, and internal and external peace universally prevail; and when all the evil introduced by sin into the world, will be forever done away. Elevated above all space and time, the prophet contemplates from the height on which the Holy Spirit has thus placed him, the whole development of the Messiah's kingdom, from its smallest beginnings to its glorious completion.

GENUINENESS OF ISAIAH, CHAP. XL.—LXVI.

Throughout all ages hitherto, the second part of the Book of Isaiah has been regarded as the indisputable property of that prophet, both by the Jewish synagogue and by the Christian church. In the last quarter of the 18th century, for the first time, the attempt was made to render his title to it questionable. The first hint to this effect, which however was little regarded, was given by Koppe, who remarked (on c. 50), that Ezekiel, or some other prophet who lived during the exile, might perhaps have been the author. A definite suspicion against the genuineness of the whole second part, was first uttered by Doed-

erlein.* The most full and complete effort to establish this opinion was made by Justi;† and from this time onward, it became generally prevalent. It stood in necessary connexion with the view of the moderns, that the prophets enjoyed no immediate divine influence, and could therefore know nothing more of the future, than what might be deduced beforehand, by men of intelligence and political sagacity, from the events of their own times; and which was therefore, thus far, eagerly seized upon by the prophets. Among the supporters of this opinion we may name particularly Eichhorn, Rosenmueller, Paulus, Bauer, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Gesenius.‡ But these scholars are in this respect divided, that some of them assume several writers, while the rest ascribe the whole to *one* author. The latter opinion, however, seems now to be the generally prevailing one.

In regard also to the time when the second part was composed, there is a diversity of opinion. But these writers all agree thus far, that the prophecies of this part cannot have been committed to writing, before the last years of the Babylonish exile. Gesenius, to whom, without regard to earlier opponents, it is necessary almost solely to have reference, calls the second part the work of an anonymous prophet towards the end of the exile; who directed these words of comfort, of exhortation, and of reproof, probably in writing in the manner of all later prophets, to his contemporaries still living in the Babylonish exile; so that it constitutes a prophetic epistle or letter missive to the exiles.§

Among the defenders of the genuineness of the second part of Isaiah, we may name Piper,|| Beckhaus,¶ Hensler,**

* Auserlesene theol. Biblioth. Bd. I. Heft 11. p. 832.

† In Paulus Memorabilien IV. p. 139 sq. Also in his own Vermischte Abhandlungen üb. wichtige Gegenstände der theol. Gelehrsamkeit, Bd. I. p. 254 sq. II. p. 1—80.

‡ See the literature in Bertholdt's Einleitung, IV. p. 1371.

§ The same view is given by Rosenmueller in Gabler's Neuestes theol. Journal II. 4. p. 334.

|| Integritas Jesaie a recentiorum conatibus vindicata. Greifsw. 1793.

¶ Die Integrität der prophetischen Schriften des A. Test. p. 152 sq.

** Anmerkk. zu seiner Uebersetzung des Jesaias.

Jahn,* Dereser,† Greve,‡ and lastly J. U. Moeller§ of Copenhagen, in a separate work on this subject. By means of this acute and learned work, the investigation of the subject has been greatly advanced; and it is only to be regretted, that the author should have so much weakened the impression of his solid arguments, by too often giving himself up to conjectures not only uncertain in themselves, but contrary to all sound exegetical judgment and taste.

We cannot here wholly pass by this investigation; inasmuch as the different results of it essentially affect the judgment to be formed, in regard to the Christology of Isaiah. We will endeavour therefore, as briefly as possible, first to state and refute the grounds relied upon by opposing critics, and then to exhibit the positive grounds by which the authenticity may be established. In doing this we shall thankfully make use of what is tenable in the work of Moeller; the grounds of the opponents we shall cite mostly in the words of Gesenius, who has subjected them to a revision, and has thus spared us the trouble of paying any regard to several futile arguments advanced by former opponents.

I. "All the historical allusions to the situation of the people, point to the times of the exile—not to those of the prophet. Jerusalem is in ruins, the land laid waste, the people rejected of God; the kingdom of the Chaldeans, so little powerful in the days of Isaiah, is now at the highest summit of its power, but still is already near to its destruction by Cyrus. All this however is not described as something future, but as the real position of the prophet in the present, as the actual present situation of the nation and the adjacent countries; with which situation too the prophecies in regard to the future stand connected. According to the analogy of all other prophetic oracles, Isaiah must of course set out, or take his departure, in this manner from the present, and then connect therewith his prophecies respecting the future. Besides, the remotest possibility that Isaiah

* Einleitung. This is also done in part by the author of the Exeget. Handbuch p. xxiii. sq. Comp. Angusti Einl. ins A. T. § 204.

† Einleitung zu seiner Bearbeitung des Jesaia als Fortsetzung des Brentano'schen Bibelwerkes.

‡ Prolegom. to the work: Ultima Capita Jesaiae. Amst. 1810. 4to.

§ De authentia oraculorum Jesaiae c. 40—66. Copenh. 1825.

could have been the author, is taken away by the circumstance, that the exile is not *announced*, but the station of the prophet is in it; just as that of Isaiah is in his own times.*

This whole objection owes its existence to a want of proper insight into the nature of prophecy. The knowledge of the prophets is conceived of as depending on intelligence; whereas it was in fact intuitive, i. e. arose from vision, as is sufficiently indicated by the name *Seer*.* The prophets, to whom, as we have seen in the general Introduction, all revelations were imparted in vision, became greatly excited and were in an ecstasy (ἔκστασις); they lived in the midst of the things which they announced, and these things existed in them. They either took their station in the present, and looked from thence upon the less distant future; or they took their station in the less distant future, and looked from thence upon the more remote. In the latter case, the less distant future is represented or assumed by them as the present; from whence they contemplate as past, that which in the reality is perhaps still to come; and this less distant future lies before them in such clearness of vision, that they seem to live and act in it. From the mass of examples which serve to confirm this observation, we select only a few.†

The prophet Hosea had in c. 13 announced to the Israelites severe punishments from heaven, the desolation of the land, and the carrying away of its inhabitants by mighty enemies. In 14: 2 sq. he transports himself in spirit into the time, when these punishments shall have already been inflicted. He anticipates the future as having already taken place, and exhorts not his contemporaries, but those upon whom such misfortunes have been sent, to sincere repentance: "Return, O Israel, unto Jehovah; for thou hast become wretched (אֲבַיָּוָה praet.) through thine iniquity." In verse 5 he again represents the blessings of Jehovah as still future.—The prophet Micah says 4: 8, "And thou, O tower of the flock, hill of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall come and arrive the former dominion, the dominion over the daughter of Jerusalem." When the

* See the note on p. 709 below.

† Striking proofs are also afforded in the farewell song of Moses, Deut. c. 32. comp. ver. 7 and ver. 30. On the latter verse Le Clerc remarks: "Haec quasi praeterita cantico deplorat Moses, quod ea ita futura praevideat, et quasi in illas aetates futuras se animo transferat eaue dicat, quae tum demum debebant dici."

prophet, who was contemporary with Isaiah, here speaks of a former dominion, and announces that it shall again return to the house of David, he transports himself in spirit out of his own times, when the royal line of David still existed and flourished, into the times of the exile of which he had just been speaking, and during which the dominion of the house of David should cease. In verse 9 he says: "Wherefore dost thou now cry out aloud? Hast thou no more a king? or are thy counsellors perished? Yea, pangs have taken hold on thee as of a woman in travail." Here the prophet addresses the Jewish people in exile. The time of their being carried away into exile constitutes for him the present; their deliverance from it, the future; compare verse 10, "Then shalt thou be delivered; then shall Jehovah redeem thee." In 7: 7 Micah introduces the people already in exile as speaking, at the same time acknowledging the justice of the divine punishment, and expressing confidence in the divine compassion. In 7: 11 also, the answer of Jehovah presupposes the destruction of the city as having already taken place; for he promises that her walls shall again be built.—Isaiah himself also, in the prophecy against Tyre c. 23, looks out upon the impending distress of this city through Nebuchadnezzar, as if already present; and describes as an eye-witness the flight of the inhabitants, the impression made by the intelligence of their calamities upon their allies, etc. Thence, from this less distant future which has thus become to him the present, he casts his view upon the more remote futurity. He announces, that after seventy years, to be reckoned not from the real but from this imaginary present, the city shall again recover her ancient greatness. His view now extends itself still further into the future, and he beholds how at last in the days of the Messiah, the inhabitants of Tyre will receive the true religion. In c. 53 the prophet takes his station between the sufferings and the glorification of the Messiah; the sufferings appear to him as past, the glory he represents as yet to come.—These examples, which might easily be increased by a multitude of others, may suffice to refute the assertion, that it is contrary to the nature of prophecy, that the prophet, taking his station in the nearer future, should regard that as the present, and from thence look forward into the more distant future.

Bertholdt admits, "that other prophets also have often transported themselves in spirit into later times, and especially into

the ideal times of the Messiah;”* and thus he essentially gives up this ground. He argues only from this circumstance, that other prophets return back to their actual station in the present, while Isaiah remains fixed in the future. But we shall see hereafter, that the latter also, in numerous passages, passes over from his imaginary present into the real one.

II. “Before Isaiah announced a return from exile, he would most naturally have foretold the carrying away.”

To this we may reply, that it is an act of presumption to prescribe to God what revelations he shall impart to his prophets; that Isaiah might well take it for granted, that the impending deportation to Babylon was already sufficiently known from the declarations of other prophets, and especially from those of his contemporary Micah; that moreover the second part of Isaiah does actually include the carrying away into exile, as well as the return from it, only the carrying away appears as something past, because the prophet takes his station in the times of the exile; and lastly, that we certainly do not possess in our collection all the prophecies of Isaiah, and therefore he may actually have prophesied much respecting the exile, which has not come down to us. If then it could even be shewn, that there was in the first part no clear prediction of the carrying away of the nation, the objection under consideration could afford no satisfactory proof. But such predictions do actually exist. We refer, first, to c. 39, where the prophet in clear and express words, unsusceptible of any other possible meaning, announces to Hezekiah the carrying away to Babylon. The suspicion expressed, though doubtfully, by Gesenius,† that this prediction may have been written at a later period, and thus have been more definitely expressed after the event, is wholly arbitrary, and does not even render the service expected from it; it does not set aside the fact, that at that very time an event had already been predicted, which lay wholly out of the political horizon of the age, and could not have been foreseen by any human sagacity; for Micah announces with equal definiteness (4: 9, 10) the carrying away to Babylon and the deliverance from exile, 150 years before the event, and while Babylon as yet stood in no hostile relation whatever towards Jerusalem. There are moreover several other prophecies in the first part, which can only with the greatest violence be understood of any thing else, than the de-

* *Einleitung* p. 1384.

† *Commentar* p. 1006.

vastation of the country and the carrying away of its inhabitants by the Babylonians; and in which at the same time the return from exile is also announced. So c. 5 and c. 6: 11—13; the genuineness of which passages is universally acknowledged.

III. "The prediction of events so remote, would have been unintelligible to the contemporaries of Isaiah, and therefore without object."

This objection is in itself of little importance, inasmuch as it is altogether *a priori*. It springs, moreover, from an entirely false conception of the purpose and object of the prophetic office. We might indeed admit, that these prophecies were not entirely clear and intelligible to the contemporaries of the prophet; for this in general was not essential to prophetic oracles, which were first to receive their full light through the details of history. Even the prophet himself, in his ordinary state, might not be able to make to his own mind an entirely clear representation of the contents of his prophecy.* Still, such a prophecy cannot, on this account, be said to be without object. Even if the contemporaries could obtain no wholly clear understanding of it, still they had such a comprehension as was sufficient to accomplish the moral object of the prophecy. No contemporary of Isaiah, for example, could read the second part of his prophecies, without recognizing in it both the penal justice and

* The admission here made, as well as the whole answer to the first objection above (p. 706), depends upon the writer's view of the nature of prophecy, which he has unfolded at large in a previous chapter of his book. It is the Editor's intention to present this article to his readers in the next number of this work.—The concession made in the text above, may seem, at first sight, to be in contradiction to the views advanced by Professors Hahn and Stuart in No. I. of this work. The difference however is apparent rather than real. The latter writers are speaking of interpretation, and refer only to the *words*; while Prof. Hengstenberg has regard not to language, but to *things*. Thus in the prophecy respecting Cyrus, Is. 44: 28. 45: 1 sq. the *language* expresses now just what it did when uttered by the prophet, and just what it was then understood to mean by his contemporaries, and no more; while we, who live after the fulfilment, have an understanding of the *things* or events predicted in it, many times clearer than it was possible for the contemporaries of the prophet to obtain. On this point some further observations may be expected from Prof. Stuart in the next number. Compare also below, on p. 728. VI. EDITOR.

the divine love of Jehovah, in accordance with which he would give his people a prey to their enemies and again grant them deliverance. The point of time in which the prophet takes his stand, would be to him so much the less obscure, inasmuch as the same prophet had just before announced the Babylonish exile as yet to come. In regard to the *manner* of the carrying away and of the deliverance, and as to the person of Cyrus, etc. much would of course ever remain to him obscure. In like manner every one who did not voluntarily shut his eyes upon the light, would distinguish in c. 53 the atoning death of the Messiah; although the particular circumstances connected with this event would of course not be unfolded. Indeed, the prophecies were not even all intended chiefly for the present. They were even not all openly published by the prophets. The whole of the second part of Isaiah, for instance, was probably never publicly recited. Committed to writing by the divine command, they were destined for future generations; who would receive a clearer insight into them from the circumstance, that the less distant future in which the prophets had taken their station, was now become for posterity the real present. The Jews during the Babylonish captivity must have been, through the definite prediction of their return, preserved from utter despondency and strengthened in their confidence in God, and thereby induced to render themselves worthy of the promised deliverance by penitence and fidelity towards Jehovah. And just as these and other prophecies served to strengthen the faith of the people of the former covenant, so also do they afford the same benefits in a still higher degree to us, who can now every where compare the promise with the fulfilment, and perceive the exact accordance between them. Although indeed our faith in God and Christ does not rest solely on this foundation, still it may here receive a firmer support and consistency; and whoever thinks he is in want of no such aids, he it is who needs them most of all.

IV. "The prophet appeals to former prophecies respecting the return of the people from their exile, which were already in a course of fulfilment, and to which he now subjoins new ones. See 42: 9. 45: 19. 46: 10. 48: 5, 6. This presupposes a later prophet, contemporary with the events themselves."

This objection is by no means clearly expressed. How then could prophecies respecting the return from captivity be already fulfilled or fulfilling, while the exile still continued? According

to Gesenius, moreover, the prophet published his prophecies before the end of the exile.—Gesenius also falls into an inconsistency, when he finds here allusions to the predictions of more ancient prophets, who had formerly prophesied respecting the exile and the deliverance from it. He must then admit, what he nevertheless denies, that there actually were prophecies, in which future events were announced so definitely and so long beforehand, as to afford a certain proof of God's omniscience.

How little the passages cited in the objection serve to prove that which they are adduced to shew, will appear from an impartial examination of them. In c. 45: 19 and 46: 10, Jehovah, in order to shew his preeminence above the nothingness of idols, appeals to his omniscience; which is demonstrable from the circumstance, that the annunciations of his servants the prophets receive a fulfilment. These declarations of Jehovah are given in general terms; they refer both to former prophecies already fulfilled, e. g. to the prophecies of Isaiah himself respecting the destruction of the Assyrians; and also to present prophecies, whose fulfilment will one day evince the omniscience and omnipotence of Jehovah.—In c. 42: 9 and 48: 5, 6, Isaiah appeals to former prophecies, which are already fulfilled, and the accomplishment of which affords a pledge to the people, for the fulfilment of the predictions respecting the return from captivity, which he now imparts to them. Let it then be here assumed, that the prophet, in appealing to prophecies already fulfilled, has also appealed to those which had reference to the carrying away into exile; this he might well do, when we consider that he takes his station, as to time, not in the real present, but in the future, which becomes to him as the present. In c. 39 Isaiah had foretold the Babylonish exile. When now in spirit he transports himself into those times, and directs his language to the people already in exile, he looks on that as already fulfilled, and can appeal to it as such, which in the reality was indeed yet unfulfilled; but which, when fulfilled, would afford to the people in their exile a pledge for the accomplishment of those other prophecies, which had reference to still future events.

V. "What the prophet says of the present, is correct, and is carried out into minute details. What he says of the future is ideal, the expression of joyful and excited hopes, to which the reality by no means corresponded. Were the work really from Isaiah, it *must* have been written with the divine cooperation.

Then however the writer must have known the future as it would be. But what a contrast between the condition of the miserable colony under Ezra and Nehemiah, and the prophet's splendid descriptions of approaching prosperity?"

In the first place it is not correct, that in that part of the prophecy which refers to the condition of the people in the Babylonish exile, there occurs any thing (the mention of the name of Cyrus excepted, of which hereafter) so specific as to shew, that the prophet had any more correct knowledge of that period, than he had of later times. The mention of the name of Cyrus is at least counterbalanced by the passage c. 44: 27. Gesenius himself (p. 88) finds in this passage, a distinct allusion to the laying dry of the bed of the Euphrates near Babylon, in the execution of the well known stratagem of Cyrus.* He must therefore here admit a prediction, which cannot be explained on any natural grounds; since he himself places the composition of the second part before the taking of Babylon by Cyrus.—It is not to be mistaken nor denied, that the author of the greater and higher deliverance, the great Servant of God, the Messiah, is still more definitely and clearly described, than the author of the first deliverance, Cyrus; and every impartial mind must also acknowledge that the prophecies of the second part, which have personal reference to the Messiah, are in no sense whatever mere ideal descriptions, but have found an accomplishment even to the minutest circumstances.—The objection, that whatever relates to the times after the exile, remained for the most part unfulfilled, is certainly applicable to those who, like Jahn and others, seek for the full accomplishment of all the promised prosperity in the times immediately after the exile. Gesenius is right when he observes, that it would be a very arbitrary mode of proceeding, to attempt to exhibit the whole contents of these prophecies as fulfilled during that period. So soon however as we assume two distinct objects of promise in the prophet's vision, not always clearly defined, and often represented under the same figures, viz. the return from the Babylonish exile, and the bliss of the Messiah's reign; this objection loses all its significance. There is then nothing more to be said of ideal descriptions and excited hopes; but we await from God, with right, the fulfilment of the yet unaccomplished part of these prophecies, without however overlooking their figurative character; we

* Herodot. I. 185, 190. Xenoph. Cyrop. VII.

await this fulfilment from that God, who has manifested the divine origin of these prophecies by the accomplishment of a great portion of them, and has confirmed it by the entirely corresponding prophecies of the New Testament respecting the later ages. At least, opposing critics should hesitate to employ this argument, until time shall have shewn the nonfulfilment of the prophecies. *Adhuc sub judice lis est.* That, moreover, these prophecies are for the most part with perfect right referred to the times of the Messiah, is shewn by a comparison of them with other passages, which the opponents themselves interpret of the Messiah; e. g. with c. 9 and c. 11. As the promise of deliverance from the Assyrians is there followed by a prospect of the Messiah's reign, so here the same prospect is subjoined to the announcement of deliverance from the Babylonians. The prophet describes the scene presented to him in vision, without regard to the determination of times and seasons. That the times of the Messiah would immediately succeed those of the Babylonish exile, is no more said *here*, than it is *there* said that the corporeal deliverance from the Assyrians would be immediately connected with the promised spiritual deliverance.

VI. "It may be assumed with certainty, that the oracles thus ascribed to Isaiah were not yet extant in the time of Jeremiah. Otherwise this latter prophet, who suffered such mistreatment in consequence of his prediction of the exile, would without doubt have appealed to such a predecessor."

This *argumentum a silentio*, which in and for itself proves nothing, would, if it proved any thing, prove too much. It would prove, namely, that the first part also of Isaiah was not yet extant in the time of Jeremiah; indeed, it would even prove that all those prophetic writings, which refer at all to the carrying away into exile, were not yet in existence; since Jeremiah speaks only of a deportation in general, and not definitely of the carrying away into the Babylonish exile. In fact, Jeremiah could with much greater propriety have appealed to the prophecies respecting the exile contained in the first part, namely to c. 5, and to the most definite of all in c. 39, than to those now in question in the second part, where the carrying away into exile is no longer announced, but presupposed; and which too are far more occupied with joyful hopes than with threats. And it was on account of these latter only, that Jeremiah (c. 26) was assailed, and defended by his friends through an appeal to the similar prophecy in Micah 3: 12. It might be assert-

ed with the same right, that at that time the still more definite prediction in Mic. 4: 10 was not yet extant; because otherwise the friends of Jeremiah would not have omitted an appeal to it. That Jeremiah or his defenders appealed on other occasions to the prophecies of Isaiah, who indeed can assert, but who also will undertake to deny? We shall see however further on, that Jeremiah's acquaintance with the second part of Isaiah cannot be the subject of doubt; inasmuch as he has both used and imitated it.

VII. "Although the style of the writer is in general pure, still he exhibits several traces of Chaldee and later idiom."

In reply to this, we may urge the following considerations. The proof drawn from supposed later words and phrases is of very doubtful authority. We have too few written monuments of the Hebrew literature, to enable us to distinguish and limit exactly the stock of words, which belonged to each several age. If a word first occurs in later writers, still this is no proof at all, that it was not also earlier in use. It is of more weight, when forms of words occur, which seem to belong to a later Chaldaizing dialect. But even in this case, there must also be other and stronger grounds present, in order to afford sufficient proof of later composition. We know too little when the Chaldee began to have an influence upon the Hebrew, to be able to determine, whether a single Chaldee form might not, before this or that time, have found its way into the Hebrew. The chief influence of the Chaldee took place, it is true, in the period not long before the exile. But since the two nations had already stood in connexion with each other at a far earlier period, it was certainly possible for single Chaldee forms, to have passed over in earlier ages into the Hebrew language.

But how difficult it is to give even the appearance of force to this argument, is shown by the fact, that most of the opposers of the authenticity of the second part, have entirely passed it by. Paulus asserts that the language in these chapters is, at least, as pure as in those of Isaiah himself. Bertholdt candidly admits (Einl. p. 1363 sq.) that not a single trace of later idiom is to be found in these chapters. Eichhorn also has adduced no examples of later idiom. Gesenius, aware how strongly it would speak for the genuineness of the second part, if, in respect to the style, it should appear to belong to the first age of the language; and although he admits that not much of a later character is to be found; has nevertheless brought forward some few

things, which he supposes to arise from the later idiom. Among the examples cited, however, there is scarcely one, which can be proved to have belonged to the later usage.

First of all, we must abstract from these examples all those which the second part has in common with other writings, the age of which has indeed been attacked by modern critics; but on grounds so little satisfactory, that they themselves must regard it as a reasonable requisition, that for the present at least the supposed later idiom of these books, shall not be brought forward as a proof of later idiom in other books. If then we abstract that which the second part of Isaiah has in common with such writings, and especially with the book of Job, a very important part of the examples quoted immediately falls away. The remainder we will consider separately.

The verb *צָמַד*, 47: 13, is said to have its prevailing Chaldean signification, *surgere*, i. q. קָמָה. But this signification is here arbitrarily assumed; for in v. 13 the verb *צָמַד* can have no other meaning than that which it has in the same connexion in v. 12, where Gesenius himself renders it not by *aufstreten*, *stand up*, but by *beharren*, *stand firm*, *persevere*; just as he also translates it by *stand* in the parallel passage 44: 11. In all these passages the appropriate signification is *Stand halten*, i. e. *stand fast*, *be constant*; in which meaning the verb also occurs Amos 2: 15.—A second Chaldaism is found in the meaning of the verb *בָּחַר*, 48: 10. But first, it is probable that the meaning here assigned to this verb, viz. *to try*, *prove*, did not belong to the Aramaean alone, but also to the Hebrew, since the verb occurs in the same signification in Job; and secondly, it is quite uncertain, whether the verb in this place actually has this signification. The best interpreters, with the exception of Gesenius, retain the usual meaning. The verb *בָּחַר* occurs so frequently in these chapters in the sense *to choose*, that it must be regarded as very improbable, that the prophet should have used it, in this single instance, in a different signification. The sense: 'I chose thee in the furnace of affliction,' i. e. I loved thee even while I suspended refining punishments over thee, is entirely appropriate to the parallelism.—It is said also to be a later idiom, when in 54: 15 the particle *הִן* signifies *if*, instead of the earlier meaning *lo!* But this particle occurs in this sense at least four times in the Pentateuch, e. g. Lev. 13: 56; comp. Gesenius sub voce. Only the more frequent use of it can belong peculiarly to the later age; but in Isaiah it occurs in

this sense only in the single passage above cited; and not even there with certainty.—The expression ‘nations and tongues,’ 66: 18, is said to be wholly Chaldaic. But *tongue* already stands for language in Gen. 10: 5, and in other places; and how, in this very natural connexion of the two words, which in *Isaiah* occurs only once and has nothing at all of a fixed character, there can be any thing Chaldaic, it would be difficult to comprehend. In the passages of *Daniel*, to which Gesenius refers (3: 4. 7: 14), the two words here in question, לְשׁוֹנוֹת and גּוֹיִם, do not even occur in connexion, but the three words עַמֵּינָא, לְשׁוֹנָא, אַמֵּינָא.—A Chaldaism is also found in יְהָרַר, 56: 12, in the meaning *very, exceedingly*, i. q. the Chaldee יְהָרַר. But Gesenius himself on this passage acknowledges, that this is not a necessary sense, and that the word may be taken as a noun in the sense of *abundance*. So also Rosenmueller: יְהָרַר est περισσόν, quod abundat. Should however any one prefer to take יְהָרַר as an adverbial accusative in the sense *abundantly*, still there could be no question of Chaldaism; since the phrase יְהָרַר עַל occurs in the same meaning Ps. 31: 24, where however the use of the preposition makes no difference.—In c. 61: 10 the verb בָּרַךְ, which elsewhere means *to be or become a priest*, is said to assume the Syriac signification *to make rich, splendid*. But there is certainly no sufficient ground for attributing to the verb בָּרַךְ, which in all other places is a denominative from בָּרַךְ, *priest*, a different signification in this single instance. Kinchi and Jarchi,* after the example of the Chaldee Targum and Aquila, explain the words בָּרַךְ יְבָרַךְ יְפָאָר in this manner: ‘As the bridegroom makes priestly his turban,’ i. e. puts on a turban of priestly splendor; and Gesenius brings forward nothing against this mode of explanation. Or even if one prefers to assume the meaning proposed by Gesenius, still, according to the general remarks above (p. 714), he does not need to admit here a Chaldaism.—The confounding of אִית with אָח, which occurs in two passages, is said never to take place in the earlier prophets. It is however sufficient, if it occurs in any earlier writers; and it is so found in Gen. 34: 2. Josh. 14: 12, and in other places; see Gesen. sub voce. Here also at the most, it is the more frequent occurrence only that can be considered as belonging to the later idiom; and it is not necessary to assume, with Jahn, a mistake in writing; which however might

* In Rosenmueller's Scholia in loc.

very easily arise, where the difference is so purely orthographical.—Examples of the position of the verb after the object, as in c. 42: 24. 49: 6, which is assumed as Chaldaic, are also found in no less number in earlier books; comp. Ewald's Grammatik p. 635.—The verb קָרָא in the meaning *to preach, announce*, c. 42: 2, does not belong to the later idiom. It is found in the same sense Joel 4: 9, קָרְאוּ זֵאת בְּגוֹיִם, *proclaim ye this among the Gentiles*; and so also Lev. 25: 10.—The noun צָבָא in the sense of *military service*, besides in the book of Job, is found also several times in Numbers, e. g. 1: 3.—The use of הַ as a relative in the single passage c. 56: 3, is not exclusively peculiar to the later idiom, but occurs also in Josh. 10: 24. Judg. 13: 8. 1 Sam. 9: 24.—There is then only one solitary form of a word, viz. אֲנִי־לְהִי for הִי־אֲנִי־לְהִי 63: 4, which can probably with justice be regarded as Aramaean, and which Jahn supposes to be an error of the transcribers for the fut. אֲנִי־לְהִי, inasmuch as it is preceded by the fut. אֲרַמְסֶם.

But taking it for granted, that even a few other traces of Syriac and Chaldaic idiom could be detected by an attentive observer; what would this prove? The Aramaean was already so generally known, that the officers of king Hezekiah (Is. 36: 11) could propose to carry on a conversation in the Syriac language. Bertholdt therefore is so reasonable as to admit, that Isaiah in the delivery of his prophecies might well intermingle occasionally an Aramaean word or form. He says (Einl. p. 1374): "Thus much must be conceded, that in the times of Ahaz, Hezekiah, and Manasseh, the condition of things was such, that any writer, unless he directed his attention particularly to this point, might easily lose something of the purity of his Hebrew mode of expression."

The preceding argument therefore is destitute of all force; first, because the examples cited partly rest upon false interpretation, and partly, with a single exception, do not belong exclusively to the later idiom; and secondly, because single instances of Chaldaism were already characteristic of the age in which Isaiah lived.

VIII. "The style, the circle of words, and the phraseology in these chapters, have much that is peculiar, with which the genuine Isaiah is unacquainted."

Here again it has been thought that much was proved, when a few words and phrases were adduced which seem to be peculiar to the second part. But in this way it is a matter of per-

fect ease, to prove the spuriousness of any part of any writing. Who would demand of an author, that he should every where employ the same words and phrases? Indeed, what writer of any intelligence would always repeat his former expressions, and never intermingle new ones? especially, when his earlier and later productions are separated by so long an interval, as may be assumed in the case of *Isaiah*; and when also the change of subject almost necessarily brings with it the use of new words and phrases.—This argument may with the same right be inverted. If in any suspected portion of a writer, we should find only the same circle of words and phrases that appear in other genuine and acknowledged parts, it might be said with justice, that this very uniformity only indicates an anxious and slavish imitator; who, in order to pass off his production as that of the author in question, and to hide the want of internal coincidence, has been cautious to produce an exact external correspondence.

Among the examples adduced, we will here touch only upon those, which have some appearance of plausibility. The first is the appellation עֶבֶד יְהוָה, *servant of Jehovah*. In the mere occurrence of this appellation, in and for itself, there is surely nothing to scrutinize. It not only occurs frequently in the other books of the Old Testament; but also in the first part of *Isaiah*, e. g. 20: 3 as an appellation of the prophet himself, and 22: 20 as applied to another pious Israelite appointed to office under the theocracy. But the occurrence of this appellation would indeed be of weight, if it were really applied [as Gesenius supposes] to designate the whole body of the prophets taken collectively. This however, as we shall see on c. 53, is an assumption which rests on no sufficient grounds.—The word אֲרָמִים in the signification *distant lands*, is also found in the first part c. 24: 15. That however in the passages of the second part where it occurs, the prophet had not always floating before his imagination the indistinct and to the Hebrews immeasurable west,—and consequently that here also he has not always employed אֲרָמִים in a sense absolutely indefinite,—is remarked by Gesenius himself, s. v.

Another peculiarity of the second part is said to lie in the use of the nouns צָרָה and צָרָה, in the sense of *prosperity, help, deliverance, triumph*, i. q. יְשׁוּעָה and יְשׁוּעָה. But Gesenius himself takes back in part this assertion, when he doubts (II. p. 136) whether צָרָה is any where thus employed without

some reference to the fundamental idea of the word, and whether therefore it could stand for the prosperity and triumph of the wicked. A careful comparison of the passages cited by Gesenius also shews, that in them all, the ordinary meaning *righteousness, justice*, combined sometimes with the accessory idea (so common in the Hebrew mode of conception) of *the consequences of righteousness*, is fully sufficient; and accordingly the earlier interpreters have every where retained it. In c. 41: 2, the words *צֶדֶק יִקְרָאֵהוּ לְרַגְלֵי* are to be translated: "righteousness comes to meet him at his foot," i. e. wherever he goes. The sense is, 'righteousness will be his inseparable companion;' the figure being taken from a faithful servant, who does not wait to be called, but voluntarily presents himself for service.—In v. 10 the words *בְּיָמֵינוּ צֶדֶקִי* are not to be rendered *my victorious right hand*, but rather *my righteous right hand*. The righteous right hand of Jehovah, is that with which he executes his righteous purposes, and with which he here rescues the Jews from their unrighteous oppressors.—Neither in c. 45: 8 are we compelled to forsake the usual signification; where the sense is, that 'through the blessing of Jehovah, righteousness and prosperity will be diffused over the earth.' This is represented, as if the heavens would send down righteousness like a refreshing rain or dew after long drought, and as if the earth thus fertilized would bring forth a rich harvest of righteousness and prosperity. Comp. Ps. 85: 11, 12 and Ps. 72: 3, where righteousness and prosperity are connected in the same manner.* For c. 45: 13, compare on c. 42: 6.—In c. 46: 13 the righteousness of Jehovah is his fidelity in the fulfilment of his promises and of the obligations into which he has entered.—In c. 48: 18 it is only necessary to connect with the principal idea of righteousness, the accessory idea of its consequences; which in a certain sense are identical with it, since righteousness itself is happiness. In c. 51: 5 righteousness is parallel with deliverance (*יִשׁוּעַ*); it is the righteousness which will be imparted from above to Gentile nations, in which and in its consequences their salvation will consist.—On c. 54: 17 Rosenmueller justly remarks: *צֶדֶקָתָם, h. e. quod iis ex sententia iusti iudicis debetur*. In c. 56: 1 the righteousness of God is again his fidelity in the fulfilment of his promises.—The phrase *מִשְׁפָּטֵי צֶדֶק*, 58: 2, does not mean *ordinances of deliverance*, but *ordinances*

* See Rosenmueller in loc.

of divine justice.—In c. 62: 1, 2 also, we shall not find occasion to forsake the meaning *righteousness*, if we call to mind, that to draw a conclusion of guilt from suffering, and of innocence from prosperity, was at that time the prevailing custom; and consequently, in the deliverance and prosperity of the people, lay at the same time their justification in the eyes of their enemies.

All the remaining examples—which however are far less important than those we have now examined—are correctly and fundamentally refuted by Moeller in his work above referred to, p. 188 sq. Several phrases which often recur, the frequent doubling of the words, the custom of subjoining to the name of Jehovah a greater or less number of predicates,—all these are only results of the general features of the mode of representation in the second part, marked as it is by a character of diffuseness and repetition, which is easily and satisfactorily to be accounted for. All these peculiarities therefore do not require to be examined and justified in detail.

IX. “The style is here throughout light, flowing, clear; has however a tendency to diffuseness and repetition; while, on the contrary, the style of the genuine *Isaiah* seems far more concise and energetic, full of implied thought and imagery, but also harsher and more incorrect.”

This difference of style, which however is not so great as is represented by the opposers of the genuineness of the second part, we have already conceded above; but, at the same time, have also specified the chief cause which occasioned this difference. Other less important causes were, the difference of the subject and of the emotions of the prophet. Where the prophet reproves and admonishes the present age, his mode of representation must be different from that with which he would address the future with consolations and promises. But wherever the subject is the same, there we find a striking coincidence of representation between the first and second parts. So especially in the descriptions of the times of the Messiah, where even the minutest circumstances correspond to each other. Thus e. g. in 65: 25 as well as in 11: 6, the circumstance is rendered prominent, that the wolf and the lamb shall feed together. The tone of punishment and threatening, which is peculiarly characteristic of the acknowledged pieces of *Isaiah*, recurs also in c. 56: 9—57: 12. 58: 1—7. 59: 1—8. 65: 11—14.

X. “But if all other grounds of objection should signify nothing, still the mere mention of the name of Cyrus, c. 44:

28. 45: 1, is a sufficient proof of spuriousness. The prophets are accustomed to describe the persons, whose future appearance they announce, by their qualities and characters; but never do they name their names."

We present in answer to this objection the following considerations. The name *Cyrus* is, with the greatest probability, an appellative, which was employed as the title of the Persian kings; just as Pharaoh was the title of the kings of Egypt, and Abimelech, of the Philistine kings. In Greek writers* this name is every where explained by *the sun*, and this correctly; since even to the present day the word سُور in Persian signifies *the sun*.† According to the accounts of Strabo, Agradatus, and according to Schickhard,‡ *Cyrus* before his accession to the throne was called also by the surname کور; as was also a later Persian monarch Bahram. When therefore Isaiah here predicts deliverance through *Koresh*, the prophecy is in no respect more definite than those of the first part, (c. 13, 14, 21,) in which he foretels the destruction of the Babylonish monarchy by the Medes and Persians. That *Cyrus* afterwards usually bore this appellative, so that his own proper name was wholly superseded by it, took place in consequence of his great actions; he was called *κατ' ἐξοχήν* 'the great king.' Through the special guidance of divine Providence, Isaiah was led to employ this name; which he might have learned from Persian merchants, or, according to Hensler, from Medes who served in Sennacherib's army.§

Against these considerations the opponents have no solid argument to produce. But even if we grant, that the name *Koresh* was really a proper name, and that there could be no other prophecy adduced in which a later person was mentioned by name, still even this would afford no proof of spuriousness. For who will prescribe to Jehovah the rule which he shall follow in his revelations? who will say that he shall never do that, which

* Ctesias. Plutarch in Artaxerxe 1.

† Comp. Gesenius a. voce. Von Bohlen Symbol. ad Interp. Sac. Cod. ex Lingua Persica p. 20. Reland de vet. Lingua Persar. p. 166 sq.

‡ Tarich p. 123. See Gesenius, l. c.

§ Hensler's Jesaias pp. 247, 363. Jahn's Archaeol. II. 2. p. 286.

ordinarily he does not do? Just as he ordinarily revealed the future to the prophets without any determination of the time, but in occasional instances pointed out definitely the number of years which should pass away between the prophecy and its fulfilment; so might he also in a single instance reveal the name of a future person, who was to have an important influence upon the destinies of his kingdom. The mere mention of a future name surely does not pass more widely beyond the bounds of nature, than does the previous annunciation of any historical circumstance whatever, as in c. 44: 27.

But further, the assertion of the opponents, that not a single analogous case can be produced, is by no means correct. We have the same case in 1 K. 13: 2. There a prophet foretels to Jeroboam, who had built an idolatrous altar, that a son shall be born to the house of David, who will bear the name of Josiah, and he will offer upon the altar the priests of the high places, who burn incense thereon. If then the name of Josiah is there mentioned more than 300 years before his existence, how can it surprise us to find here the name of Cyrus about 150 years before his appearance? Should however the opposers here undertake to say, that the name of Josiah in the book of Kings is the mere gloss of a later interpolator, the assertion would be wholly an arbitrary one. In this way no proof whatever could be brought against them. But then also they must give up their appeal here to the name of Cyrus. For what could they have to object, if we were to assert, that the name of Cyrus in both these passages is also the gloss of a later interpolator? And although we are very far from doing this, still there would be in it nothing more arbitrary, than in the course which they thus take in regard to the book of Kings, or in that by which, as we shall presently see, they declare all the characteristic peculiarities which the second part has in common with the first, to be the work of a later assimilating hand.

These are all the grounds brought forward by the most recent and able opposers of the authenticity of the second part of Isaiah. They are here conscientiously quoted in the very words of their authors; and the weakness of them is not to be compensated by the confidence, with which the spuriousness of the work in question is asserted.

We now pass to the exhibition of the positive grounds, by which the authenticity of the second part may be maintained.

I. It is a principle of higher criticism, that both whole works and the single parts of the same, must be regarded as the production of the author to whom they are attributed, so long as it is not shewn by internal and external grounds, that he could not have been the author. That this has not been done in the present case, we have already shewn; while the second part is fully attributed to Isaiah by the circumstance, that it is found in the collection to which his name is prefixed. That Isaiah was uniformly acknowledged in the Jewish synagogue as the author, may be shewn by unimpeachable witnesses. The most ancient is that of Siracides, c. 48: 22 sq. 'Isaiah the great prophet,' it is there said, 'filled with the Spirit, looked forward into the remotest future, and comforted the mourners in Zion.' This can refer only to the second part; as Gesenius himself concedes.* In the New Testament Isaiah is always named as the author, whenever a passage from the second part is cited. It may indeed be said, that the writers of the New Testament have only followed the prevailing modes of citation, without thereby expressing any opinion as to the authenticity. But passages like Rom. 10: 20 shew, that they regarded Isaiah as the real author of the second part. Josephus and Philo also acknowledge Isaiah as the author of the whole collection.

II. The fact assumed in regard to Isaiah, when it is asserted that a number of heterogenous portions are intermingled with his genuine writings, is without any demonstrable analogy in the Hebrew literature. An appeal is made to the book of Canticles; but the view of those who find in this book a series of poems of different authors, is in recent times almost wholly abandoned, and the oneness of the author acknowledged. An appeal is made to the Proverbs; but here also the supposition, that Solomon is only a collective appellation is unfounded. In the prophetic literature, the attempt has not even been made, to show any thing analogous. It is acknowledged, that all the pieces in the collections under the names of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, belong to them as the authors: and in the minor prophets also there is no similar appearance, except that some critics, on very feeble grounds, have assailed the latter half of Zechariah. It is true that this absence of any analogy can itself decide nothing; the case of Isaiah might still be the only instance of the kind. But nevertheless this want of analogy serves at least

* Th. I. p. 37.

to shew us, how strong the grounds must be, which shall compel us to yield assent to the assertion of our opponents.

Besides these considerations, the opponents are also pressed by the difficulty of pointing out any object, which the compiler could have had in such a proceeding. In one point all these critics are united, viz. that the compiler was aware that these pieces were not from Isaiah. This indeed they are compelled to admit; for their assumed compiler and the author of the second part must have been contemporary. According to Eichhorn, the genuine pieces of Isaiah did not fill out a roll. But who tells us, that large rolls only were employed? And if any one had wished thus to connect any thing with Isaiah, why should he not have distinguished it from the genuine writings of Isaiah by a space and superscription, just as the minor prophets are distinguished, although they constitute but one collection? To this it cannot be objected, that the name of the prophet could not be given, because it was not known; for the name of so distinguished a prophet could not be unknown to the compiler, especially as the race of prophets had then become almost extinct.—Others, as Doederlein, assume that the author of the second part also bore the name of Isaiah; and that thus his prophecies came to be received among those of the elder Isaiah. But that a second Isaiah, son of Amoz, lived during the time of the exile, is a supposition drawn merely from the air, confirmed by no historical testimony whatever, and would indeed be a most remarkable coincidence. But even admitting the supposition to be true, still the coincidence of the name could have afforded no ground for the compiler, to join together the productions of both without the slightest remark.—Others speak here of a *pia fraus* of the compiler; he is said to have had the purpose of procuring for the prophecies of a contemporary a greater authority, by causing them to be attributed to Isaiah. But a *pia fraus* of this nature could not have remained undetected; if the writer lived in the time of the Babylonish exile, he could not, in his preeminence, but have been as well known to those whom the compiler thus wished to deceive, as to the compiler himself.—Another class suppose, that the threatening prophecy in c. 39, was the occasion of subjoining the consolatory predictions contained in the second part. But, on the one hand, such a strange proceeding of the compiler can be supported by no analogous example; and on the other, no reason can be assigned, why this second part of Isaiah might not then just as

well have been interpolated in some other collection of prophetic writings, since several other prophets had also foretold the Babylonish exile; why, especially, it might not have been appended to Micah or to Jeremiah, both of whom speak of the exile with the utmost definiteness.—Gesenius, aware of the difficulties of all these suppositions, regards the whole as the work of chance. This however is only an admission, that the fact itself is inexplicable. As a possibility Gesenius asserts, that the mere connexion of this anonymous oracle with those of Isaiah in one roll, might have been ground enough for a later possessor of this roll, to ascribe to Isaiah all that was contained in it. But the very point in question is, how the compiler came to join them both together in one roll.

III. There are in the second part of Isaiah many peculiarities of style, which it has in common with the first part, but which are very seldom, or not at all, found in the other books of the Old Testament. Of these both Jahn and Moeller have made a diligent collection.* We cite here only two examples. The first is the constant appellation of Jehovah, קְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, *Holy One of Israel*, which occurs throughout the whole book, and just as often in the second part, as in the first. This name is found elsewhere only *five* times in the whole of the Old Testament, viz. Ps. 71: 22. 78: 41. 89: 19. Jer. 50: 29. 51: 5. In both these last passages, moreover, it does not strictly even belong to Jeremiah, but to Isaiah, whom Jeremiah has in these chapters imitated. How entirely the use of this name was peculiar to Isaiah, is also apparent from the fact, that it is also found in 2 K. 19: 22 in the address of Isaiah; while it occurs no where else in the books of Kings. The second peculiar idiom, which was first pointed out by Gesenius himself, is, that in the second part, as well as in the first, the verb *to be named or called* is very frequently employed instead of *to be*.† These idioms have occasioned great difficulty to the opponents. They admit of themselves, that these idioms cannot possibly be acci-

* Jahn l. c. p. 460 sq. Moeller p. 59 sq.

† E. g. Is. 1: 26. 4: 3. 9: 5. 19: 18. 30: 7. 35: 8. 44: 5. 47: 1, 4, 5. 48: 8. 56: 7. 58: 12. 60: 14, 18. 61: 3, 6. 62: 2, 4, 12. 63: 16. These are all the examples specified by Gesenius, *Comm. Th. III. p. 29. Ed.*

dental.* The solution which they adopt is a violent one. They affirm, that these idioms have arisen from an assimilating hand, which was also active in the general shaping of the whole. But this assertion is wholly arbitrary. There can then, in general, no question whatever of higher criticism be decided, on the grounds of style and language; for the same liberties which the opposers of the genuineness of any piece permit to themselves, they must also permit to its defenders.—It is a supposition entirely unnatural and at variance with the spirit of that period, even as the opponents themselves represent it, that the compiler, or whoever else it might be, should have set himself down and collected single words and phrases out of the first part, and then have substituted them for others in the second part. What object could he have had in this? It was only by accident, as the opponents themselves affirm, that the second part was joined to the first. Consequently, he could not have had the purpose, to enable himself thereby to pass off the second part with greater plausibility as the work of Isaiah. And even if he did entertain this purpose, he could not, from the character of the readers of that age, expect to accomplish his object. For who at that period had a taste for the critical comparison of various idioms, in the manner that it is now practised?

IV. Against the opinion, that the second part of Isaiah was composed during the exile, an argument by no means to be contemned is furnished by its style. During the Babylonish exile, the influence of the Aramaean language upon the Hebrew, which had already existed in some degree, naturally became very important. Even before the end of the exile, the Hebrew began to be a learned language. A Chaldee element quite important is already contained in the writings of Jeremiah, who lived before the exile and at the commencement of it, not at Babylon but at Jerusalem; and one still more important is found in those of Ezekiel, who passed his life in exile. But in the style of the so called Pseudo-Isaiah, we ought to expect a far greater measure of Chaldaic influence. According to the determination of opposing critics, he must have prophesied at Babylon towards the last year of the seventy years' captivity. Of course he was never in Judea; he had lived from his youth upward among a foreign people. We find in him, however, a dic-

* Compare De Wette Einl. p. 231. Gesenius Einleitung zu dem zweyten Theil, p. 29.

tion, which, according to the admission of the opponents themselves, is parallel in purity and beauty to the productions of the most flourishing periods of the Hebrew literature. That the Pseudo-Isaiah had *retained* the purity of his language, cannot with propriety be affirmed, with our opponents; for what he never possessed, could not well be retained; and that he had formed his style after the model of more ancient writings, cannot well suffice for the explanation of the fact in question. It does not seem possible, in times so unfavourable for learned studies, to avoid so entirely the influence of surrounding persons and objects, that this influence should no where become visible in a work of such extent. When an appeal is made to a similar case in the book of Job, the later age of this oldest among all the productions of Hebrew literature is unjustly presupposed. When again it is affirmed, that many Psalms, written in a style either wholly or at least tolerably pure, belong to the times of the Babylonish exile, it is still the case that most of those also are arbitrarily assigned to this period. Those Psalms which really belong to this period prove nothing; since in a poem consisting of only a few verses, many Chaldaisms cannot of course occur. Nor can an appeal be made to the books of Kings; for in them, on the one hand, there are found not a few Chaldaisms; and on the other, in the composition of them, older contemporary documents were literally transcribed.

V. The first and second parts have also, in other respects, many peculiarities in common. Both delight in appending hymns of thanksgiving to the prophecies. Examples of this kind are found indeed in other prophets; but still by no means so frequent in proportion. In both parts visions and symbolical actions occur only seldom. The first part contains only one vision, c. 6; the second also only one, c. 63. Both have the same simplicity and artlessness, and not the overloaded manner which prevailed among later writers.—Of symbolical actions there are only two in the first part, c. 8 and 20; and in the second part only one, c. 62: 6, where the prophet declares that he will set watchmen, who shall pray upon the walls of Jerusalem; which may strictly be regarded rather as a figure, than as a symbolical action. This peculiarity, as being common to both parts, is in itself very striking; but it speaks so much the more for the authenticity of the second part, because if the time of its composition be assumed during the exile, we should naturally expect many visions and symbolical actions. At least these

are very prominent in the later prophets, as in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Daniel. On the other hand, it is indeed brought as an argument, that the prophets Haggai and Malachi, who also lived at a late period, have no visions nor symbolical actions. But this is by no means demonstrative evidence; since the prophecies still extant of the former consist of only two chapters, and those of the latter of only four.—Finally, there occur in the second part, throughout, the same imagery, the same thoughts, the same historical illustrations, which are also peculiar to the first part. Single examples by themselves cannot, of course, here be considered as demonstrative; but assuredly the collected examples, as exhibited by Jahn, Beckhaus, and especially by Moeller (p. 71 sq.) cannot but serve to strengthen in an important degree the unprejudiced mind, in the conviction already gained from other sources, of the authenticity of the work in question.

VI. If the author of the second part lived towards the end of the Babylonish exile, it is matter of surprise that we find in him so few particular allusions to this period, and that so much is not at all touched upon, which, it would seem, he must necessarily have taken notice of. Even in regard to Cyrus, how enigmatically is all expressed! Without the actual fulfilment, it would be impossible to obtain a clear view, who this Cyrus should be, and in what manner he would act for the deliverance of the Jewish people. And if the prophet really prophesied at the time, (as is said,) when the Medes and Persians were already on their march against Babylon, what could have induced him to pass over in silence the names of these nations, which had already been mentioned by Jeremiah, c. 51: 11, 28?

VII. On the other hand, there are a multitude of allusions, which do not suit at all the situation of things towards the close of the Babylonish exile, but necessarily presuppose the age of Isaiah, or at least the period before the exile. If Isaiah was the writer, these passages are of easy explanation. He had indeed transported himself in spirit into the time of the exile, and this had become to him in place of the present. But still it would be to us cause of suspicion, if the real present did not sometimes assert its claims, and draw the view of the prophet upon itself. Such is also actually the fact. The prophet often turns away from the scenes of vision, and casts his view upon the relations of his own time. Now he has before his eyes the situation of the unhappy people in exile; and again, the Jewish

state, as still existing in his time, but internally torn in pieces by idolatry and rebellion. These apparent inconsistencies can be explained in no other way, than on the supposition that Isaiah was the author. We must here go more into detail.

For the most part, Jerusalem appears to the prophet as already destroyed, as also the other cities of the land; the land itself as laid waste. But on the other hand, in c. 40: 9 it is said: "Zion, ascend upon a lofty mountain; say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God!" and c. 41: 27 it is also said: "I am the first who saith to Zion, Behold it is there; and give to Jerusalem messengers of joy." Here Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are spoken of, as being not yet destroyed. Gesenius, in order to avoid the force of this argument, prefers to understand these passages of the former inhabitants of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah.* But granting that Zion could stand for the Zionites in exile, still it is difficult to comprehend, how Zion could speak to the cities of Judah, when these had been now a long time destroyed; while, on the contrary, it is easy to conceive, if Isaiah was the author, how he could fall back out of the situation into which he had in spirit transported himself. But even the first supposition, that Zion may stand for the Zionites in captivity, is not susceptible of proof, and by no means follows from the passages, Jer. 51: 10. Zech. 2: 10, cited by Gesenius. For c. 51 of Jeremiah was composed in the fourth year of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was not yet wholly destroyed; † while the prophecies of Zechariah were first written after the rebuilding of the city.

In c. 43: 22 sqq. Jehovah declares that he will have compassion on his people, although by their conduct they have not deserved his help. He reproaches them, namely, with the fact, that they have failed to yield him that internal service required by the law, and to honour him with real holiness; yea, they have discontinued even their external homage by sacrifices. "Thou hast not brought me the lambs of thy burnt-offerings; thou hast not honoured me with sacrifices," etc. But how could Jehovah reproach the people in exile with the omission of a service, which, according to his own laws, they could perform only in their own country, and in the temple consecrated to him, but then destroyed?

* Comm. Th. III. p. 31.

† Compare Bertholdt Einl. IV. p. 1432.

In c. 48: 6—8 the prophet affirms, that the fall of Babylon and the deliverance of Israel had not been foretold by any prophet before him. In c. 41: 26 also, he appeals to the fact, that he is the first to prophesy these events, of which no one else had had a foreboding. How could this be said by a prophet, who lived in the last year of the captivity, when Micah (4: 10) had long before foretold in express words, not only the carrying away into exile, but also the deliverance from it; when Jeremiah had already published his still more definite prophecies (c. 50, 51), in which not only the fall of Babel and the deliverance of Israel are announced generally, but also the very nations are named by whose agency these events shall be brought about, and even the particular circumstances connected with them are specified? Gesenius seems to refer this passage merely to the mention of the name of Cyrus.* But, on the one hand, this does not immediately precede; and on the other, it is not easy to conceive how a prophet, who prophesied immediately before the taking of Babylon,—after the earlier prophets had distinctly foretold that the destruction of that city should be accomplished by a Medo-Persian host, and after Cyrus at the head of such a host had gained many victories and subdued many nations,—could, without making himself ridiculous, boast in many words, that God had revealed to him how Cyrus should deliver the covenant people out of the power of the Babylonians. This every one might know, since Jeremiah had even distinctly specified the time.—It is the position of Gesenius himself,† that “the station of the prophet in time is no other than the period when, from the splendid victories of Cyrus and his advance towards Babylon, there arose by degrees in the minds of the Hebrews the fixed hope and even the conviction, that this storm would shortly descend upon Babylon, and at the same time prepare the way for the freedom of the people.”

In c. 52: 4 it is said: “Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, My people went down at the beginning into Egypt to sojourn there; and Assyria did them violence at the end.” This could have been written only by Isaiah, and not by the Pseudo-Isaiah, to whom the Assyrian oppression was not the last. The prophet here places together the first deliverance of the people from the Egyptians, and the last or that from the Assyrians, which had been accomplished in his own days. Gesenius, in order to re-

* Th. III. p. 32.

† L. c. p. 33.

move this stone out of the way, translates **בְּאֵין עֵצָה** by *without cause, absque ulla causa*, as the Vulgate has it. But this qualification does not suit the context at all, and **בְּאֵין עֵצָה** stands manifestly in antithesis with **בְּרֵאשִׁית הַיּוֹם**.

In c. 57 the Israelites are threatened with punishment on account of their idolatry, and in v. 5 they are addressed as those "who burn for idols under every green tree, and slaughter the children in the vallies." In these words there is a distinct allusion to the days of Isaiah, in which children were slain in the vallies in honour of idols. That this took place under Abaz is evident from 2 Chr. 28: 3; and also under Manasseh, from 2 Chr. 33: 6. All the other passages of the Old Testament, in which such sacrifices are spoken of, refer also to the time while the Jews were still in Palestine; e. g. Jer. 7: 32. 19: 5. But with the carrying away into exile, this horrible custom was discontinued. The exile produced this effect upon the Hebrews, viz. that while they perceived in the exile a punishment for their idolatry, and on the other hand hoped by a faithful attachment to Jehovah to be restored to their former prosperity, they held the worship of idols in utter abomination. To this detestation of idol worship, which was thus produced by the Babylonish exile, all the writings of the later Jews bear testimony; e. g. the books of Ezra and Nehemiah and the books of the Maccabees. It is also apparent from the fact, that hell itself was named after the valley, in which the worship of Moloch was formerly practised.—On this topic Gesenius reasons in a complete circle. "Wherefore this constant warfare against idolatry," he asks, "if the greater part of the people were not devoted to it?" This is indeed the very point in question, whether such a controversy against idolatry in the time of the exile is conceivable; and whoever maintains this, must further shew, that at this period idol worship, and especially (what is still more incredible) the burning of children in honour of idols, was actually practised. When Gesenius further affirms, that "nothing else could be expected from people devoted of old to idolatry, and now living wholly among idolaters," he sets aside the historical testimonies, in behalf of probabilities which are wholly without foundation. For, to say nothing of the religious excitement which had been produced by the exile in the minds of the Hebrews, national pride and hatred against their oppressors would naturally prevent them from any approach or imitation. While the Jews, so long as they continued to be a separate and inde-

pendent people, eagerly adopted every mode of foreign worship; the whole earlier and later history of their dispersion among other nations, presents only a constant example of their inflexible attachment to their paternal religion.—Several even of the opposers of the genuineness of the second part, have been compelled to acknowledge the weight of the argument drawn from this passage. De Wette admits, that this passage seems to point back to the age of Isaiah.* Eichhorn concedes,† that the portions c. 56: 10—57: 21, and 66: 1—17, on account of the punishment there threatened against idolaters, could not have been first written during the exile, but belong to the time of Manasseh. But since, according to the proof adduced by Gesenius himself,‡ the whole second part of Isaiah is bound together by an inseparable unity, it follows that the whole second part must also necessarily belong to an earlier period, if this is demonstrable of a single portion of it.

The Israelites are reproached, c. 57: 9, as having sinned against Jehovah, not only by their idol worship, but also by the fact, that instead of placing their hopes alone in Jehovah, they have, by embassies and costly presents, sought for help from distant kings. This is a reproach which Isaiah often brings against the people in the first part; but it is one which would be without meaning in the time of the Babylonish exile, when the people, oppressed as they were, and having lost their national independence, could not have adopted such a measure, even if they would.

Jehovah declares, c. 57: 11, that he has long borne with great forbearance the sins of the people; but that the people, instead of being thereby induced to return to him, have been strengthened in their sins.|| But how does this suit the times of the Babylonish exile, when the people now sighed under the judgments of Jehovah, and had experienced, not his forbearance, but already for seventy years his punitive justice?

Finally, the whole contents of c. 66 go to shew that the second part was composed at a time when the temple was still standing, and when the Mosaic rites, and idol worship along with them, were still practised. In this chapter the prophet

* *Einleitung ins A. T.* p. 232.

† *Hebräische Propheten Bd. I.* p. 415.

‡ *Commentar Th. III.* p. 5 sq.

|| *Compare Rosenmueller T. III.* p. 441.

contends against those, who thought by external observances, by sacrifices and the like, to obtain merit in the sight of God. But in the time of the exile this forbidden by-way could no longer be extant; since both the temple worship and all the sacrifices had ceased; and the prophet would therefore only beat the air.

We have here adduced only that which can be refuted by no opposing remarks whatever, with any appearance of plausibility. Besides all this, there are also many other particulars, which can be referred to the time of the exile only with the greatest violence.

VIII. The assertion, that the author of the second part prophesied in the last year of the exile, is refuted by the circumstance, that Jeremiah (c. 50, 51) has undeniably used and imitated his writings. Jahn has shewn this (T. II. p. 463) by a careful comparison; and the counter remarks of Bertholdt and Gesenius, are not adapted to overturn the results established by him. In the writings of other prophets, also, distinct traces may be pointed out of imitation of this part; but we cannot here enter further into the subject.

ART. V. ON THE MEANING OF *ΚΤΡΙΟΣ* IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PARTICULARLY ON THE MANNER IN WHICH THIS WORD IS EMPLOYED BY PAUL IN HIS EPISTLES.

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

THE above subject was suggested to me by a remark in Winer's Supplement to the second edition of his Grammar of the New Testament.* In speaking of the Greek article (*ὁ*) as standing before *κύριος*, or being omitted, he observes, that "Paul usually calls Christ, *the Lord* (*τὸν κύριον*); and this appellation is given [by him] to *God*, only in quotations from the Old Testament, or where the apostle is speaking in reference to

* Grammatiche Excursus, p. 38.

them." The author, however, does not pursue the subject any farther, but promises a particular *Commentatio* upon it.*

A careful reader of the New Testament will allow, that the subject is one of deep interest to the critic and the theologian; much deeper than might at first be suspected. On this account I have undertaken to discuss it, according to the measure of my ability, and at least to satisfy myself as to the meaning and design of the apostle, in bestowing so frequently upon the Saviour, the appellation of *κύριος* and *ὁ κύριος*.

I limit myself to the writings of Paul, because in them I find the appellation more frequently given than elsewhere, and because it is more convenient in an investigation of this sort, to compare the same writer with himself. One may easily believe, also, that it is more probable he will obtain a definite and consistent view of the *usus loquendi* in this way, in respect to any particular word. Possibly, at some future time, I may extend the investigation to all the writers of the New Testament.

The method which I propose in the following investigation is, to inquire into the following points, viz.

I. The meaning of *κύριος* as employed by the classic heathen writers.

II. Its use by the authors of the Septuagint version.

III. Its proper meaning in general, as applied to God or to Christ, in the New Testament.

IV. The manner in which Paul actually applies it, in his epistles.

The two first heads of inquiry are merely a preparation for the third; and the third is essential to the satisfaction of every intelligent reader, before he proceeds to the fourth. The radical idea conveyed by any word, its fundamental, essential, and

* After I had made out the plan of the present dissertation, and nearly completed the leading parts of it, I obtained, through the kindness of the Editor of this work, a copy of Winer's *Programm* or *Disputatio de Sensu vocum κύριος et ὁ κύριος in Actis et Epistolis Apostolorum*, Erlang. 1828, a pamphlet of 26 small quarto pages, very sparsely printed. Some valuable hints are contained in this Programm, as indeed in almost every thing which Winer writes that has respect to the philology of the New Testament; but my plan and purposes are so different from those which this author had in view, that I have not changed any part of them in consequence of reading his *Disputatio*, and have conducted the whole inquiry merely by the aid of my concordance.

usual meaning, must be well understood, before we can advance with pleasure or profit, to inquire into the particular manner in which any individual writer applies it.

I. Classic Meaning of *Κύριος*.

I take the word, in its proper origin, to be an *adjective*; which, like many other words originally of the same nature, came by usage to be employed as a mere noun. Its proper theme or original root seems to be *κῦρος*; from which, in a manner common to the Greeks, the adjective *κύριος* was formed. *Κύριος*, as employed by the classic writers, (it does not occur in the New Testament,) means *the principal thing on which all depends, power, consequence or respect, principal efficiency, authority, confirmation, security, key-stone* (e. g. of an arch), etc. The verb *κυρόω*, (a denominative springing from *κῦρος*), has significations that correspond with these, viz. *to confirm, to render valid, to authorize, to make a law, choice, etc. to determine or decide*.

From these words, by a very easy and natural derivation, comes *κύριος, ια, ιον*, an adjective, which, when applied to *persons*, means one who is *lord, master, or owner* of any thing, *one who has power over it* to dispose of it as he pleases. *Κυριός τινος* was a common expression among the Greeks, to designate a relation of this nature.

When the word, as an adjective, was applied to *things*, then its meaning was kindred with that of the noun from which it is derived. That was called *κύριον*, on which *any special power, efficiency, or operative force depended*. Hence it signified, *pre-eminent, principal, significant or expressive, authoritative*; also *valid, firm, lasting*.

Besides this, it has a *technical* use in rhetoric. When employed to characterize a mode of expression, it means *proper or literal*, in opposition to that which is tropical and figurative. As allied to this last meaning, the Greeks also said *κύριον ὄνομα*, in order to designate *the proper name* of any individual.

The use of *κύριος* or *ὁ κύριος* as a *noun*, falls in with the use of the adjective *κύριος* as applied to persons. Consequently it means, as has been remarked above, *lord, master, owner*. It also designates the *head of a family, the head of a house*. In reference to the relation between husband and wife, the Greeks called the former *κύριος γυναικός*. In reference to the rela-

tion between father and son, they called the father *κύριος υιοῦ*. In reference to the relation between master and slave, the Greeks usually expressed this by calling the master *δεσπότης*, which means *lord* or *master* in the most absolute and unlimited sense, one clothed (as we say) with despotic power; for such, in Greece and Rome, was the power of a master over his slave.

In the New Testament, however, this classic use of *κύριος* and *δεσπότης* is not adhered to. For example; we find *κύριος* employed to designate a *master* in relation to servants, in Col. 4: 1. 3: 22. Eph. 6: 5, 9, and a great number of the like cases elsewhere; while in 1 Tim. 6: 1. Titus 2: 9. 1 Pet. 2: 18, the word *δεσπότης* is employed for the same purpose. Whether it is accidental or designed, that the apostle in his epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians calls *masters* by the mild and honourable name of *κύριοι*, can hardly be determined, at the present time. Whether indeed the usage among the Greeks, which made such a distinction between *κύριος* and *δεσπότης*, is general or universal, has not perhaps been sufficiently investigated. I have made the statement above, on the authority of Passow in his lexicon. One thing is certain, viz. that the Septuagint does not observe the distinction noted by Passow; inasmuch as the master of a servant is frequently named *κύριος*; e. g. Ex. 21: 4, 5, 6 bis, 8, 32. Gen. 24: 9, 10, 12, 14, 27, 35, 36, etc.

Among the Greek poets, the *gods* were often called *κύριοι*. From the fact that the word was employed in such an honorary way, and for the purposes of distinction, it came at last to be employed in common usage as a term of respectful and polite address, applied by men to each other, and especially by inferiors to superiors. In the same way the Hebrew *אֲדֹנָי* is employed in the Old Testament; and in like manner, *Sir, Sire, Monsieur, Monseigneur, Signore, Herr*, etc. are employed by the present nations of Europe. This latter usage is most abundantly illustrated in the New Testament; e. g. John 4: 11, 15, 19. Luke 5: 12. Matt. 8: 2, 6, 8, 21, 25. 13: 27, 51. 18: 26, et al. saepe.

Such are the various meanings of *κύριος* and its correlates, as employed by the Greek classic writers.

II. Meaning of *Κύριος*, in the Septuagint Version.

I shall be very brief here, because the same ideas are, for the most part, to be repeated when we come to the New Testament usage of the word.

1. *Kýrios*, then, means, *owner, possessor*; e. g. Ex. 21: 28, *ὁ κύριος τοῦ ταύρου*. Ex. 21: 29, 34.

2. It signifies *husband, lord*, in the sense of being the head of a family; e. g. Gen. 18: 12, *ὁ κύριός μου προσβύτερος*. Here it is employed like the Hebrew *אָדוֹן* and *בַּעַל*.

3. It is used as an appellation of respect and civility; Gen. 23: 5, *κύριε*, addressed to Abraham by the children of Heth. Gen. 23: 11, 15, et al. *saepe*.

4. *Kýrios* is very frequently employed to designate the relation of a master to his servants or slaves; e. g. Gen. 24: 9, 10, 12, 14, 27, 35, 36, et al. *saepe*. In this sense is the word employed many scores of times in the Septuagint; as may be seen in Tromm's Concordance. Indeed, so far were the Seventy from recognizing the usual classic distinction between *δεσπότης* and *κύριος*, as stated by Passow, that they have scarcely used *δεσπότης* at all in the sense to which I now advert. I find only Prov. 30: 10 (found under chap. xxiv. in the Septuagint), 17: 2, and perhaps 6: 7, where it is so employed. In the few cases in which the Seventy use this word, it corresponds mostly to the Hebrew *אָדוֹן* and *אֲדֹנָי*, as designating Jehovah.

5. It is employed, in numberless instances, to designate *the only living and true God, the King of kings and Lord of lords*, as the supreme ruler, governor, master, owner, and rightful lord and possessor of all things; having them all under his control; possessing almighty power and a sovereign right to dispose of, order, and arrange them, as seems good in his sight, without any obligation whatever to give to any one an account of his proceedings.

In this sense, it is used one hundred and fourteen times as the translation of *אֲדֹנָי*, one of the appropriate and exclusive names of Jehovah. In the same sense, it is employed twenty-nine times, to represent *אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה*, which the Hebrews read (as the vowel points indicate) *אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה*. In forty-one instances it represents *אֱל*; in twenty-two, *אֱלֹהִים*; in eighty-five, *אֱלֹהִים*; in twenty, *יְה* *Jah*; and in more than fifteen hundred instances it stands for the Hebrew *יְהוָה*. It is plain, therefore, that what was occasional and poetic use among the Greeks, viz. the employment of *κύριος* to designate *a divinity, a divine being*, is the common and altogether predominant usage in the Greek Scriptures of the Old Testament.

These classifications of meaning I have gathered from the Concordance, and a comparison of the examples there noted,

with the Septuagint and the original Hebrew Scriptures. This one is obliged to do, who wishes to know the full extent of the Septuagint usage of *κύριος*; for the article under *κύριος* in Schleusner's Lexicon of the Septuagint, is nothing more than a chaotic mass, thrown together without skill, order, perspicuity, or any other quality which such an article ought to exhibit.

It is a remarkable fact, that the Seventy have almost uniformly rendered the Hebrew יהוה by *κύριος*. In no one instance have they attempted here to give us the pronunciation of this word, as they do that of other proper names. Whether it was known to these translators or not, we are unable now to tell. The word itself occurs, as has been stated above, in more than fifteen hundred instances in the Hebrew Scriptures, and is in most cases read by the Jews, and has been so read from time immemorial, as אֲדָרָי. It has the same vowel points as this word, excepting that the composite Sheva under the Aleph in אֲדָרָי, is exchanged for a corresponding Sheva simple under the Yodh in יהוה. In the few cases where the word אֲדָרָי occurs as joined with יהוה, the Jews point the latter word יהוה, and read it אֱלֹהִים.

From all this it appears, then, that the name יהוה, has never been written with its original vowels, in the Hebrew Scriptures. As the vowel points, beyond all reasonable doubt, were not introduced until after the fifth century of the Christian era; and as the vowels confessedly belonging to אֲדָרָי and אֱלֹהִים have always been appended to the word יהוה ever since these vowels began to be written; so we cannot now determine what the original sound of the word יהוה was. Critics have been divided between יהוה, (which has a majority in its favour,) יהוה, and יהוה. See Michaelis Supp. ad Lex. Heb. p. 554.

The antiquity of the usage, which substitutes the reading אֲדָרָי or אֱלֹהִים for the original sounds attached to יהוה, is altogether certain from the Septuagint manner of translating; for this almost always represents יהוה, as has been already stated, by *κύριος*. This fact makes it quite clear, that at least some three hundred years before the birth of Christ, the custom of substituting אֲדָרָי for יהוה, was common, or rather universal among the Jews. How much older than this such an usage was, it is impossible for us now to determine.

Be this however as it may, it is clear that *κύριος*, in the view of the Seventy, expressed the name of the only living and true

God, in the highest sense in which they could express it. *θεός* is indeed often employed by them to translate *לַאֵלֹהִים*, *הַיְהוָה*, and more than two thousand times as the version of *יְהוָה*. It is occasionally used, also, to translate *הַיְהוָה*; e. g. Gen. 4: 1, 4. Ex. 4: 1. Num. 23: 3, 16, etc. and also for *יְהוָה* Is. 26: 4. But as *κύριος* is immeasurably the predominant word in translating *הַיְהוָה*, and as *הַיְהוָה* was the highest and most sacred name (*ὄνομα ἀνεκφώνητον, ἄρρητον, ἄφραστον, ἄλεκτον, ἀφθεγκτον, ἀπόρρητον*); so it is clear, that *κύριος* was considered by the Seventy as a name of as high an order, when applied to the divine Being, as any one which the Greek language afforded.

Besides the evidence afforded by the manner in which the Seventy have translated *הַיְהוָה*, that very early the true pronunciation of this word was lost, or at least that the common people abstained from uttering it, there are other early testimonies that cast light on this curious fact. Theodoret, in his *Questio XV in Exodum*, speaking of the name *יהוה* says, *τοῦτο δὲ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἀφραστον, ἀπειρητον γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς διὰ τῆς γλώττης προσφέρειν* 'this is not uttered by the Hebrews, nor do they attempt to pronounce it with the tongue.' To the same purpose Eusebius (Praep. Evang. XI.) says, *ἄλεκτον τι τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ ἀπόρρητον* 'it is something which cannot be spoken or uttered by the multitude.' He is here speaking of a σύνθεσιν μᾶς τινος ἀπορρήτου προσηγορίας, 'the composition of a certain unutterable appellation,' ἣν διὰ τεσσάρων στοιχείων παῖδες Ἑβραίων σημαίνουσι, 'which the Hebrews designate by four letters.' Again he says (in the same chapter), *τοῦ θεοῦ κύριον ὄνομα ἄρρητον εἶναι καὶ ἀφθεγκτον, οὐδὲ φαντασίᾳ διανοίας ληπτόν* 'the proper name of God is unutterable and not to be spoken, nor is it even to be conceived in idea by the mind.'

These testimonies of early fathers, are plainly confirmed by hints both in Philo and Josephus. In his treatise *De Vita Mosi*, when speaking of the high priest's mitre, Philo says: "A golden plate was made like a crown, having four engraved characters of a name, ὃ μόνοις τοῖς ὤτα καὶ γλώτταν σοφία, κεκαθαρμένοις θέμις ἀκοῦειν καὶ λέγειν ἐν ἁγίοις, ἄλλω δὲ οὐδενὶ τὸ παράπαν οὐδαμοῦ, 'which it was lawful only for those whose ears and tongue were purified by wisdom, to hear and to utter in the sanctuary, but for no one at all in any other place.'" In like manner Josephus Antiq. II. 12. 4, *καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν [יהוה] σημαίνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προσηγορίαν, οὐ πρότερον εἰς ἀν-*

θρώπους παρελθούσαν· περι ἧς οὐ μοι θέμις εἰπεῖν· ‘and God made known to him his own name [יהוה], which before had not been disclosed to men; respecting which it is not lawful for me to speak.’

Observe that Josephus does not say, that he did not know it; for being a priest, he doubtless had heard it in the temple. The extract above from Philo, shews that it was pronounced there, but no where else; and what Josephus says, implies that he was acquainted with it. These considerations serve to render it probable, that when the temple was destroyed, the name in question ceased any longer to be pronounced, and was finally lost.

From what quarter the Jews borrowed this custom, it would be difficult to say. I find nothing that prescribes it in the Old Testament. Indeed, it is plain from Ex. 3: 13—15. 6: 1—3, that this name was intended to be known to the Jewish people in general. It is not unnatural therefore to suppose, that in process of time, reverence for the peculiar and appropriate name of God led the Jews to adopt the custom of other nations, in keeping the most mysterious name of the divinity from vulgar tongues and ears, in order to avoid its profanation. We are told that the Egyptian Hermes said, *θεὸν νοῆσαι μὲν ἔστι χαλεπὸν, φράσαι δὲ ἀδύνατον*, ‘to understand God is difficult, to speak of him impossible; and again, *οὐ τὸ ὄνομα οὐ δύναται ἀνθρώπινω στόματι λαληθῆναι*, ‘whose name cannot be uttered by the mouth of man.’ See Drusii *Tetragrammaton* in Crit. Sac. Lond. VI. p. 2152. So the Delphic Apollo, when asked what God was, replied, *οὐ τὸ ὄνομα μηδὲ λόγῳ χωρούμενον*, ‘whose name cannot be contained in language.’ (Ibid.) Champollion has also read an inscription on the temple of the goddess Neith (*Isis*) in Egypt, which runs thus: “I am all that has been, all that is, all that will be. No mortal hath raised the veil that conceals me; and the fruit I have produced is the sun.” (Greppo’s Essay on Hieroglyph. p. 227.) The same thing is mentioned by Plutarch, in the following words, viz. *ἐγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονός, καὶ ὄν, καὶ ἔσομένον, καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδεὶς θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψε*. Plutarch *de Iside*.

I add only, that the expressions in the Apocalypse, “a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it,” 2: 17, and “he had a name written, that no man knew but himself,” 19: 12, seem plainly to refer to the well known usage of the Jews respecting the *ὄνομα ἄρρητον*, in the days of the apostles.

Every reader must be struck with the resemblance between the inscription on the temple of Neith, as quoted above, and the passage in Rev. 1: 4, which contains a species of translation of the word יהוה, or at least a paraphrase of it: "Grace and peace to you, *ἀπό ὧν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*. In Hebrew the name יהוה is indeclinable. John has made the Greek paraphrase of it here equally so, putting ὧν κ.τ.λ. after the preposition ἀπό, which demands the genitive case.

What shall we say now to this? Did the Egyptians borrow their sublime description of Neith from the Hebrews? or did Moses transfer the idea contained in such a description, from their theology to that of the Hebrews, and appropriate it to Jehovah, because it belonged to him only and truly? This question we cannot satisfactorily answer; for antiquity has covered with obscurity the evidences on which the true answer must depend.

But I must return from this digression; which, however, I would hope may not be without some interest and profit to the readers of the Hebrew Scriptures, who so often meet with the word יהוה furnished with vowels that do not belong to it, and who need some particular information to satisfy their minds respecting this matter. It has an important bearing, also, on the import of the word κύριος, as employed by the Hellenistic Jews in almost numberless instances.

The way is now prepared, so that we may advance to our next inquiry.

III. In what senses is the word κύριος employed in the New Testament?

A general answer might be given to this; which would be, that it is often employed in the same way as in the Septuagint.

1. It designates the *owner* or *possessor* of any thing; as Matt. 20: 8, ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος. Matt. 21: 40. Gal. 4: 1.

2. It signifies the *head* or *master* of a *family* or *household*; e. g. Mark 13: 35. Matt. 13: 27, et al. saepe.

3. It is used as an appellation of respect and civility; Matt. 18: 21. 20: 30, 33. 21: 30, et al. saepe.

4. It is employed as designating the relation of a *master* to a servant or slave; Matt. 24: 45, 46, 48, 50. Eph. 6: 5, 9. Col. 4: 1. 3: 22, and often elsewhere.

5. It means *master* or *lord* over any thing, i. e. as having the

absolute right to dispose of it, or make any arrangement respecting it, as one pleases; e. g. Matt. 9: 38. Luke 10: 2. Matt. 12: 8, 'the Son of Man is *κύριος τοῦ σαββάτου*.' Mark 2: 28.

It is easy to see, that all these specific meanings arise rather from the particular relations of the word *κύριος* to other surrounding words, than from any essential variation in the principal meaning of the word itself. The idea of being a complete *owner* or *possessor* of any thing, and of having it at one's disposal; the idea of being master of it in such a sense that it is entirely under one's control, and subject to any disposition or arrangement that he may please to make respecting it; lies at the foundation of all the specific meanings that have been noted; and these are specific, merely because *κύριος* stands in connexion with different objects, to which it must, from the nature of the case, hold a relation specifically different.

The transfer of the essential idea which *κύριος* thus designates, (when it is used as related to the various objects already named, and applied to men or human beings as *κύριοι*,) to a Being of the highest and most exalted order, is very easy and natural. It has also the Greek *usus loquendi* in its favour. We have already seen, that the Greek poets called their supreme gods, *κύριοι*. Paul doubtless alludes to this usage, when he says 1 Cor. 8: 5, *ἑστὶ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ, θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί*. It is no more objection to *κύριος* being employed by a New Testament writer, because the heathen employed the word to designate his false gods, than it is that *θεός* should be used by such writer; since *θεός* was also employed by the heathen to designate a false god. In such a case, the idea suggested by *θεός* to the mind of a Hebrew who understood the Greek language, would be one that was in unison with the characteristics of Jehovah, as portrayed in the Hebrew Scriptures, and not according to the views which a heathen Greek entertained in respect to the gods whom he worshipped. The same is the case with *κύριος*. The Hebrew who was acquainted with the Greek Scriptures of the Old Testament, would of course there find *κύριος* employed times almost without number, in order to translate יהוה, the "incommunicable name" of the true God. Of course he would attach to *κύριος*, when it referred to the God-head, the same ideas which he attached to the יהוה, אֱלֹהֵי, אֱלֹהִים, etc. of the Old Testament. All words of such a nature, when employed by a foreign nation, are used in a *modified* sense; and although they designate some general idea that is

common both to them and the nation to whom the words are vernacular, yet there must of course be a *specific* difference between the same words as employed by the one nation and the other. Every critical reader well knows how plainly this is the case with a multitude of words in the New Testament, which, in passing from a *heathen* to *Christian* use, have become modified; so that they may be fairly said, and in a very intelligible sense too, to have acquired a new meaning.

Such was the case with *κύριος*; and this in a way of necessity. In designating the true God, the Hebrew who wrote in Greek, must either use a word foreign to the Greek language, e. g. the Hebrew יהוה, אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהֵינוּ, etc. or else he must employ such words as the Greeks had already coined in order to designate their own divinities, and trust to the reader to modify the meaning of this, as he himself did in his own mind while writing, according to the analogy of the Jewish Scriptures. The latter was the plainest and most obvious course; and accordingly the writers of the New Testament have followed it throughout, almost without exception.

We can easily see, then, how *κύριος* came to be employed, to designate the only living and true God, by the writers of the New Testament. They found it every where so employed in the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures; and the natural and obvious meaning of the word, considered in an etymological point of view, rendered it exceedingly well adapted to express the idea which they wished to express, when they conceived of God as the sovereign ruler, proprietor, and disposer of all creatures, all events, and all worlds.

It is proper to stop here, for a moment, in order to inquire whether there is any specific difference between the appellations *θεός* and *κύριος*. In answer to this inquiry it may be said, that both refer to the same Being; both designate the only living and true God; both are also employed for the purposes of other designations. Neither is a *proper* name, in a true sense. *Jehovah* seems to have been so, among the Hebrews. But *θεός* and *κύριος* are names designating quality or condition, and were employed by the Greeks, in like manner as we employ such designations of God as *the Almighty, the Eternal, the Omnicient*, etc. when used alone, to indicate the Supreme Being. The etymology of *θεός* has indeed been a subject of dispute. But still, I cannot help thinking that Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat. I.*) has developed it in a way which

hardly admits of reasonable doubt. "God," says he, "is called θεός, παρὰ τὴν θέσιν καὶ τάξιν, τὴν διακόσμησιν, because of *disposition* and arrangement, or setting in order." The θεῶν here plainly refers to τίθημι, which means *pono, dispono, colloco, constituo*, etc. The old root or theme of this word is θέω, which appears to have been laid aside, because another verb, written with the same characters, was employed in the sense of *running, flying, moving swiftly*. If θεός be a derivative of θέω in the sense of *dispono, colloco*, etc. then it very naturally designates the Godhead as the *founder, author, or creator* of the world; as him who arranged all things in their present order, and made a disposition of them so harmonious and consistent.

On the other hand κύριος would designate the same Being as the *governor, ruler, head, and disposer* of the creation thus brought into being and orderly arranged. To the mind then of a person who uses the designations of θεός and κύριος intelligently, they would convey distinct ideas; the first, that of creator, author, founder of the universe; the second, that of governor, controller, sovereign proprietor and disposer of it. God may be designated in either way, or by either characteristic. Both belong to him, and to him exclusively.

We may now proceed with our investigation, under the advantage of having a more definite understanding of the meaning of κύριος as applied to God, and of the ground or reason of giving him such an appellation.

6. Ὁ κύριος then is often employed to designate *God, the supreme God*, simply considered; e. g. Matt. 1: 22. 2: 15. 5: 33. Luke 1: 6, 29. Mark 5: 19. Acts 7: 31. James 4: 15, et al. saepe. So also often in quotations from the Old Testament; e. g. Rom. 10: 17. 11: 3, et al. saepe. The same is true of κύριος, without the article; e. g. Rom. 4: 8. 9: 28. Matt. 27: 10. Mark 13: 20. Luke 1: 58, et al. saepe. Such is the case also in the Septuagint; for κύριος, both here and in the New Testament, has by usage the license of a proper name in respect to the article, and can either take or reject it, at the pleasure of the writer.

7. Κύριος is used in special reference to God the Father; e. g. Christ in his thanksgiving says Matt. 11: 25, *πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς*. Luke 10: 21. 20: 42.

8. Most frequently of all, is κύριος an appellation given to the Saviour, especially by John, Luke, and Paul. Matthew and

Mark do not themselves apply this to Jesus, as designating his supreme dominion, excepting after his resurrection. But in the other writers named, the appellation abounds beyond all others, and seems to have been the most common of all among the primitive disciples.

As a simple acknowledgment of respect or a title of civility, it could not thus be employed; for this would be confined to direct address, when in the personal presence of the Saviour. It remains therefore to inquire, in what sense Christ is called *κύριος* by the writers of the New Testament.

I design to be brief here; for a few texts will cast all the light on this subject which we can well expect, in our present imperfect state.

Omitting earlier notices of Christ as a *prince*, I advert, first of all, to the declarations made by David respecting him, in the second Psalm. "Yet have I set my *King* upon my holy hill of Zion. . . . Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, [crush them i. e. all thine enemies, with an iron sceptre,] thou shalt dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel," Ps. 2: 6, 8, 9. Here the supreme and universal dominion of the Messiah in the earth, and his irresistible power over all his enemies, are plainly and distinctly marked. And this accords well with what Nathan the prophet was commissioned to tell David, in the name of the Lord: "I will set up thy seed after thee . . . I will establish his kingdom . . . thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever," 2 Sam. 7: 12, 16. This latter passage does indeed contain promises of a temporal nature also; but there seems to be no good reason why we may not suppose, that both temporal and spiritual blessings were promised to David, as they were also to Abraham, Gen. 17: 1—8.

In Ps. *xlv.* which the apostle (Heb. 1: 8) says is addressed to the Son of God, the kingdom of Christ is described as eternal (v. 6), and he is represented as a most glorious and all conquering king (vs. 3—5), and as superior to all others who bear this name, v. 7.

In Ps. *cx.* Jehovah is represented as saying to him whom David calls his *Lord*: "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. . . . Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies;" i. e. be thou *σύνθρονος, πάρεδρος* with me, a part-

ner of my throne, whilst all thine enemies are utterly subdued. The many and laboured comments which have been made on this Psalm, in order to wrest it from being interpreted as having relation to the Messiah, remind one of the perplexity of the Pharisees, when Jesus asked them: "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They said, The Son of David." "How then," replied Jesus, "doth David in spirit call him *Lord*? . . . If David called him *Lord*, how is he his Son?" The consequence of this question was, that the Pharisees were put to silence. "No man was able to answer him a word; neither durst any man, from that day forth, ask him any more questions." Matt. 22: 41 sq.

It was indeed a confounding question, which Jesus asked, viz. How David could call Christ *Lord*, when at the same time he was his own Son; for among the Hebrews, children could never be entitled to such deference on the part of a parent who held the highest rank himself. The question was unexpected and confounding, therefore, to the Pharisees, who do not appear to have once thought that the Messiah must be something more than the Son of David, in order to be entitled to such honour. It must be remembered, however, that they had not the sagacity of modern critics, who have made the discovery, that David, or whoever wrote Ps. cx. had no reference to the Messiah; and that Jesus adverted to this Psalm as having respect to himself, merely because the Jews erroneously believed it to be *Messianic*. Whether they would not be as much embarrassed to defend the honesty and integrity of Jesus in so doing, as the Pharisees were to know how David could call him *Lord*, is a question which has not yet been cleared up.

I return to my more immediate purpose. In Is. 9: 6, 7, is a very striking passage respecting the kingly authority of the Messiah. After stating that he should be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father [perpetual Guardian], Prince of Peace," the prophet goes on to say, that "of the increase of his government and peace [prosperity], there shall be no end; upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom [over it shall he be], to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

These are sufficient from the many passages which the Old Testament Scriptures afford. Do these harmonize with the representations of the New Testament?

I shall select but a few passages, for more will not be needed, in order to answer this question. When the birth of Jesus was announced by the angel Gabriel, it was declared by him, that he, Jesus, "should be great, that he should be called the Son of the Highest, and that the Lord God should give him the throne of David his father, and that he should reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there should be no end," Luke 1: 32, 33. So Daniel had said before, when he saw "one like the Son of Man, coming in the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days . . . and there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is *an everlasting* dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed," Dan. 7: 13, 14.

Peter, in his sermon to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, says: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," i. e. king over all, and king anointed by God, viz. one duly constituted by his authority, Acts 2: 36. The same apostle, in addressing the Jewish magistrates, says of Jesus, "Him hath God exalted at his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour," Acts 5: 31.

The Jews expected their Messiah to be a *King*. "Rabbi," said Nathanael to the Saviour, "Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel," John 1: 49. The beloved disciple delights in presenting Jesus to us in this capacity. He begins the Apocalypse, by calling him "Prince of the kings of the earth," 1: 5; he represents him as sitting down with the Father on his throne, 3: 21; he presents the heavenly world as offering him the same praise and worship as to the Father, in ascribing to him "blessing and honour and power and glory," 5: 13; he calls him "King of kings, and Lord of lords," 17: 14 (comp. Deut. 10: 17); which he repeats in Rev. 19: 16, and which is a title that is given to "the blessed and only Potentate," in 1 Tim. 6: 15.

Peter speaks of Jesus as being 'at the right hand of God, and of angels, and authorities, and powers, being made subject to him,' 1 Pet. 3: 22; and he tells us also of "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 1: 11.

What other sacred writers thought and wrote, in earlier and in later times, relative to the *dominion*, *kingdom*, or *lordship* of Christ, we have now briefly considered; but it is more directly

still to our present purpose, and altogether apposite to the design of this essay, to inquire what the views of Paul were relative to this same subject.

In writing to the Philippians this apostle says, that after Christ Jesus had "humbled himself and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross . . . God highly exalted him, and gave him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (κύριον), to the glory of God the Father," Phil. 2: 8—11. Accordingly Paul tells the Ephesians that they have "one Lord," as well as "one faith and one baptism," Eph. 4: 5. So also he tells the Corinthians; "to us . . . there is one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him," 1 Cor. 8: 6. To the same church he says: "There are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord," 1 Cor. 12: 5. What Lord is here meant, is determined by the preceding context, in which he says: "No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost," v. 3.

What particular idea the apostle attached to the term *Lord*, is not expressly indicated by the passage quoted above from Phil. 2: 8—11; but it is very clearly exhibited by another passage, or rather by several passages, in the epistle to the Colossians. In chap. 1: 15—19, he calls Christ "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature;" and after asserting that "all things were created by him, in heaven and earth, visible and invisible" . . . that they "were created by him and for him," . . . and that "by him all things consist;" he goes on to say, that "he [Christ] is the head of the body" [the Lord of the church], that "he is the beginning, [ἀρχή, ruler, prince,] the first-born from the dead," i. e. he who being raised from the dead, is exalted to preeminence over all. "For," adds the apostle, "it pleased the Father, that in him all fulness should dwell." What this *fulness* is, a subsequent passage in the same epistle defines: "In him [Christ] dwelleth all the *fulness of the Godhead* bodily," 2: 9, *σωματικῶς, corporaliter, substantially, essentially, really, truly*; so the context leads us to interpret *σωματικῶς*; for in v. 16, the apostle speaking of holidays and ordinances respecting meats and drinks, says: "They are a *shadow* (σινιά) of things to come, but the *substance or reality* (σῶμα) is Christ." The reader will bear pa-

tiently with me, if I add here, on this important and difficult word, that strong confirmation of the sense given above to *σωματικῶς* is not only deducible from the nature of the writer's own design and his *usus loquendi* in the context, but also from two passages in Josephus, where *σῶμα* has most clearly the sense of *substance, reality*; e. g. Bell. Jud. II. 2. 5, *σκιὰν αἰτησόμενος βασιλείας, ἧς ἤρπασεν ἑαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα*, 'asking the *shadow* of a kingdom, of which he assumed for himself the *substance*.' Bell. Jud. Proem. § 5, *τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἱστορίας, true narration*, in opposition to that which is fictitious; history respecting *realities*, not romance.

Paul assures us in 1 Cor. 15: 25, that Christ must "reign, until he hath put all things under his feet." In Rom. 9: 5, he tells us that Christ "is over all, God, blessed forever." In the epistle to the Hebrews he tells us, that "all things are put under the feet" of Christ; that God has "left nothing which is not put under him," himself only excepted, Heb. 2: 8. According to the same epistle, Jesus, after having made expiation for our sins, "sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high," 1: 3; he "was made higher than the heavens," 7: 26; he "is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," 8: 1. 10: 12; he "is set down at the right hand of the throne of God," 12: 2.

It were easy to increase the number of texts selected from the epistles of Paul, of the like tenor with those already produced. But it would be superfluous in respect to my present design; which is only to illustrate the reason why Paul has so often given the appellation of *κύριος* to the Saviour. And surely, after examining the texts already produced, there can be no doubt remaining in the mind of any impartial reader who is capable of judging, that Paul believed and taught that Christ was indeed **THE LORD OF ALL**, universal Potentate, or (as John calls him) **KING of kings and LORD of lords**.

One question, however, still remains; a difficult and delicate one it is also, and one which I approach with a sacred awe. Never do I feel the imperfection of human foresight and understanding, more than when I revolve in my mind the various inquiries to which this question gives birth. The main topic to which I now refer is this, viz. Of what nature is the *κυριότης* so often ascribed to the Saviour by Paul and the other writers of the New Testament? Is it *original* or *conferred*? Is it limited or perpetual? In a word, does Christ as Messiah, and

in this capacity as Lord of the church and of all things, possess original or delegated dominion? Is his *κυριότης* temporary or eternal?

The latter question is intimately connected with the former; for if the *κυριότης* which he has as Messiah, is one simply of original and divine right, then it can neither be a delegated dominion, nor a temporary one. The *immutable* God, simply considered as such, must of course be "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." His dominion was not conferred, for who gave it? It cannot cease, for to whom shall it be given?

But "God manifest in the flesh;" "God in Christ reconciling the world to himself;" the eternal *Λόγος* who "was with God, and was God," but "became flesh and dwelt among us;" in a word, God-man, he who 'was *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, and yet took on him the form of a servant, and humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;' this *complex* person, (if I may so express myself because the poverty of language will not supply me with phraseology,) might have a *κυριότης* that was delegated or conferred, and which in itself would not in some important respects be eternal. Was this in fact so? Have Paul and his coadjutors taught us such doctrine?

These questions I feel myself obliged to answer in the affirmative. The apostle, in Phil. 2: 5—11, states it as a ground of Christ's exaltation to be Lord of all, that "he became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" for when he had made mention of this obedience he immediately adds, *διὸ καὶ κ. τ. λ. wherefore*, i. e. because he was thus obedient, he was exalted to a throne of glory. Consequently, the dominion in question was the reward of obedience, i. e. it was *conferred, bestowed*, and not original.

In exact accordance with this is the passage in Heb. 2: 10, which represents Christ as *τελειωμένον, perfected in glory, advanced to the highest honour and happiness*, as a consequence of his sufferings.

Of the same tenor, also, are all those passages which speak of Jesus as exalted to the right hand of God, *after* his resurrection. So testifies also the beloved disciple: "Even as I [Christ] overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne," Rev. 3: 21; i. e. his *κυριότης* or *being enthroned* was the consequence of his *overcoming*, viz. overcoming the temptations and trials of life, overcoming his spiritual enemies, and persevering even to the end in a course of entire duty and holiness.

Again: "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands," John 13: 3; "Thou [Father] hast given him [the Son] power over all flesh," John 17: 2; "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands," John 3: 35; "The Father . . . hath given the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man," John 5: 26, 27; "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," John 5: 22.

With this testimony agree the declarations of Jesus as recorded by another disciple: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father," Matt. 11: 27; "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth," Matt. 28: 18.

These are only a few of the many texts which speak plainly on the subject of the Messiah's *conferred* dominion. It is impossible to set them aside. Whatever dominion he possesses as Messiah, as God-man, as Mediator, as head of the church militant, it is one which is *bestowed*; promised it was indeed from everlasting, but it was actually bestowed in time, i. e. after his resurrection and ascension to glory.

'But *how* can he be Lord of all in this capacity? If he be God as well as man, then as God he has dominion original and underived; how then can we speak or conceive of his dominion as *bestowed* or *derived*?'

Questions that have often been asked, and which involve, of course, the mystery of the incarnation, and the *θεανθρωπία* of the Logos. I can only say here, that human language is too imperfect to represent such a subject in any other than an imperfect manner. How can words, framed by men for their own limited purposes, and according to their own very limited views, ever express the mystery of the incarnation, except in a faint and imperfect manner? It is impossible; and we must therefore be very cautious here how we reason and conclude, merely from *terminology* or particular forms of expression.

After all the difficulties of the subject, however, so much is clear, viz. that if the incarnation of the Logos "who was God," be matter of fact, then this *complex person*, (the imperfection of this phraseology I again acknowledge, but how shall I render it more perfect?) is and must continue to be different in some important respects, from the Logos in his preexistent state. Human nature becomes, by this new union, a partner in the throne of the universe. So the apostle expressly intimates, in Heb. 2:

5—10. The dominion given to this complex person as such, may be a *conferred* dominion; for to the human nature must be imparted or given whatever belongs to it. In a sense which may now be understood, Jesus speaks so often, as related by John, of “all things being given to him of his Father;” and in unison with this, speak all his other disciples. When the fact is once allowed, that “the Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us,” that he “who was ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ took on him the form of a servant, καὶ ἐξένωσε ἑαυτὸν,” then the possibility of a *conferred* dominion can no longer be denied. And that such is the dominion of Jesus, as Mediator and Messiah, needs no further proof than that which has already been exhibited.

‘But the continuance of this dominion—is it ever to have an end?’

I know of but one passage that fully and unequivocally asserts this; which is in 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. In this same epistle there are two other passages which seem to imply the same thing; or at least they imply a subordination to the Father in respect to the mediatorial kingdom; e. g. 1 Cor. 3: 23, “Ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s;” 11: 3, “The head of Christ is God.” In a like sense Christ says of himself, John 14: 28, “My Father is greater than I.” *How* this can be true, seems to be developed in 1 Cor. 15: 24—28, where the apostle explicitly declares, that when “the end of all things is come,” Christ shall “deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; . . . when “all enemies are put under his feet . . . and all things subdued to him, *then shall THE SON HIMSELF BE SUBJECT UNTO HIM that put all things under him, that GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL.*” In other words, when the office of Mediator is fully completed; when there shall be no more sinners to be reconciled to God, or saints to be guided and defended; when all the ends which Infinite Wisdom had in view in the mission of the Son of God to this world of sin shall have been consummated; when the world itself shall come to an end, and there shall no longer be any rational beings placed in a state of probation and capable of being redeemed; in brief, when every end of the mediatorial office is fully accomplished, and nothing more remains to be done; then the office itself, the power with which the Mediator was clothed, the dominion that was conferred in order to render him competent to fulfil the design of his office—all these will of course *cease*, and God will then reign simply as God, and not by the Vicegerent (so to speak) who has

so long wielded the sceptre of his kingdom, in consequence of authority conferred upon him.

All this, indeed, we are obliged to express in merely human language; and how easy it is, therefore, to raise questions of difficulty, if one will carry forward, in a literal way, human analogies to divine things, every person must know who has had any experience in the subtleties of disputation. But after all the objections which may be raised, thus much seems to be substantially true, viz. that the *mediatorial* dominion as such, which had been bestowed on Christ as Mediator, will cease at the day of judgment, and God will no more govern by a Vicegerent, but directly and immediately as God.

A thousand fearful questions start up at once. ‘What then is to become of this *complex person*, God-man, no longer occupying the throne of the universe? What is to be the future state or condition of the *human* nature of the Saviour, thus giving over his exaltation to the Divinity, and resigning the authority with which it had been clothed?’

I answer at once, that I do not know. The apostles have not told us. Jesus has not revealed any thing relative to this. The “glory that he had with the Father before the world was,” he will doubtless have after the world shall be no more. ‘But is none to be given through eternal ages to the *Messiah*?’ Paul does not deny this. He only says, that the *κυριότης* of the Messiah will be resigned, at the final consummation of all things; in other words, that the duties of his office as Mediator being fully consummated, the office as such is no longer retained. But the glory which results to him as the Redeemer of countless millions—the praise of salvation purchased by his blood—are these to cease? So the beloved disciple does not seem to teach us; for he represents the same honours as being paid to the Redeemer, in heaven, which are paid to the Father, and “blessing, and honour, and glory, and power,” as being ascribed by worshippers before the throne of God, not only to Him “who sitteth on the throne,” but “to the LAMB FOR EVER AND EVER,” Rev. 5: 13. When will there be a time in heaven, that the hearts of the redeemed will cease to beat high with gratitude for atoning blood? And when will the time come, in which they will no longer be inclined to express this gratitude?

But I must stop. Here is a boundless ocean, and I dare not launch any farther upon it. It is easy to ask a thousand ques-

tions, which none but the redeemed in heaven, or God himself, can answer ; but what profit would there be in doing this ?

One other difficulty I must just touch. How does the passage in 1 Cor. xv. which represents Christ's dominion as *coming to an end*, comport with the very many passages which assert his dominion to be *everlasting* ? For example : "He shall reign over the house of David forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end ?"

I answer, that both may be true ; that is, it may be true, that his kingdom in certain respects will come to an end at the final consummation of all things ; while in certain other respects, i. e. in relation to his *moral* reign simply considered as such, it may continue forever. That dominion which was employed in subjugating enemies, and in guiding and protecting friends, may come to an end, when enemies can make no more struggle, and friends need no more protection ; but the *moral sceptre* (so to speak), the throne of the Son in this respect may be, as it is declared in Ps. xlv. that it shall be, **FOR EVER AND EVER.**

But I must dismiss this and all other questions connected with the inquiries that I have just been making, in order that I may apply myself to the object more immediately before me.

We have seen the ground or reasons, why the writers of the New Testament speak of Christ so often as *κύριος* and as King. "He is Head over all things to the church." He is "Lord of all." But he is so, as Messiah, in virtue of a *delegated* authority, and one which will be *resigned* at the final consummation of all things. *Κύριος* he will then no longer be, so far as this appellation is given him merely in relation to the office which he will resign. But *κύριος* in another sense, as "God over all, and blessed forever," he will always be ; and *κύριος*, in the moral sense, as the Lord, Master, Redeemer, and Benefactor of the blessed, he must forever continue to be. These relations can never cease to exist, so long as the parties who sustain them shall live.

Thus, in my imperfect way, have I touched on these fearful questions, from which the mind almost instinctively shrinks back with awe. I hope that I have not put my own presumptuous assertions or declarations in the place of the divine word, nor attempted to unveil what God has chosen should remain a mystery to us in our present state. The proper attitude of mind for a solicitous inquirer here, is one which receives implicitly what is revealed, and waits with submission and humility for further

disclosures, until the veil that covers all mortal things shall be removed, and the disciple sees his Lord and Master "face to face."

One consideration I cannot help suggesting, before I pass to that part of my investigation which still remains. This may be distinctly brought before the mind, by the following question: If the office of Mediator comes thus to an end, at the day of judgment, and Christ ceases to exercise any more authority in this way from and after that period; how are the impenitent in the world of woe to be reconciled to God? What is the probation or arrangement which is to bring them into the kingdom of God *without a Mediator*? Does the Bible propose any such method of salvation? And if not, who can assure us that such an one exists?

These are questions of truly awful import; and it does behove those who are placing their hopes on being redeemed in a future world, to ask who the Redeemer is to be, after Jesus has resigned his office, and completed in it all the duties which he had to perform.

The way is now prepared to advance to our last inquiry.

IV. *In what manner does Paul apply the word κύριος in his epistles?*

We have already seen in what sense κύριος is used when applied to God, and in what sense when applied to Christ, by the writers of the New Testament in general, and particularly by Paul. It remains only to inquire now, how frequently Paul has applied the epithet in question to God or to Christ, and in what manner or under what circumstances this application is made. The inquiry may not seem at first to promise much fruit. We shall have reason, I trust, to see in the sequel, that it is connected with some exegetical questions and principles of an important nature.

My design is to pass in review all the examples which Paul's writings afford of the use of κύριος, so that we may have a distinct recognition of the idiom of this apostle in respect to the word under consideration.

So far as the word is applied to *Christ*, the examples of its use may be divided into two great classes; I. Those where κύριος is joined with Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; where, of course, the application is plain and certain.

II. Those where no such union of appellations is exhibited, but where κύριος alone is the designation employed.

I. Κύριος united with other usual appellations of the Saviour. These may be divided into several classes, as follows.

1. Where ὁ κύριος with the article is preceded or followed by Ἰησοῦς without the article. E. g. Rom. 4: 24, Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν. 1 Cor. 5: 5, τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 1 Cor. 6: 11. 11: 23. 2 Cor. 1: 14. 4: 14. Gal. 6: 17. Eph. 1: 15. 1 Thess. 2: 15. 2: 19 where Χριστῶ after Ἰησοῦ is of doubtful authority. 3: 13, Χριστῶ doubtful. 4: 2. 2 Thess. 1: 7. 1: 8, Χριστοῦ doubtful. 1: 12, Χριστοῦ doubtful. 2: 8. Philem. v. 5. Heb. 13: 20. In all *eighteen* examples, if we include the cases which are attended with some little doubt.

2. Where ὁ κύριος with the article, is followed by Χριστός without the article. Rom. 16: 18, τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῶ. Only *one* example.

3. Cases in which ὁ κύριος with the article follows Ἰησοῦς Χριστός or Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς without it. Rom. 1: 4, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Rom. 5: 21. 6: 23. 7: 25. 8: 39. 1 Cor. 1: 9. 9: 1. 15: 31. Eph. 3: 11. Phil. 3: 8. Col. 2: 6, where Χριστὸς has the article. 1 Tim. 1: 2. 2 Tim. 1: 2. *Thirteen* examples in all.

4. Cases in which κύριος without the article, precedes Ἰησοῦς without it. Rom. 10: 9 κύριον Ἰησοῦν. Rom. 14: 14. 1 Cor. 12: 3. Phil. 2: 19. Col. 3: 17. 1 Thess. 4: 1. In all, *six* cases.

5. Cases in which ὁ κύριος with the article, precedes Ἰησοῦς Χριστός or Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς without it. Rom. 5: 1, τὸν κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Rom. 5: 11. 13: 14. 15: 6. 15: 30. 16: 20. 1 Cor. 1: 2. 1: 7. 1: 8. 1: 10. 5: 4 bis. 15: 57. 16: 22. 16: 23. 2 Cor. 1: 3. 8: 9. 11: 31. 13: 13. Gal. 6: 14. 6: 18. Eph. 1: 3. 1: 17. 3: 14. 5: 20. 6: 24. Phil. 4: 23. Col. 1: 3. 1 Thess. 1: 3. 3: 11. 5: 9. 5: 23. 5: 28. 2 Thess. 2: 1. 2: 14. 2: 16. 3: 6. 3: 12. 3: 18. 1 Tim. 6: 3. 6: 14. 2 Tim. 4: 22. Philem. v. 25. *Forty three* examples.

6. Cases in which κύριος without the article, precedes or follows Ἰησοῦς Χριστός or Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς without it. Rom. 1: 7, κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 2 Cor. 4: 5, Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον. 1 Cor. 1: 3. 8: 6. 2 Cor. 1: 2. Gal. 1: 3. Eph. 1: 2. 6: 23. Phil. 1: 2. 2: 11. 3: 20. 1 Thess. 1: 1 bis. 2 Thess. 1: 1. 1: 2. 1: 12. Tit. 1: 4. Philem. v. 3. *Eighteen* cases in all.

Besides the examples above exhibited, there are several oth-

ers of doubtful authority, and some that are contained in the *Textus Receptus*, which are omitted in the critical editions.

a) Of doubtful authority, is *κύριος* in Rom. 6: 11. 2 Cor. 4: 10. Col. 1: 2. 2 Tim. 4: 1. I mean to say, the authority is so far doubtful, that they cannot fairly be enumerated as legitimate examples of the use of *κύριος*. There are some other cases of a different nature, which are comprised under no. 1 above. I follow the edition of Knapp, in my critical estimate of these texts. Four cases, then, are of doubtful authority.

b) Rejected from the text, is *κύριος* in 1 Cor. 10: 28. Col. 3: 16. 1 Tim. 1: 1. 5: 21. Philem. v. 20. Five instances in the *Textus Receptus*, are rejected in the critical editions of the New Testament.

In my estimate, therefore, of the number of times in which Paul applies *κύριος* to Christ, in a manner that admits of no possible doubt, the instances in *a* and *b* are omitted.

From the preceding view it appears that *κύριος* is an appellation very frequently given to the Saviour by Paul; for the number of instances in which this is certain, because it is connected with one or more of the proper names of Jesus, amounts to no less than 99 in the sum.

We come now to a more difficult part of our task. Paul employs the word *κύριος* alone, i. e. unconnected with any of the proper names of the Saviour, more frequently than he does when connected with them. This leads to our second head of inquiry, as proposed above on p. 755 sq.

II. Use of *κύριος* when not accompanied by other appellations.

It will render our investigation more easy, if we first separate those examples of such a use, which plainly and certainly are applied to God, in the same way as *κύριος* is applied to him in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament.

These are contained in the quotations made by Paul from the Old Testament Scriptures; in regard to which no reasonable doubt can be urged, that in most cases *κύριος* is to be taken as it is in the Old Testament.

The examples are, Rom. 4: 8. 9: 28. 9: 29. 10: 13. 10: 16. 11: 3. 11: 34. 12: 19. 14: 11. 15: 11. 1 Cor. 1: 31. 2: 16. 3: 20. 10: 26. 14: 21. 2 Cor. 6: 17. 6: 18. 1 Tim. 6: 15. 2 Tim. 2: 19 bis. Heb. 1: 10. 7: 21. 8: 2. 8: 8. 8: 9. 8: 10. 8: 11. 10: 16. 10: 30. 12: 5. 12: 6. 13: 6. In all, *thirty-two* cases.

In some of these instances indeed, the passages quoted are applied directly to Christ. For example; in Rom. 10: 13 the apostle says: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the *Lord*, shall be saved;" where a reference to vs. 9—11 makes it quite clear that Christ must be meant, and of course that *κύριος* is here applied to him, in like manner as it is applied to Jehovah in the Old Testament.

So again in Heb. 1: 10, it is clear by a comparison with v. 6, that *κύριε* here is intended by the apostle to designate *the Son*; and to him is ascribed not only the same name, but the same works, as to יהוה or *κύριος* in Ps. 102: 25 sq.

I pass by instances, however, of this nature, because I do not wish to lay any stress, for my present purpose, on examples of this class. Some of them are indeed fraught with important instruction. In the two instances just quoted, how could the apostle apply to Christ the name and the works which are ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament Scriptures, provided he did not believe that this ascription could be justly and truly made? And on the supposition (sometimes proposed) that he *accommodated* the Old Testament language to the expression of his views in regard to Jesus, how could he, as a prudent and honest man, employ language in a way that was so very liable to be misapprehended by his readers?

But my present object is not to urge these questions, nor the subject with which they are connected. I proceed to note a few other instances, in which Paul uses the word *κύριος* in the common secular sense, as denoting the *master* of servants. Thus Rom. 14: 4. Eph. 6: 5. 6: 9. Col. 3: 22. 4: 1, are plain instances of this nature; and I may add, these are among the very numerous class of examples in the Septuagint and New Testament, which go to shew that the classical distinction made between *δεσπότης* and *κύριος* was not at all regarded by the Hellenistic writers.

Once only is *κύριοι* applied by Paul to designate the heathen divinities, in the same manner as their own writers applied it; viz. in Cor. 8: 5, *εἰς θεοὶ πολλοί, καὶ κύριοι πολλοί*.

To designate a *possessor*, *owner*, or *rightful proprietor* and *disposer*, *κύριος* is once used by Paul, in Gal. 4: 1.

All the remaining examples apply to Christ or to God. We come now to the consideration of these; which was the original and particular design of the present disquisition.

For convenience' sake I shall divide the examples of this na-

ture into two classes; viz. (A) Those which seem to be clear and fairly incontrovertible; and (B) Those about which more or less doubt may arise in the mind, and concerning which critics have entertained different opinions.

(A) Cases where the application of *κύριος* to Christ, when standing alone, seems to be plain and incapable of being fairly controverted.

1. Rom. 10: 12, “ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων, abounding [in mercy] to all who call upon him.” The apostle had just said, v. 9, “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth *κύριον Ἰησοῦν*,” and he says again v. 14, “How shall *they call on him*, in whom they have not believed.” That Christ is here the object of belief and confession, and he on whom Jews and Gentiles are *to call*, admits of no rational doubt; and of course, the *ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος* in v. 12 must designate the Saviour. Comp. Acts 9: 14, 21. 7: 59. 22: 16. 1 Cor. 1: 2. 2 Tim. 2: 22.

2. Rom. 14: 6—8, “He who regardeth the day, regardeth it to the *Lord*; and he who regardeth not the day, to the *Lord* he doth not regard it;” i. e. for the *Lord's* sake, out of conscientious obedience to what he believes to be agreeable to the commands of the *Lord*, he omits to regard it. “He who eateth, eateth to the *Lord*; . . . and he who eateth not, to the *Lord* he eateth not. . . If we live, we live to the *Lord*; and if we die, we die to the *Lord*; whether, therefore, we live or die, we are the *Lord's*.” The application of this is quite clear, from the sentence which the apostle immediately adds: “For to this end Christ both died and revived, that *he might be Lord* (*κυριεύσῃ*) of the dead and the living,” v. 9. The mention of Christ's *κυριότης* here, in respect to the *dead* and the *living*, renders entirely explicit what was before said, viz. “Whether we live, we live to the *Lord*; or whether we die, we die to the *Lord*,” for ‘living and dying we are his.’ Why? Because he died and rose again, in order that *he might be Lord* of his followers, whether living or dying. Of course the application of *κύριος* in these *seven* instances is clear.

3. Rom. 16: 2, “Receive her [Phebe] *ἐν κυρίῳ* in a manner worthy of the saints.” In all the examples of the like nature, where *ἐν κυρίῳ* is added as descriptive of the state or condition of any one, or as designating the manner in which he is to act, there can be no doubt that *κυρίῳ* refers to Christ. I cannot go here into a full explanation of the phrase itself, which in some cases involves difficulties, and has given rise to controversies

among critics. In general the meaning of it is to be made out by a reference to the fact, that believers are, in a *spiritual* sense, "members of Christ's body," of "his flesh, and his bones," "one with him." Thus they are *ἐν κυρίῳ*. In consequence of this, they are to live and act as it becomes those to do, who hold such a relation, i. e. as we should now say, in a manner worthy of Christians. Sometimes *ἐν κυρίῳ* describes the *condition* of persons; in which case it designates them as being Christians. In the case before us, it may qualify either *προσδέξασθε* or *αὐτήν*. In the first case the meaning is, 'Receive her in such a manner as those who are Christians should do;' which would here be only a repetition, however, of the idea that is contained in the *ἀξίως τῶν ἀγίων* that follows. In the second case, which seems to be the true one, the idea is, 'Receive her as being *ἐν κυρίῳ*, i. e. as being a real Christian, and worthy of your confidence and kindness.'

4. Rom. 16: 8, *Ἀμπλιαν . . . ἐν κυρίῳ*; 16: 11, *τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ*; 16: 12, *Τρυφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν, τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ—Περσίδα . . . ἥτις . . . ἐκοιτάσεν ἐν κυρίῳ*; 16: 13, *Ῥοῦφον, τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ*; 16: 22, *ἀπαύσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος . . . ἐν κυρίῳ*, *I Tertius professing the Christian faith*; are all cases of the same nature as is described in no. 3, and admit of no doubt that *κυρίῳ* applies to Christ. The reader will take notice that the *article* is wanting in all the formulas of this nature.

5. 1 Cor. 2: 8, "For had they known it, they would not have crucified *τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης*." There can be no mistake here, as the allusion to the crucifixion must necessarily prevent it.

6. 1 Cor. 4: 4, 5, "He who judgeth me, *κύριός ἐστιν*. Therefore judge nothing before the time, when *ὁ κύριος* shall come." The very numerous instances in which the *coming* of Christ is spoken of by Paul and others, and *his coming to judgment*, admit no well grounded doubt that *κύριος* here means the Lord Jesus.

7. 1 Cor. 4: 17, *Τιμοθέον . . . πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ*; see nos. 3, 4.

8. 1 Cor. 6: 13, 14, "The body is not for fornication, but for *τῷ κυρίῳ*, and *ὁ κύριος* for the body; for God both raised up *τὸν κύριον*, and will raise up us by his power." The reference here made to the *resurrection* of the *κύριος*, makes the sense of it clear.

9. 1 Cor. 6: 17, "He who is joined *τῷ κυρίῳ*, is one spirit."

The apostle had just been saying (v. 15), that Christians are *members of Christ*, of course the phrase in v. 17 refers plainly to him.

10. 1 Cor. 7: 22, "For he who is called *ἐν κυρίῳ* as a servant, is the freed-man *κύριον*; and he who is called as a free-man, is the servant of Christ." Here it is plain that *κύριος* designates Christ; first, from the phrase *ἐν κυρίῳ*; and secondly, because *κύριος* in the first part of the verse, is plainly interchanged with *Χριστός* in the last part.

11. 1 Cor. 7: 32, 34, 35, 39, *μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ κυρίῳ . . . μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου . . . ἐνπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ . . . μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ*. Taking all these passages together in their connexion, it is quite clear that *κύριος* here designates the Saviour.

12. 1 Cor. 9: 1, 2, *τὸ ἔργον μου . . . ἐν κυρίῳ . . . ἡ σφραγὶς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀποστολῆς . . . ἐν κυρίῳ*; see nos. 3, 4.

13. 1 Cor. 9: 5, *ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου*; i. e. plainly of the Lord Jesus.

14. 1 Cor. 10: 21, 22, *ποτήριον κυρίου . . . τραπέζης κυρίου . . . ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον*, most plainly refer to Christ.

15. 1 Cor 11: 11, "But neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, *ἐν κυρίῳ*;" see nos. 3, 4.

16. 1 Cor. 11: 23, *Ἐγὼ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, viz. that "the Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, etc."* The nature of this revelation, the very frequent declarations which Paul makes respecting his being instructed by Christ himself, Gal. 1: 12. 1 Cor. 15: 3. Eph. 3: 2, 3, and the immediate mention of *κύριος Ἰησοῦς* in the sequel, all concur in making this a plain case as to the meaning of *κύριος*.

17. 1 Cor. 11: 26, 27, 29, *θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου . . . ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου . . . τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου . . . τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου*, are unequivocal examples.

18. 1 Cor. 12: 6, *ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος*. That this means Christ, seems to be made quite clear from the clause which succeeds; for here *ὁ αὐτὸς θεός* is used in the way of distinction from it.

19. 1 Cor. 15: 47, *ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, an example which needs no comment.

20. 1 Cor. 15: 58, "abounding in the work *τοῦ κυρίου*." The apostle had just said, in the preceding verse, "Thanks be

unto God, who giveth us the victory, through our *Lord Jesus Christ!*" This seems to make the meaning of *work of the Lord*, quite plain.—In the same verse, we have in the same sense, *ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν . . . ἐν κυρίῳ*, which being plain of itself (comp. nos. 3, 4), makes the above expression plain, because it is a mere equivalent for it.

21. 1 Cor. 16: 10, *τὸν ἔργον τοῦ κυρίου*, the same as in the preceding number.

22. 1 Cor. 16: 19, *ἐν κυρίῳ*; see nos. 3, 4. The same formula also occurs in 2 Cor. 2: 12.

23. 2 Cor. 3: 16, 17, 18, *ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον . . . ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν οὐ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, ἐκεῖ ἐλευθερία . . . τὴν δόξαν τοῦ κυρίου . . . καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος*,—all manifestly relating to one and the same *κύριος*. Who this is, seems to be disclosed by v. 14, in which the apostle asserts, that the veil on the faces of the Jewish nation, *ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται*. Then he adds in v. 16, "When it [the Jewish nation] shall turn *πρὸς κύριον*, the veil shall be taken away, *περιαίρεται*." As he is here speaking of the conversion of the Jews to Christianity, so *turning πρὸς κύριον* means, turning to Christ. The last phrase, *κυρίου πνεύματος*, does not mean *the Spirit of Christ*, but *the Lord who is a Spirit*; for so the preceding phrase, *ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν*, leads us to explain it, Christ being here called *πνεῦμα* as he is in Heb. 9: 14, and perhaps in 1 Pet. 3: 18. Rom. 1: 4. In regard to *πνεῦμα κυρίου*, compare John 16: 7, 14, 15.

24. 2 Cor. 5: 6, 8, 11, *ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου . . . ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον*, (to be absent from the Lord, and to be present with him), refers clearly to Christ; for in the immediate sequel the apostle says, "Whether present or absent, we are strongly desirous to be acceptable to him." To whom? The next verse tells us; "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may receive according to the deeds done in the body," etc. That is, 'We are strongly desirous to be acceptable to the Lord Christ, for he is to be our final judge; on whom our eternal condition depends. In v. 11, *εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου*, manifestly refers to the same *κύριος* who is to be our final judge.

25. 2 Cor. 8: 5, "They gave themselves first *τῷ κυρίῳ*," i. e. to the Lord Christ, as the clause which follows seems plainly to intimate; which runs thus: "then to us by the will of God." If *θεοῦ* here were the same as *κυρίῳ* in the preceding

clause, *αὐτοῦ* would of course have been put in its place, so that the whole clause would then have run thus: "They gave themselves first to the Lord, and then to us by his will." But as it is, *κυρίῳ* seems evidently to refer to Christ.

26. 2 Cor. 10: 8, "If I should glory somewhat in this power which *ὁ κύριος* has given me." He had just before said, that if any were confident they belonged to Christ, so was he confident of the same thing, i. e. that he was acting under a commission or by virtue of authority derived from him. *Ὁ κύριος* is therefore, in this passage, only another designation instead of *Χριστός*. Comp. Rom. 1: 1, 5. Tit. 1: 1—3. 1 Tim. 1: 12.

27. 2 Cor. 11: 17, *οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ κύριον*, I do not speak by revelation or command of the Lord, i. e. of Christ; comp. v. 10, *ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ*; v. 14, *ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ*; v. 22, *διακόνους Χριστοῦ*; all of which shew that as an apostle he is recognizing, by the expression *κατὰ κύριον*, his relation to the great Head of the church. Comp. also Rom. 1: 1, 5. 1 Tim. 1: 1.

28. 2 Cor. 12: 1, "I will come to visions and revelations *κυρίου*." Vs. 7, 8, "Lest I should be exalted above measure, a thorn in the flesh was given me . . . on this account I besought *τὸν κύριον* thrice," etc. That the *Lord* whom Paul besought was Christ, is plain; for a part of the answer to the apostle's supplication was, "*My power* is perfected in those who are weak." To this the apostle immediately rejoins, "Most gladly then will I rejoice in my weaknesses, that the *power of Christ* may rest upon me." The power of Christ is then the power of that Lord whom the apostle besought. And this, standing in such an intimate connexion with the preceding verses, makes it quite probable that *ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου* in v. 1, means 'revelations made by Christ to his apostle.'

29. 2 Cor. 13: 10, "according to the power which *ὁ κύριος* has given me." The same as in no. 26.

30. Gal. 1: 19, "James the brother *τοῦ κυρίου*;" which explains itself.

31. Gal. 5: 10, "I am confident in respect to you *ἐν κυρίῳ*;" see nos. 3, 4. Eph. 2: 21. 4: 1, 17: 5: 8, *ἐν κυρίῳ*, have all the same meaning.

32. Eph. 4: 5, *εἷς κύριος* here is said by way of distinction from *εἷς θεός* in v. 6; and of course it refers to Christ.

33. Eph. 5: 10, *εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ* stands in such imme-

diate connexion with ἐν κυρίῳ in v. 8, that there can be no reasonable doubt that Christ is meant.

34. Eph. 5: 17, "Understanding what is the will τοῦ κυρίου." The writer had just said, "Christ shall give thee light." He here says, then, 'Mark well or understand the instruction or light which the Lord (Jesus) gives.'

35. Eph. 5: 19, "Speaking among yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart τῷ κυρίῳ." The clause which follows, runs thus: "Giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to God even the Father." I understand this here in the way of distinction. I do not mean to say, that the apostle intends to describe two separate kinds of worship, differing in manner, and, if I may so speak, in degree. The singing of psalms etc. is one method of thanksgiving; the direct expression of thanks in prayer is another. The writer means to say, that Christ is to be praised and thanked; and that God the Father is to be praised and thanked; and he merely expresses this by a reference to different ways in which Christians were wont to utter their thanks.—In confirmation of this, one might appeal to the account which Pliny (Epist. 10. 97) gives of the primitive Christians. "Soliti sunt . . . carmen Christo dicere quasi Deo." Why should not the church on earth do what angels and the spirits of the just in heaven do? See Rev. 5: 11—14. Koppe, Gabler, Winer, and others, have expressed the same opinion in respect to κύριος in the passage above.

36. Eph. 5: 22, "Ye wives, [be subject] to your own husbands, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ." In vs. 23, 24, Christ is said to be the head of the church, and the church to be subject to Christ; Christ then is the κύριος to whom reference is here made.

37. Eph. 6: 1, ἐν κυρίῳ; see nos. 3, 4. In v. 4, παιδεία καὶ νοουθεσία τοῦ κυρίου seems evidently to refer to the same κύριος which is mentioned in v. 1.

38. Eph. 6: 7, 8, "Heartily and with a willing mind performing service, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις." The δούλος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 6 appears to explain κύριος here. So in v. 8, "He shall receive this [the reward of obedience] παρὰ κυρίου," i. e. from Christ their master, in whose service they are engaged. Κύριος in v. 9 refers to the same master. Comp. Col. 3: 22—24.

39. Eph. 6: 10, 21, ἐν κυρίῳ; see nos. 3, 4. The same in Phil. 1: 14. 2: 24. 2: 29. 3: 1. 4: 1. 4: 2. 4: 4. 4: 10. In

Col. 1: 10, ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου is of the like nature; for the meaning is, 'Worthily of those who are ἐν κυρίῳ, or worthily of those who profess the Christian religion.' Col. 3: 18. 3: 20, ἐν κυρίῳ.

40. Col. 3: 22, 23, 24, φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον . . . ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε, ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ . . . ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήσεσθε τὴν ἀναπόδωσιν . . . τῷ γὰρ κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε. The last clause of course makes all the rest plain. Comp. Eph. 6: 7, 8.—Col. 4: 1 stands in the same connexion, and therefore ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον is clear.

41. Col. 4: 7. 4: 17. 1 Thess. 3: 8, ἐν κυρίῳ; see nos. 3, 4.

42. 1 Thess. 1: 6, "Be ye imitators of me and of τοῦ κυρίου," which plainly refers to the Lord Jesus. In v. 8, λόγος τοῦ κυρίου seems as plainly to mean, 'the gospel of Christ.'

43. 1 Thess. 3: 12, "ὁ κύριος make you to abound in love," etc. In the preceding verse, ὁ κύριος Ἰ. Χριστός is mentioned; and to this the ὁ κύριος of v. 12 plainly refers.

44. 1 Thess. 4: 15, 16, 17, ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου . . . τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου . . . αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος . . . εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου . . . σὺν κυρίῳ, are all plain examples of κύριος applied to Christ. And, as standing in immediate connexion with this, ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου in 1 Thess. 5: 2 seems of course to be *the day of the Lord Jesus*.

45. 1 Thess. 5: 12, ἐν κυρίῳ, is plain.

46. 2 Thess. 1: 9, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου has reference to the τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ of the preceding verse.

47. 2 Thess. 2: 13, ἀγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου, i. e. beloved of Christ, or dear to Christ; comp. v. 14.

48. 2 Thess. 3: 1, ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, *the gospel of Christ*. And in this same connexion, "ὁ κύριος is faithful," etc. (v. 3,) seems evidently to refer to Christ. Therefore v. 4, πεποιθήμεν ἐν κυρίῳ refers to the same Lord; all of which is plain from v. 5, where it is said, "ὁ κύριος direct your hearts to the love of God." In v. 6 also, τοῦ κυρίου Ἰ. Χριστοῦ is fully named.

49. 1 Tim. 1: 14, ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου, i. e. of the Lord Jesus Christ, as is plain from comparing v. 12, where the apostle expresses his thanks for the χάριν thus received from Christ.

50. 2 Tim. 1: 8, τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, the gospel of Christ.

51. 2 Tim. 2: 24, δοῦλον κυρίου is equivalent to δοῦλον

Χριστοῦ; an appellation which the apostle so often gives himself and other Christians.

52. 2 Tim. 4: 8, "A crown of glory, which *the Lord* will give me." Ὁ κύριος here is immediately called *the righteous judge*; and the apostle, in the next clause, speaks of "all those who love *his* appearing," viz. the appearance of the righteous judge, or of the *Lord*; which of course refers to Christ.

53. Philem. v. 16, ἐν κυρίῳ; see nos. 3, 4.

54. Heb. 2: 3, "Which [word] began to be spoken ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου," i. e. by Christ, as all must agree. Equally plain is Heb. 7. 14, "Our *Lord* sprang out of Judah."

The result of the preceding investigations is, that we have, in the whole of the epistles of Paul, *ninety-nine* examples in which κύριος is united with one or more of the proper names of the Saviour, excluding from this reckoning the four doubtful instances, and the five rejected ones, mentioned on p. 757 under *a* and *b*. In addition to these, we have *one hundred and sixteen* instances, in which κύριος seems manifestly to designate the Saviour; making in the whole *two hundred and fifteen* instances in which this designation is applied to Christ; while, on the other hand, we have only *thirty-three* clear instances in which κύριος is applied to designate Jehovah or God absolutely considered, and these are all in quotations made from the Old Testament. The examples may be seen on p. 757 above. Whether Paul uses κύριος in more instances than those just mentioned, in the simple sense of θεός or יהוה, remains for examination under our next head, which is made up of cases that are more or less doubtful.

I would not be understood here to say, that in all the one hundred and sixteen cases above mentioned, included under the class which we have just been examining, there are none which have not been doubted or called in question by some critics. This is far from being the case. What I mean to say is simply this, viz. if the instances produced are examined maturely, and in the light which the context and the *usus loquendi* of Paul affords, they will appear, as I must believe, to all impartial and adequate critics, at the present time, as falling under the head where I have ranked them. We pass now to the remaining class of examples.

(B) Cases, which have a fairer claim to be placed upon the list of doubtful ones.

I shall be as brief in my examination of them, as will be consistent with the nature of the undertaking.

1. 1 Cor. 3: 5, "Who then is Paul, or who is Apollos, but ministers by whom we have believed, even as *ὁ κύριος* hath given to each?" The frequency with which Paul calls himself *ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ*, etc. the frequency with which he ascribes the qualifications of Christian ministers to Christ, who by his Spirit furnishes them with gifts; and I may add, the harmony of this with the gospel economy, as disclosed in the words and promises of the Saviour, John 15: 26. 14: 16, 17. 16: 13, 14. 16: 7; together with the general *usus loquendi* of Paul; seem to create a strong probability that *ὁ κύριος* here is meant to designate the Saviour. *Διάκονοι* in the preceding clause seems evidently to mean *διάκονοι Χριστοῦ*; and if so, then *ὁ κύριος* means *Christ*.

2. 1 Cor. 4: 19, "I will come to you quickly, *ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ*, and will know," etc. In itself this might apply either to *θεός* (comp. James 3: 15), or to *Χριστός*. But the application to the latter seems more probable here, because the apostle had just said (v. 17), "I have sent Timothy to you . . . πιστόν ἐν κυρίῳ, who will make known to you *τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἐν Χριστῷ*." *Ὁδοὺς* here means, all *his labours and toils* for the cause of Christ. Now the mention of Timothy as *πιστόν ἐν κυρίῳ*, and of *ὁδοὺς ἐν Χριστῷ*, seems very naturally to presuppose that the same *κύριος* was in the mind of the writer, when he penned the next sentence in which *ἐὰν ὁ κύριος* occurs. The application of it to the Saviour, then, appears probable.

3. 1 Cor. 7: 10, 12, "Those who are married I command, yet not I, but *ὁ κύριος* . . . To others I say, *οὐχ ὁ κύριος*." General analogy pleads here in favour of referring this to the great Head of the church; and particularly so, as soon after (v. 17) the writer speaks of *ὁ κύριος* as distributing gifts, conferring talents, and directing the affairs of the church, in distinction from *θεός*. I can hardly doubt here, that Paul meant to refer to the Saviour. *Ὁ κύριος* in v. 17, must be considered as liable to very little doubt, if any, on account of the distinction made by *ὁ θεός* which follows. In v. 25, *ἐπιταγὴν κυρίου* of course follows on in the train of *ὁ κύριος* in vs. 10, 12; and *ἡλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου* in the same verse, must naturally be construed in the same way. Another instance of the same nature, is in 1 Cor. 9: 14.

4. 1 Cor. 11: 32, "But being condemned, we are chastened *ὑπὸ κυρίου*." The preceding context speaks of 'the cup of the

Lord—the body and blood of the Lord—the body of the Lord'—all having reference to offending him, by eating and drinking unworthily at the sacramental table. It seems natural, then, to refer *κυρίου* (in v. 32) to the same Lord; especially as there can be no doubt that Christ does punish offending Christians; comp. Rev. chap. 1.—III.

5. 1 Cor. 14: 37, "Let him know that what I write unto you, are commands *κυρίου*." General analogy only can settle the question here. In the preceding verse, the apostle mentions *λόγος θεοῦ*, which, however, means *the gospel* in general. But *ἐντολαὶ κυρίου* has a *special* meaning, and refers to the particular directions which Paul had been giving to the Corinthians. These he refers, as it seems to me, to Christ; see no. 3 above, which should be compared with the passage under examination.

6. 1 Cor. 16: 7, "I hope to stay with you some time, *εἰὰν ὁ κύριος ἐπιτρέπη*." The application may be either to *θεός* or *Χριστός*; but for reasons given under no. 2, it seems more probable that it refers to the latter.

7. 2 Cor. 8: 19. "Chosen to travel . . . with this present, which is supplied by us to the glory of the same *κυρίου*," i. e. the Lord of both us and you. But who is this? Can we well doubt that it is the same Lord who is spoken of in v. 5 of the same chapter, to whom the churches of Macedonia had given themselves; the same Lord Jesus, who, though rich, became poor for our sakes? v. 9. If so, and this seems the most probable construction, then v. 21, "Providing things honest *not* only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men," refers of course to the same Lord.

8. 2 Cor. 10: 17, 18, "He that glorieth, let him *glory ἐν κυρίῳ*; for it is not he who commendeth himself that is approved, but whom *ὁ κύριος* commendeth." I have not ranked this passage under the quotations from the Old Testament, exhibited on p. 757, as I might have done. I omitted it because although the reference to Jer. 9: 23, 24 seems quite certain; yet it is not equally so, that the writer meant simply to quote. But however this might be, the reference is so plain (comp. 1 Cor. 1: 31), that there can scarcely be a doubt, that *κύριος* in both these cases is equivalent to *θεός* or *יהוה*.

9. Eph. 4: 17, "This I say, and testify *ἐν κυρίῳ*." The meaning is somewhat obscure; but the phraseology is so consonant with that in A. 3, 4, that I can hardly persuade myself to foster any doubt concerning its reference to the Saviour.

10. 1 Thess. 4: 6, "Defraud not . . . for *ὁ κύριος* is an avenger of all such things." Connected with this is *θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ* in v. 3, and *οὐ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ κ. τ. λ.* in v. 7. From the connexion here then, we must on the whole recognize this as an instance of *κύριος* being applied in the simple sense of *θεός* or *יהוה*, independently of a quotation from the Old Testament.

11. 1 Thess. 5: 27, *ὀρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον*, i. e. the Lord Jesus. Comp. no. 9. Analogy is not wanting to confirm this interpretation; see Rom. 9: 1. Yet the majority of instances, in such appeals of Paul, are of a different kind; e. g. Rom. 1: 9. 2 Cor. 1: 23. 11: 31. Gal. 1: 20. Phil. 1: 8. The principal reason why I refer *κύριον* as above to Christ, lies in the fact, that the apostle had just mentioned (v. 23) the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Comp. 2 Tim. 2: 14.

12. 2 Thess. 3: 16, "The *Lord* himself of peace give you peace always and in every way; the *Lord* be with you!" Comp. John 14: 27. 16: 33. A comparison also of vs. 12 and 18 here, renders it probable that Christ is the *Lord* to whom reference is made.

13. 2 Tim. 1: 16, 18, "*ὁ κύριος* grant mercy to the house of Onesiphorus . . . *ὁ κυριος* grant mercy to him *παρὰ κυρίου*, in that day." The first *κύριος* in the latter clause I understand here as referring to Christ, the second to God; so Winer. Others compare Gen. 19: 24, "*Jehovah* rained down . . . brimstone and fire from *Jehovah* out of heaven;" where both names refer to the same *Jehovah*. But as this is an *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in the Bible, and as *κύριος* in v. 18 above is susceptible of a more easy and natural interpretation, I prefer the turn which has been given to it. *Ὁ κύριος* in v. 16, if v. 18 is interpreted rightly, must refer to Christ.—Of the same tenor is 2 Tim. 2: 7, *δώη γὰρ σοι ὁ κύριος σύνεσιν ἐν πᾶσι*; 3: 11, *ἐκ πάντων με ἐρύσαστο ὁ κύριος*; 4: 14, *ἀποδώη αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*; 4: 17, *ὁ δὲ κύριός μοι παρέσται*; 4: 18, *ὄυσεται με ὁ κύριος*. The general tenor of Paul's epistles speaks in favour of applying *ὁ κύριος* in all such instances to the Saviour. Comp. 2 Cor. 12: 8, 9. 5: 9—11.

14. 2 Tim. 2: 14, *διαμαρτυρούμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου*; see no. 11. I am inclined to believe that *κυρίου* here refers to Christ, in the same manner as in 1 Thess. 5: 27.

15. 2 Tim. 2: 22, "Follow righteousness . . . *μετὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν κύριον*." Comp. Acts 9: 14, 21. 7: 59. 22: 16.

Rom. 10: 12. 1 Cor. 1: 2. The *usus loquendi* hardly permits one to doubt here, that κύριον means *the Lord Jesus*.

16. Heb. 12: 14, "Without holiness no one shall see τὸν κύριον." Comp. Matt. 5: 8, also 1 Cor. 13: 12. 1 John 3: 2. I am inclined to believe that κύριος here is the same as יהוה or יְהוָה. *To see God*, is an expression which means to come into his presence in the heavenly world, Ps. 16: 11. 17: 15. The special sense of κύριος is not needed in Heb. 12: 14.

I have now gone through the examination of all the instances, in which κύριος is found in the writings of Paul. Under this last class of *doubtful* cases, i. e. in which it is doubtful whether κύριος means Ἰησοῦς or θεός, I have ranked *thirty-one* examples. I have not put all of these, however, under the class of doubtful cases, because of my own persuasion respecting them; for in many of the examples just cited, it does seem to me that there is no reasonable ground of doubt. It is because these cases have most of them been more or less controverted, and made the subject of doubt by others, and been differently classed by them, that I have arranged them as above; and on the same account I have made them the subject of particular examination. Whether others may accord with me or not, in the classification to which I am now adverting, is not material in respect to the general subject of discussion. And even in case they should differ in their persuasion, with respect to some of the examples, whether κύριος designates *God* or *Christ*, (which it is very possible they may do,) it will not alter the conclusion to which we must all come, in regard to the general use of κύριος by Paul. This is, that *in nearly ALL of the two hundred and forty-six instances in which κύριος is used by Paul to designate CHRIST or GOD, independently of quotations from the Old Testament, IT IS APPLIED TO THE DESIGNATION OF CHRIST.*

According to the view given above, there are not more than *five* instances in which the application of κύριος in the sense of θεός is very probable, viz. 2 Cor. 10: 17, 18. 1 Thess. 4: 6. 2 Tim. 1: 18. Heb. 12: 14. Of these, two are by good right to be excepted, because they are either quotation, or directly dependent on quotation, from the Old Testament; see B. 8. above. We come then to the very small number of *THREE* legitimate and pretty clear examples, in which Paul, when using his own language, applies κύριος to *God*, and not to *Christ*. These compared with 241 instances of a different nature, or (abstracting some twelve or fifteen of these as doubtful) with

some two hundred and twenty-eight or two hundred and twenty-five instances, can leave no doubt on the mind as to the overwhelming evidence, that *κύριος* familiarly and habitually, in the mind of Paul, was the chosen designation of the Lord Jesus.

Enough of detail. Let us turn our attention, now, to some of the results of this investigation, in respect to criticism and theology.

I shall doubtless be met here with the question from many a reader, *Cui bono?* And many will insist too, that some important good should come from a process so long and tedious, as that to which they have been subjected in the preceding pages. But if they are wearied in the reading of this discussion, after the subject is classified and presented in such an order as to make the conception of it clear and plain; what will they think of the labour of making out this classification? Yet this labour, severe as it is, is more than compensated by the views relative to the subject of examination, which the pursuit of it has afforded.

I. An examination of the instances in which *κύριος* is used, has served to correct the error into which some critics of distinguished name have fallen, in respect to the use of the *article* before this word. Gabler, in his *Neueste Theol. Journal*, IV. p. 11—24 (comp. III. p. 501), has maintained that *κύριος* means *God*, and *ὁ κύριος* *Christ*; i. e. that the New Testament writers make such a distinction by virtue of the article. Even Winer, accurate and thorough as he is in New Testament grammar, acceded in general to the correctness of this statement, so lately as in the second edition of his *Grammar*, p. 56. He has indeed corrected this error in his third edition; but this was in consequence of his writing a *monogram* on the word *κύριος*, cited on p. 734, in which he came of course to the correction of his mistake.

One who investigates for himself the New Testament in regard to the Greek article, or any thing else of this nature, will do well to look carefully to those critics who are afraid of *Concordance labour*. For example in the case before us; the article is used with *κύριος*, signifying *God*, in Rom. 15: 11. 1 Cor. 10: 26. Heb. 8: 2. 8: 11; all indubitable examples. In 2 Cor. 10: 18. 1 Thess. 4: 6. Heb. 12: 14, it is altogether probable that *κύριος* refers to *God*, and yet it has the article.

On the contrary, *κύριος* as meaning *Ἰησοῦς*, is without the article in Rom. 10: 9. 14: 14. 1 Cor. 12: 3. Phil. 2: 19. Col. 3: 17. 1 Thess. 4: 1; where the use of the word is certain, since it is

joined with Ἰησοῦς. Again, there are 18 cases in which κύριος without the article is united with Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, as may be seen in no. 6, p. 756 above. Besides these, there is a multitude of examples of the same nature; e. g. all the numerous instances in which ἐν κυρίῳ occurs, and also others mentioned under no. 2, p. 759 above. All these examples occur in the writings of Paul only. How it ever could have been suggested, that κύριος always means *God*, and ὁ κύριος *Christ*, it is indeed difficult to see. The very first opening of a Concordance dissipates the whole illusion, and shews that the presence or absence of the article, has little or nothing to do with the designation of the meaning which κύριος bears.

The same is the case in the Septuagint, for there κύριος without the article very often corresponds to the Hebrew יהוה or יהיה; e. g. Ex. 34: 10. 1 K. 3: 10. 22: 6. Ps. 29: 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, et al. saepe. The numberless instances of ὁ κύριος, as applied to Jehovah, render specific examples altogether unnecessary.

On the whole nothing is plainer, than that κύριος (like θεός) did, by usage among the sacred writers, attain to the same license as *proper names* are wont to do; and this because it was usually employed in the capacity of a proper name. No careful reader can help observing that θεός occurs in numberless cases without the article, in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. In the like way, and on the same grounds, κύριος is employed where ὁ κύριος might have been used.

It is laid down as a general rule in nearly all our Greek Grammars and works on the philology of the Greek language, that *the article is employed before a definite, well-known, monadic subject*; e. g. ὁ ἥλιος, ὁ οὐρανός, ἡ γῆ, ὁ θεός, κ. τ. λ. This is undoubtedly true; but then he who believes and trusts to this as being *all* the truth concerning the matter, will be greatly misled. It is equally true, that the very *definiteness* of such monadic subjects, is a reason why the article may be sometimes dispensed with; because the writer very justly apprehends that the reader will of course not misapprehend the proper nature of these subjects, for the very reason that it is so well known to him. Thus in proper names, which of course are altogether definite, the article may be inserted or omitted at the pleasure, as it would seem, of the writer. This is well known, and generally acknowledged. But the same is true in such cases as those noted above. For example; ἥλιος without the article, Matt. 13: 6.

Mark 4: 6. Rev. 7: 2. 16: 12. 22: 5. 1 Cor. 15: 41. Luke 21: 25. Acts 27: 20. So οὐρανός; for ἐξ οὐρανῶν and ἐξ οὐρανοῦ is the usual formula; see also Acts 3: 21. 17: 24. 2 Cor. 12: 2. 2 Pet. 3: 5, 12, 13. Rev. 21: 1. We have γῆ instead of ἡ γῆ in 1 Cor. 15: 47. Eph. 3: 15. 2 Pet. 3: 5, 10, 13. Acts 17: 24. Luke 2: 14. Heb. 6: 7. 8: 4, 9. Mark 13: 27, et al. saepe. As to θεός, the instances in which the article is omitted are too numerous to need any mention.

Nor is this New Testament license only. The Greek classic writers practise the same, or the like omissions; as may be seen in the third edition of Winer's excellent Grammar of the New Testament.

The truth is, that there are two ways in which a noun may be made definite; the first is, by adding the article to it, in which case definiteness of some kind or other is designated; the second, by adding some pronoun, adjective, noun, etc. i. e. some qualifying circumstance, which serves of itself to distinguish it and make it definite. In this last case, the article may be employed or omitted *ad libitum scriptoris* in many cases; and we find abundance of examples in accordance with this. But this is a part of Greek syntax which is yet very imperfectly illustrated, and which needs the skill of some critic very different from Middleton, and who has not, like him, a favourite theory to support and to render tolerable in all cases, even of the most refractory nature.

I cannot go farther into this subject at present. But I must not quit it without cautioning the young interpreter, not to lay much stress on the presence or absence of the Greek article, in his reasonings either of a philological or theological nature. The ground is yet too slippery, and too imperfectly surveyed. There is scarcely a rule laid down for the article, which does not admit of numerous exceptions; and in very many if not most cases, it seems to have been a matter quite at the writer's pleasure, whether he inserted or omitted it. How can we hazard the proof of an important theological doctrine, then, upon such ground as this? Let the correction made above, as to κύριος and ὁ κύριος, serve as a warning against such argumentation or criticism. Should it serve this purpose, it will prevent many a false argument and unfounded criticism among those, who are accustomed to make their appeal to the Scriptures in the original Greek.

II. The doctrinal views which stand connected with the subject of our investigation are truly important, in respect to the character of the Saviour, and the duty of his followers.

1. The Lord Jesus is the *Lord on whom Christians call*, i. e. he to whom they direct their petitions and their praises; comp. A. 1, 35. B. 15. pp. 759, 764, above.

2. The Lord Jesus is the Lord to whom the primitive Christians looked in a peculiar manner for guidance, for consolation, for illumination, for success in their work, and for victory over their spiritual and temporal enemies. Him they regarded, in a peculiar manner, as "Head over all things to his church;" as "King of kings and Lord of lords," for the express purpose of accomplishing the work of redemption. Hence their frequent supplications for his grace and favour; their desire for his benediction; their deep sense of dependence on his protection and his mercy. To cite the proofs of this, would be to cite a great part of the examples which have been already produced in the preceding pages. No attentive reader should overlook the instruction afforded by such examples.

It is indeed ordained of God, that "every knee shall bow to Jesus, and every tongue confess that he is Lord." He will surely "reign until all enemies are put under his feet." But is it not equally true, when "every knee shall bow to Jesus, and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord," that this will be to the glory of God the Father?" So thought Paul, Phil. 2: 11; so then we ought to believe. But when the proper idea of the *κυρίότης* of Christ as Mediator is once well understood, the explanation of this seeming paradox becomes much more easy. The *κυρίότης* in question is *delegated*; see p. 750 sq. above. It will cease at the end of time, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. But who delegated the mediatorial dominion to Christ as Messiah?

The texts cited on p. 751 shew that it was the *Father*. To the Father, then, glory will redound, when "every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord." Why should it not? "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "Thanks be unto God, then, for his unspeakable gift." Glory and praise be unto him for ever and ever, for his boundless mercy!

But is glory due to him who said, "Lo I come, my God, to do thy will?" So thought and said the apostles; so the redeemed in heaven are represented as declaring, Rev. 5: 13. Why should the one exclude the other? Why should the glory

which redounds to God the Father, because that every tongue confesses Jesus to be Lord, detract from the glory which is to be given to this same Jesus as Lord?

But you will say, perhaps, that the glory to be given to Jesus is inferior and secondary praise. Be it so then, so far as that *κυριότης* is concerned which is *delegated*, and which will come to an end. But is there not something more than the praise of this *κυριότης* due to "Him who was in the beginning with God, and "WHO WAS GOD;" who is "GOD OVER ALL and blessed for ever;" who is "OUR GREAT GOD and Saviour," who is "the TRUE GOD and eternal life?" The humble Christian will pause, at least, before he decides against this.

One remark more, and I have done. It pertains to the *practical* part of our subject. 'Shall we separate, in our own minds, between the homage we pay to the Saviour as being Lord by delegation, and in our nature, and that which we pay to him as the eternal Logos?'

How can we do this? For myself, I have made the attempt in vain. Others may be more successful; but I cannot reach such a point of abstraction in my own views and feelings. Am I required to do it? I can find nothing in the New Testament which imposes this upon me. I find in the ascriptions to the Saviour, which John represents the redeemed in heaven as making, that he is praised and adored in the same words and by the same actions, which are employed in order to praise the Father, Rev. 5: 13. If worshippers in the temple above do not separate the objects of their worship, by the manner and matter of rendering homage, then worshippers on earth may dispense with such a separation. I doubt whether it is practicable. I am fully persuaded that it is not expedient. It would disturb the thoughts of the worshipper; it would give him a low instead of an elevated flight. If I am wrong here, most cheerfully will I submit to correction. If I am not, then let the humble Christian apply to practice the principle which I am endeavouring to confirm.

All this, however, does not hinder us from knowing and fully believing, that Christ as mediatorial *κύριος*, is in some important respects to be distinguished from Christ as *κύριος* in the character of *Λόγος* and *יהוה*. The whole of this mystery we cannot explain; it is deeper than we can fathom. I feel this to be true; and from the bottom of my heart I acknowledge it. But how can this be otherwise? 'God manifest in the flesh,' we have good authority for believing, 'is a *great mystery*;' one which

perhaps the light of heaven itself will never fully unfold. But then, even granting this, I would forever say, "Let me believe and adore," and not "wonder and perish!"

ART. VI. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

THE following extracts of letters received from distinguished individuals abroad, are presented to the readers of the Repository in the belief, that nothing can be more acceptable to them, than thus to learn from time to time the views and feelings, as well as the occupations and prospects, of persons whose names and characters are well known to the American churches, but whose works are as yet little circulated among us. Indeed, one great object of the present work, and in the Editor's view one of the most important, is, so far as opportunity may arise, to communicate information of this kind; in order thus to bring Christians of different countries into more intimate acquaintance with each other, and enable them better to appreciate and honour and love the Christian character and exertions of each other. To the sentiments of fraternal affection expressed in the following extracts, the heart of every American Christian cannot but warmly respond.

EDITOR.

1. *Extracts from a Letter to Prof. Stuart, from the REV. EBENEZER HENDERSON, D. D. Prof. of Theol. in Highbury College, near London.*†

LONDON, FEB. 22, 1831.

MY DEAR SIR,

* * *

I cannot proceed further, without tendering you my best thanks for the copy of the new edition of your Hebrew Grammar; I was already well acquainted with it, and quite agree with you as to the importance of the more condensed form in which it appears. Even as it is, it is, however, I am sorry to

† Dr Henderson is the well known traveller in the northern parts of Europe and Iceland, as the agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Ed.

say, too formidable for most of my countrymen ; who have got so spoiled by the habit of learning the language without points, or with them so superficially, that I fear few copies will be in demand. * *

You have greatly the advantage of us, in having the young men that come to Andover already initiated into the elemental parts of the [Hebrew] language. With us all is to begin ; and that with the Theological Tutor. I am happy to say however, that at *Highbury College*, (to which I removed last July, the Mission College having been given up on the ground of the disproportionate expense,) I have succeeded in getting Hebrew begun at the commencement of the *second* year ; during which I find I can take the students through the Grammar and Genesis at least ; the *third* year we can master the more important of the other Mosaic books and the Psalms ; and this leaves us time in the *fourth* year to go through Job, Isaiah, or the minor Prophets. I have now a class that began Job last September, and have read the whole of it,—all the Chaldee portions of the Old Testament, and two long chapters of Jonathan's Targum. Formerly the students only got a mere smattering, and never having got fairly over the threshold, could not enjoy the scenes within. It grieves me to think that I cannot devote more time to the prosecution of Biblical researches, for the immediate benefit of my Hebrew classes ; but when I tell you that with the exception of a course on Biblical Criticism (already prepared), I have still in a great measure to get up lectures on Biblical Antiquities, Divinity, Church History, and Pastoral Theology, you will not wonder that it should be the case. In the preparation of my divinity lectures, it is my object as much as possible to make them *exegetical*, that the students may have the means of judging whether any view is contained in the book of God, or not, and what is the exact amount of evidence which any particular passage may furnish in its support.

A specimen I wish to send you with some other things. It is a defence of [the reading] *God manifest in the flesh*, brought out to meet the temporary exigency occasioned by an attempt on the part of the Socinians, to persuade the public that Sir Isaac Newton had proved a corruption of the passage. †

† Of this little work the Archbishop of Canterbury says, that it is "a valuable specimen of critical ability, successfully exerted in the investigation and discovery of truth." It will be reprinted in the next number of this work. Ed.

The review of your work [on the Epistle to the Hebrews] in the Eclectic greatly vexed me.—However, you have this comfort, if you required it, which you do not, that this periodical is very much gone down in the estimation of the public; which I the more regret, (I mean this in reference to the cause,) as it is the only ostensibly literary production published by the Dissenters in this country. It was peculiarly ungracious, on the ground that we should, instead of carping and endeavouring to depreciate the productions of the two countries, do every thing in our power to mutually bring them forward. * *

We have a communion of labour. Our aims are the same. We serve the one Great Master. We endeavour in the strength of his grace to consecrate our energies to the advancement of his word and cause in the world. Let us persevere. 'In due time we shall reap if we faint not.' Commending you and your various and important labours to his blessing, I remain

Your's, very fraternally,
E. HENDERSON.

2. *Extract from a Letter to Prof. Stuart from the REV. JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D. Prof. of Theol. at Homerton near London.*

HOMERTON, NEAR LONDON, APRIL 7, 1831.

MY DEAR SIR,

* * *

I have not yet seen the works constituting the *Course of Hebrew Study*, which you have so kindly sent to Dr Henderson; but I have no doubt of being favoured with the inspection of them. He teaches Hebrew at Highbury College, upon the solid principles to which you are giving currency and effect. In our College the arrangement is different. 'The Hebrew tuition belongs to the Classical Tutor's office. I lament to say that Mr Walfort, an inflexible man, who has sustained that office for seventeen years, has followed the baseless scheme of Parkhurst, which you so justly denominate "without form and void." He has, under heavy mental affliction, very recently resigned. My new colleague, the Rev. Daniel Godfrey Bishop, has long entered, and most cordially, into your principles; and he will zealously and ably act upon them. Our number of students does not average more than about *sixteen*; at Highbury, they have usually double that number, or more. The term of study with us is usually two years longer than theirs. Our insti-

tution consists of two foundations, the one having commenced about 1690; the other, to which the property belongs, in 1730.

* * *

Yours, most truly,
J. PYE SMITH.

—

3. *Extracts from a Letter to the Editor from the same.*

HOMERTON, MIDDLESEX, APRIL 16, 1831.

MY DEAR SIR,

I cannot but feel myself greatly favoured in your kind attention, in addition to those of your distinguished fellow Professors Dr Woods and Mr Stuart. * *

In my letter to Professor Stuart, I forgot to advert to a topic which gave me considerable pain. May I trespass on your kindness to mention it to him? It is, what appeared to me the unkind and unjust manner in which his Commentary on the Hebrews was treated in the Eclectic Review. I am ignorant who the author of that article was, and I do not wish to know. An equally unknown reviewer also, I think in the Congregational Magazine, while in other respects he wrote with commendable fairness, made a very unreflecting objection to the constant adducing of the Greek text in the Commentary; a circumstance of so much convenience to that class of readers for whom the work is principally intended. The editor of the Eclectic Review is Mr Josiah Conder; that of the Congregational Magazine, the Rev. John Blackburn of Pentonville, near London; both excellent men. But in such publications, haste, and infirmity, and the diversity of writers, will produce things occasionally that excite regret. * *

From your long residence in Germany, I cherish the hope that you will communicate to the British and American Christian public a more accurate, discriminating, and just account of the state of real religion in the different German states than has been yet done.—In this country there are some, yet I believe not many, who have imbibed the spirit, in its worst power, of the German rationalists. These are partly among the open and honestly avowed Unitarians, and partly in the established church, notwithstanding the “binding force” of its articles and liturgy; of which “binding force” my worthy friend Mr Rose is so enamoured. In his book, of which the second edition is a

great improvement upon the first, on "The State of the Protestant Religion in Germany," he has brought forward a mass of materials, but to a considerable degree, I fear, *incomplete* as data.—Mr Pusey, Hebrew Professor at Oxford, appears to me to have a more perfect acquaintance with the case; but, I fear that his candour and benevolence have betrayed him into mistakes of a kind the reverse of Mr Rose's. Yet I can speak only of his first edition; the second, I am told, is much improved. I feel an ardent desire to know your opinion of Schleiermacher. One finds in his writings a daring and a rashness mounting up to absolute impiety; and yet, in some, the apparent breathings of vital religion. * *

Do me the favour of making my most respectful regards to Dr Woods and Mr Stuart. That the best of heavenly blessings may rest upon you and them, is the cordial prayer of,

My dear sir,

Yours, in the sacred bonds of faith and love,
J. PYE SMITH.

4. *Extracts from a Letter to the Editor from the REV. SAMUEL LEE, B. D. Prof. of Arabic and Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, Eng.*

LONDON, JUNE 5, 1831.

MY DEAR SIR,

I am very much obliged to you for your kind letter of Jan. 20th, which came duly to hand, and for the first number of your "Biblical Repository."—It will be a great satisfaction to me to open a correspondence with you, and to contribute all the encouragement, advice, etc. I can, to your praiseworthy undertaking. It delights me and all my Cambridge and other friends to find, that our American neighbours are really outstripping us in the cause of Biblical literature. May He whose cause you are labouring to promote, strengthen your hands an hundred fold! I am quite sure you will find no *unholy* rivalry here, although I do hope, you will find us endeavouring to keep up the race, as well as the contention necessary to secure that crown, which fadeth not away.

I have seen a copy of the [new edition of Prof. Stuart's] Grammar; and the industry of its author is new matter for my admiration of him. Of my own Grammar, which differs a little in principle from Mr Stuart's, a very large impression has

sold entirely off, and I am now printing a second, and am about half way through it. I have a considerable quantity of new matter, which I am sure you will duly appreciate, and I am not without hopes will closely criticise. My doctrine of the tenses of the verb, I consider as established. M. de Sacy, with whom I am now engaged in controversy on that and some other points, has, to all intents and purposes, given this up. He only now contends for the venerable *conversivum*. In my next reply, of which I shall send you a copy, I expect to satisfy him on this point also. The other points I allude to as lately made out by me, are, the use of the *apocopated present* tenses, the use of the η *paragogic*, and of the δ *epenthetic* and *paragogic*. These I find all in constant use in the Arabic, and their offices laid down by the native Grammarians; and that in no case do these rules disagree with Hebrew usages. But on this subject you will make up your mind, when you see the works alluded to.

I send you herewith two works which I have lately published. One on the interpretation etc. of Scripture generally, and of prophecy in particular. The results I came to in the latter case, were such as I did not expect, but which I found myself quite unable to get rid of.—I can only say of myself, that my aim is truth; and in so saying, I can perhaps also affirm, that I am willing to give up the views there advanced, when it shall be shown that they are unsound. You will find a considerable quantity of other curious matter in the book, and among this, some which has induced me to think more lightly both of German learning and of German divinity than I have been used to think. But this I leave. The other work I send you consists of some Latin prefaces prepared for a small Polyglott published by Mr Bagster, of which you have no doubt heard. You will find some original matter in this, although the work is not long.

Since I wrote last to America, I have been elected to the Hebrew professorship in our university. In consequence of this, I have sent out a general Prospectus of Lectures, a copy of which I send you.* So, my dear sir, you will see that I mean not to sleep at my post. Mr Skinner and several others at Cambridge are working with me very cordially, and I hope we

* The following is the Prospectus here referred to. Ed.

CAMBRIDGE, FEB. 1831.

The Regius Professor of Hebrew gives notice, that it is his intention, early in the next October Term, to commence (with a view

shall recover the honour of our country, which had been allowed to fade in this respect.

I have in the press too, a new Hebrew Lexicon, of which I

to publication) a complete Course of Lectures on the Hebrew Scriptures, of which the following is an outline.

I.

1. The Philology and Rhetoric of the Hebrews.
2. Their Archaeologia or Antiquities.
3. Jewish, i. e. Rabbinic and Karaitic Literature, and the influence it has exercised on the exegetical interpretation of the Scriptures.
4. On the Oriental Dialects, viz. the Arabic, Syriac, Chaldaic, Samaritan, Ethiopic, Persic, Coptic,—their use, and abuse, etc.
5. The authority, use, etc. of the Ancient Paraphrases and Versions of the Scriptures. viz. the Chaldee Targums, the Septuagint and other Greek versions, the Latin Itala and Vulgate, the Syriac Peschito and Versions from the Greek, the Ethiopic, and Coptic.
6. How far the Commentaries, Apologies, and Homilies, of the Fathers of the Church, may be relied on as means of Scriptural Interpretation.
7. Modern Grammars, Lexicons, Commentaries, Homilies, Ephemeral Reading, etc.

II.

1. The language of Prophecy, whether purely verbal, symbolical, or mixed.
2. The single and double sense considered.
3. Examination of passages cited from the Prophets in the New Testament.
4. On fulfilled and unfulfilled Prophecy; the opinions of the ancients and moderns, whether Christians or Jews, considered.
5. The Prophecies analyzed, read, and construed.

III.

1. The Book of Psalms analyzed, read, explained, and applied.
2. The citations given in the New Testament from this Book examined, with respect to both their grammatical and exegetical interpretation.

IV.

The Historical and Doctrinal Books of the Old Testament considered, read, and construed, in the following order.

1. The Book of Genesis, with respect to its character and authority, both as a religious and historical code; its coincidences with the Fragments of Chaldean, Egyptian, Phoenician, and other antiquities; its predictions, etc.
2. The remaining books of the Pentateuch, with regard to their religious and historical character, authority, predictions, etc.
3. Historical sketch of the Theocracy, its duration, and fate. Difficulties occurring in the Biblical narrative, and particularly those which have been adduced as grounds of objection to the authority of the Scriptures.
4. Citations of the New Testament adduced and considered.
5. The doctrinal books, viz. Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, analyzed, read, and construed; citations from these found in the New Testament, examined; their general character and authority considered.

It is not pretended that this course will be completed in one year; the intention is, merely to give an outline of the plan proposed, subject however to such alterations as the nature of each case may require; and to bring the whole to a close as early as the extent and variety of the subjects will allow.

shall send you a copy when it is published, as indeed I intend to do of every thing else. When these come to hand, remember I wish my friend Stuart to be partner with you, in remembrance of his former tokens of friendship, and to shew you how much I desire to see you flourish in these good inquiries.

Yours, most truly,

SAMUEL LEE.

In connexion with the preceding letter from Prof. Lee, the Editor is induced to subjoin the following account of his early life and studies, contained in a letter from himself to Jonathan Scott, Esq. LL. D. formerly Oriental Professor of the Royal and Military East India Colleges, published by Bishop Burgess, in his little work entitled "Motives to the Study of Hebrew," Lond. 1814. It will be found to be a very interesting account of genius and industry in humble life, struggling with and surmounting all external obstacles, and at length elevating their possessor to one of the most important and conspicuous stations in the literary and Christian world. EDITOR.

A Letter from Mr Samuel Lee to Jonathan Scott, Esq.

SIR,

In conformity to your request, I now proceed to give you a detail of my pursuits in languages, with some circumstances of my life connected therewith.

The first rudiments of learning I received at a charity school, at Longnor,* in the county of Salop, where I was born, which is a village situated on the Hereford road, about eight miles from Shrewsbury. Here I remained till I attained the age of twelve years, and went through the usual gradations of such institutions, without distinguishing myself in any respect; for as punishment is the only alternative generally held out, I, like others, thought it sufficient to avoid it. At the age above mentioned, I was put out apprentice to a carpenter and joiner, by Robert Corbett, Esq. in which, I must confess, I underwent hardships seldom acquiesced in by boys of my age; but as my father died when I was very young, and I knew it was not in the power of my mother to provide better for me, as she had two more to support by her own labour, I judged it best to submit.

About the age of seventeen I formed a determination to learn the Latin language; to which I was instigated by the following circumstances. I had been in the habit of reading such books as

* Founded and endowed by the family of Corbett, owners of that estate.

happened to be in the house where I lodged ; but meeting with Latin quotations, found myself unable to comprehend them. Being employed about this time in the building of a Roman Catholic chapel, for Sir Edward Smith, of Actonburnel, where I saw many Latin books, and frequently heard that language read, my resolution was confirmed. I immediately bought Ruddiman's Latin Grammar, at a book-stall, and learnt it by heart throughout. I next purchased Corderius' Colloquies, by Loggan, which I found a very great assistance to me, and afterwards obtained Entick's Latin Dictionary ; also soon after Beza's Testament, and Clarke's Exercises. There was one circumstance, however, which, as it had some effect on my progress, I shall mention in this place. I one day asked one of the priests, who came frequently to us, to give me some information of which I was then in want ; who replied, that "charity began at home." This was very mortifying, but it only served as a stimulus to my endeavours ; for, from this time, I resolved, if possible, to excel even him. There was one circumstance, however, more powerful in opposing me, and that was poverty. I had, at that time, but six shillings per week to subsist on, and to pay the expenses of washing and lodging ; out of this, however, I spared something to gratify my desire for learning, which I did, though not without curtailing myself of proper support. My wages were, however, soon after raised one shilling a week, and the next year a shilling more ; during which time I read the Latin Bible, Florus, some of Cicero's Orations, Caesar's Commentaries, Justin, Sallust, Virgil, Horace's Odes, and Ovid's Epistles. It may be asked, how I obtained these books ? I never had all at once, but generally read one and sold it, the price of which, with a little added to it, enabled me to buy another, and this being read, was sold to procure the next.

I was now out of my apprenticeship, and determined to learn the Greek. I bought therefore a Westminster Greek Grammar, and soon afterwards procured a Testament, which I found not very difficult with the assistance of Schrevelius' Lexicon. I bought next Huntingford's Greek Exercises, which I wrote throughout, and then, in pursuance to the advice laid down in the Exercises, read Xenophon's Cyropaedia, and soon after Plato's Dialogues, some part of the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, Pythagoras's Golden Verses, with the Commentary of Hierocles, Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead, and some of the Poetae Minores, with the Antigone of Sophocles.

I now thought I might attempt the Hebrew, and accordingly procured Bythner's Grammar, with his Lyra Prophetica ; and soon after obtained a Psalter, which I read by the help of the Lyra. I next purchased Buxtorf's Grammar and Lexicon, with a Hebrew Bible ; and now I seemed drawing fast towards the summit of my wishes, but was far from being uninterrupted in these pursuits. A frequent inflammation in my eyes, with every possible discouragement from those about me, were certainly powerful opponents ; but habit, and

a fixed determination to proceed, had now made study my greatest happiness; and I every day returned to it, rather as a source of rest from manual labour; and though I felt many privations in consequence, it amply repaid me in that solitary satisfaction, which none, but a mind actuated as mine was, could feel. But to return; chance had thrown in my way the Targum of Onkelos; and I had a Chaldaic Grammar in Bythner's *Lyra*, with the assistance of which and of Schindler's *Lexicon*, I soon read it. I next proceeded to the Syriac, and read some of Gutbir's Testament, by the help of Otho's Synopsis, and Schindler's *Lexicon*. I had also occasionally looked over the Samaritan; but as the Samaritan Pentateuch differs little from the Hebrew, except in a change of letters, I found no difficulty in reading it, in quotations, wherever I found it; and with quotations I was obliged to content myself, as books in that language were entirely out of my reach.

By this time I had attained my twenty-fifth year, and had got a good chest of tools, worth I suppose about £25. I was now sent into Worcestershire, to superintend, on the part of my master, Mr John Lee, the repairing of a large house, belonging to the Rev. Mr Cooke. I began now to think it necessary to relinquish the study of languages; as I perceived, that however excellent the acquisition may have appeared to me, it was in my situation entirely useless. I sold my books and made new resolutions. In fact, I married, considering my calling as my only support; and some promises and insinuations had been made to me, which seemed of a favourable nature in my occupation. I was awaked, however, from these views and suggestions by a circumstance, which gave a new and distressing appearance to my affairs; a fire broke out in the house we were repairing; in which my tools, and with them all my views and hopes, were consumed. I was now cast on the world without a friend, a shilling, or even the means of subsistence. This, however, would have been but slightly felt by me, as I had always been the child of misfortune, had not the partner of my life been immersed in the same afflicting circumstances. There was, however, no alternative, and I now began to think of some new course of life, in which my former studies might prove advantageous. I thought that of a country schoolmaster would be the most likely to answer my purpose. I therefore applied myself to the study of Murray's *English Exercises*, and improved myself in arithmetic.

There was, however, one grand objection to this; I had no money to begin, and I did not know any friend who would be inclined to lend. In the mean time the Rev. Archdeacon Corbett* had heard of my attachment to study, and having been informed of my being in Longnor, sent for me in order to inform himself of particulars.

* Nephew and successor to Robert Corbett, Esq. before mentioned.

To him I communicated my circumstances, and it is to his goodness that I am indebted for the situation I at present fill, and for several other valuable benefits which he thought proper generously to confer. My circumstances since that time are too well known to you to need any further elucidation. It is through your kind assistance I made myself thus far acquainted with the Arabic, Persian, and Hindoostanee Languages; of my progress in which you, Sir, are undoubtedly the best judge.

I am, Sir,

With every possible respect,

SAMUEL LEE.

Blue School, Shrewsbury, }
April 26, 1813. }

NOTE by Mr. Scott. Mr Lee was introduced to me by Mr Archdeacon Corbett. The assistance he so gratefully speaks of, from myself, was chiefly in the loan of books, and directing him in pronunciation; he wanted no other. In the course of a few months he was able not only to read and translate from any Arabic or Persian manuscript, but to compose in those languages. Since my residing at Bath, he has sent me translations, into Arabic and Persian, of several of Dr Johnson's Oriental Apologues in the Rambler, and of Addison's Vision of Mirza, in the Spectator. They are wonderfully well done; and in this opinion I am not singular, as they have met also the approbation of Mr James Anderson, whose abilities as an Orientalist are sufficiently established to render his applause highly satisfactory. Mr Lee, in addition to his knowledge of the dead and Eastern languages, has made also considerable proficiency in French, German, and Italian. With his amazing facility of acquiring languages he possesses taste for elegant composition, and has no slight poetical talents, of which I have seen some specimens in English and Latin; also a Parody of Gray's Ode to Adversity, in Greek Sapphic verse, which I am informed by judges, for I am myself no Grecian, is a surprising effort of self instructed genius. His present situation is that of Master of a small Charity Foundation in Shrewsbury; but he also attends two schools as teacher of arithmetic, and at a few private houses as instructor, in Persic and Hindoostanee, to the sons of gentlemen, who expect appointments in the civil or military service of the Honourable East India Company; and the progress made by his pupils shews, that he has the talent of conveying knowledge to others, an art not always possessed by the learned.

[Mr Lee was afterwards employed as Orientalist to the Church Missionary Society, where he so much distinguished himself, as to receive not long after the appointment of Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge.

Ed.]

INDEX I.

HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS ILLUSTRATED.

I. Hebrew.

א
אָנְאָלְחִי, 717.
אָדִירִי, 87.
בְּאֵזוֹל, אָדוּל, 606.
אָיִים, 718.
אָם, 587.
בְּאָפֶס, אָפֶס, 731.
אָשֶׁנֶב, אָפֶס, 609.
ב
ב, 104.
בְּחָר, 715.
בְּצַע, 605.
ד
דְּנָהָר, דְּנָהָר, 606.
ה
הָן, 715.
ז
זָל, 584.
ח
חָבֵל, 94.
חֹת, 597.
חֶמְאָה, 607.
חֶסֶד, 81.
חֶסֶד־יָדִיק, 100, 106.
חֶצֶץ, 590.
חֶזֶק, 596.
חֶקֶר, 596.
י
יָבֵב, 609.

יְהוָה, 738 sqq.
יָמִים, בְּיָמֵי, 585.
יָמִים, 597.
יָרֵד, 592.
יָחַד, 608.
יָתֵר, 716.
כ
כְּבוֹד, 97.
כְּדוֹן, 716.
כֹּס, 94.
כְּלִיחַ, 95.
כֶּן, 595.
כָּרַע, 608.
ל
ל, 79.
מ
מְדִין, מְדִין, 588.
מְחַצֵּצִים, 590.
מִי, 604.
מִכְתָּם, 76.
מִזֵּי, 593.
מִנַּח, 94.
מִשְׁפָּחִים, 596.
נ
נָזַל, נָזַל, 584.
נִתְיָבָה, 586.
ס
סָפֵר, 594.
ע
עָבַד יְהוָה, 718.

עַל, 85.
עָמַד, 715.
עֲצָבוֹת, 91.
פ
פְּרִזוֹן, 586.
פָּרַע, פָּרַע, 579 sq.
צ
צָבָא, 605, 717.
צָדֵק, 718 sq.
צְדָקָה, 591, 718 sq.
ק
קְדוּמִים, 605.
קְדוּשִׁים, 86.
קָרָא, 717.
ר
רָגַל, רָגַל, 595.
רִזוֹן, 582 sq.
רָקַם, רָקַמָה, 610.
ש
שָׁעִיר, 584.
שָׁרִי, 594.
ש
ש prefix, 577.
שָׁאוּל, 99.
שָׁחַת, 99, 107.
שָׁרַשׁ, 593.
ת
תִּמְרָה, 94.
תִּיבֵב, 609.

II. Greek.

Α
ἀγαθοσύνη (χρηστότης), 683,
αγορέλαιος (κότινος), 680. [684.
αιτός (αιετός), 660.
ἀθέμιτος, ἀθέμιστος, 674.
αἴτημα (αἴτησις), 672.
αἰγμαλωτίζειν, -ξισθαι, (αἰχμά-
λωτον ποιεῖν, -γίνεσθαι), 477,
684.

ἀκατάπανστος (ἄπανστος), 674.
ἀκμήν, 477.
ακούσω (ακούσομαι), 643, 666.
ἀλεκτοροφωνία, 684.
ἀλέκτωρ (ἀλεκτρυνών), 668.
ἀλήθειν, 676.
ἀλλαχόθεν, 679.
ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, 682. [666.
ἀμαρτήσω (ἀμαρτησομαι), 643,

ἄμαρτωλός (ἀμαρτηλός), 674.
 ἀμνημερινός, 675.
 ἀναβαθμός (ἀναβασμός), 660.
 ἀνακαινώω (ἀνακαινίζω), 677.
 ἀνακαινώσις (ἀνακαινίσις), 677.
 ἀναστατοῦν (ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν),
 ἀνείλατε, ἀνείλατο, 664. [684.
 ἀνετάζειν (ἐξετάζειν), 676.
 ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, 682.
 ἀνθυπατεύω, 684.
 ἀνθύπατος, 684.
 ἀνταπόδομα (ἀνταπόδοσις), 671.
 ἄντλημα (ἄντλος), 672.
 ἄξω (ἄξομαι), 666.
 ἀπαρχή, 401 sq.
 ἀπείραστος (ἀπείρατος, ἀπεί-
 ρητος), 673.
 ἀπελεύσομαι, 666.
 ἀποδεκατώω, 678.
 ἀποκαρδοκία, 373.
 ἀποκεφαλίζειν (καρατομεῖν) 683.
 ἀπόκριμα (κατάκριμα, ἀπόκρι-
 σις), 672.
 ἀπολλύων (ἀπολλύς), 667.
 Ἀπολλῶ, τοῦ, τόν, 661.
 ἀργόν ῥήμα, 481.
 ἀριγεννήτος, 674.
 ἀρχισυναγωγος, 682.
 ἀρχιτελώνης, 682.
 ἀσθένημα (ασθένεια), 672.
 αὔξη (αὔξησις), 671.
 αὔταρ (ἄταρ), 660.
 αὔχη, αὔχημα, 672.
 ἀφείωνται (ἀφείνται), 662.
 ἀφημερινός, 674, 675.
 ἀφυπνώω (ἀφυπνίζω), 677.

B

βάθμος (βάσμος), 660.
 βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, 557, 565.
 βασίλισσα (βασίλις), 668.
 βατος, 667.
 βεβηλώω (βεβηλον ποιεῖν), 684.
 βιαστής (βιατής), 673.
 βουλή (βουλήσις), 671.
 βούλομαι, βούλει, ἤβουλήθην,
 ἤβουλήθη, 662.
 βρεχειν (ὑεῖν), 688.

Γ

γελάσω (γελάσομαι), 666.
 γενέσια (γενέθλια), τὰ, 646.
 γενηθεῖς (γενόμενος), 666.
 γεννήματα, 477.
 γίνομαι (γίγνομαι), 660.
 γινώσκω (γινώσκω), 660.
 γνωτός, γνωσιός, 674.
 γογγύζειν, γογγυσμός, (τονθρῦ-
 ζειν, τονθρυσμός,) 680.
 γονεῖς, τοὺς, 661.
 γραμματεῖς, τοὺς, 661.
 γρηγορεῖν (ἐγρηγορεῖν), 676.

Δ

δαυλός (δαλός), 660.
 δεκατόω (δεκατεύω), 677.
 δεσμεῖν (δεσμεύειν), 676.
 δεσμοί, οἱ, (τὰ δεσμά), 668.
 δεσπότης, 736, 758.
 διά, 170.
 διαμερισμός, 682.
 διασκορπίζειν, 680.
 διδάσκαλος, διδάσκειν, 466.
 διδραγμαῖον (διδραχμον), 648, 661.
 δίκαιος, 477.
 δοκιμασία (δοκιμή), 670.
 δύναμαι, δύνη, ἰδυνήθησαν, ἰδύ-
 δυναμόω, 683. [νατο, 662.
 δύνη (δύνασαι), 665.
 δυοῖ (δυοῖν), 662.
 δωδεκάφυλον, 682.
 δῶη (δοίη), 643, 667.

Ε

ἐβλάστησα (ἐβλαστον), 666.
 ἐβουλήθη, 662.
 Ἐβραΐζειν, 548.
 ἐγάμησα (ἐγημα), 667. [666.
 ἐγανάκτησα (ἐγανακτησάμην),
 ἐγέννησα (ἐγεννησάμην) 643, 666.
 ἐγκυος (ἐγκύμων), 674.
 ἐγνωικαν (ἐγνωικασι), 663.
 ἐδολιοῦσαν (ἐδολιοῦν), 664.
 ἰδυνατο, 662.
 ἔζησα, 643.
 ἔθρεψα (ἔθρεψάμην), 666.
 εἶδαμεν, εἶδαν, 664.
 εἰδωλοατρεία, -άτρης, 682.

εἶπὸν (εἶπέ, εἶπά), 662.
 εἰρηκαν (εἰρήμασι), 663.
 εἴωθα, 662.
 εἰσήλθατε, 664.
 ἐκρίνοσαν, 664.
 ἔκτρομα (ἐξάμβλωμα), 679.
 ἐκχέω, 664.
 ἔλαβαν, 647.
 ἔλεος, 668.
 ἐλεύσομαι, 643, 665.
 Ἐλληνίζειν, 548.
 ἔμελλε, 662.
 ἐνδειγμα, ἐνδειξις, 671.
 ἐνδυναμόω, 683.
 ἐξάπινα (ἐξαπιναίως, -ίνης), 678.
 ἐξείλατο, 664.
 ἐξήλθατε, 664.
 ἐξουθενώ (ἐξουθενίζω), 678.
 ἐξυπνίζειν (αφυπνίζειν, διυπ.), 676, 683.
 ἐπαινέω (ἐπαινέσομαι), 666.
 ἔπεσα (ἔπεσον), 647, 664.
 ἐπιφάω (ἐπιφάω) 660.
 ἔρχεσθαι, 169.
 ἔσθημα, ἔσθησις, 672.
 εὖραν, 664.
 εὐσχημων, 645.
 ευχαριστεῖν, 688.
 ἐφαγαμεν, 664.
 ἐφαγοσαν, 477.
 ἐφυγαν, 664.
 ἐώρακαν, 663.

Z

ζήτημα, ζήτησις, 672.

H

ἡβουλήθην, 662.
 ἡδυνήθησαν, 662.
 ἡδύς, ἡδιον, 675.
 ἦλθατε (ἦλθετε), 647, 664.
 ἦλθοσαν, 477, 664.
 ἡμάρτησα (ἡμαρτον), 666.
 ἡμελλε, 662.
 ἡμέριος, ἡμερινός, 675.
 ἡμίσοις (ἡμίσεος) τοῦ, 662.
 ἡνεωγμένη θύρα, 665.
 ἡνεώχθη, 665.
 ἡνοίγη, ἡνοίξη, ἡνοιχθη, 665.

No. IV. 100

ἡροπάγην (ἡροπάσθη), 666.
 ἡττημα (ἡσσα, ἡττα), 672.
 ἦτω (ἔστω), 663.

Θ

θεός, 743.
 θερινός, 675.

I

ἴαμα, ἴασις, 672.
 ἴαυχε (ἴαχε), 660.

K

καθημερινός (καθημέριος), 674.
 καθίσω (καθιῶ), 666.
 κάθου (κάθησο), 667.
 καλέσω (καλοῦμαι), 666.
 καμμύειν (καταμύειν), 660.
 καταλαλία (λαλία, προσλ. προλ.) 684.

κατάλυμα (καταγώγιον, κατά-
 λυσις), 671.

κατελίποσαν, 664.
 καυχᾶσαι (καυχᾶ), 663.
 καύχη, καύχημα, 672.
 καύχησις, 670.
 κερδήσω (κερδανῶ), 666.
 κλαύσω (κλαύσομαι), 666.
 κλέψω (κλέψομαι), 666.
 κλίβανος (κρίβανος), 660.
 κνήθειν (κνεῖν), 676.
 κοινή διάλεκτος, οἱ κοινοί, 473,
 κολλυβιστής, 680. [652.
 κοράσιον, 680.
 κόσμος, 567.
 κράββατος (σκίμπος), 683.
 κραταιώω (κρατύνω), 678.
 κύριος, 733 sq. ἐν κυρίῳ, 759.
 κτίσις, 373 sq.
 Κῶ, τήν, 661.

Λ

λιμός, 648, 667.
 λόγος, 478.

M

μαθητρία (μαθητοῖς), 670.
 μάμη, 688.
 μέλλω, ἡμελλε, ἔμελλε, 662.
 μερισμός (δασμός, αναδασμός),
 682, 684.

μεσημβρινός, 675.
μετοικεσία (μετοίκησης, μετοι-
κία), 670.

N

ναῦν, τήν, 661.
νήθειν (νεῖν), 676, 677.
νοί (νοῖ), 661.
νοσσός, νοσσίον, (νεοσσός, νεοσ-
σίον,) 649, 660.

Ξ

ξηράω (ξηρεύω), 669.

O

ὀδυνᾶσαι (ὀδυνᾶ), 663.
οἶδασι (ἰουασι), 667.
οἰκοδεσπότης, 668.
οἰκοδομή (-όμημα), 668, 672.
ὄρη, 466.
ὄρθορίζειν (ὄρθρύνειν), 675, 683.
ὄρθρινός (ὄρθριος), 674.
ὄρηστρια (ὄρηστροίς), 670.
οὐδείς (οὐθεις), 648, 661.
οὐθέν (οὐθέν), 648, 661.
ὄψει, ὄφομαι, 662.

Π

παιδεύειν, 645.
πανδοκεύς, 477.
πανδοχείον (πανδοκειῶν), 660.
πανοικί (πανοικησία), 678.
πάντοτε (ἐκαστότε), 679.
παρακαλεῖν, παρακλήσις, 685.
παρεμβολή, 477.
παρεξει (παρέξη), 662.
παρέστηκαν, 663.
παύσομαι (πεπαύσομαι), 666.
πειράζω, ἐπειράσθην, ἐπειρά-
σθην, 673.
πιᾶζω (πιέζω), 660.
πλήρωμα, 560.
πνεῦμα, 490.
πολύσπλαγγνος, 683.
πράξω (πράξομαι), 666.
προσκοπή, 477.

προσωποληπτεύω, -λήπτης, -λη-
ψία, 684.

πρωινός (πρωίος, πρωίμος), 674.

P

ράπισμα, 477.
ρέωσω (ρέυσομαι), 666.
ρήμα ἀργόν, 481.
ρήσω (ρήγνυμι), 669.
ρύμη, 477.

Σ

σαλπιστής (σαλπικτής), 661.
σαλπίσω (σαλπίζω), 666.
σαρβήθ σαρβανέ ἐλ, 332.
σαρῦν (σαίρειν), 678, 683.
σθενόω (σθενέω), 678.
σιτιστός (σιτεντός), 675.
σκορπίζω, διασκορπίζω, (σι-
δαννυμι, διασκεδαννυμι), ἀπο-
σκορπίζω, ἐσκορπισμός, 680.
σκοτία (σκότος), 668.
σκότος, 667.
σπλαγγνίζεσθαι, ἐπισπλ. 683.
σπουδάσω (σπουδάσομαι), 666.
σωματικώς, 748.

T

τάχιον (θαττον), 675.
τεθέληκα, 477.

Υ

ὔαλος (ὔελος), 660.
ὑγιῆ accus. 661.
υἰοθεσία, 403.
ὑπό, 169.

Φ

φάγεσθαι, 477.
φιάλη (φιέλη), 660.
φρόνημα, φρόνησις, 672.
φως, 490.

Χ

χαρήσομαι (χαιρήσω), 666.
χρόνον ποιεῖν (διατρίβειν), 685.

Ψ

ψεῦσμα, 673.
ψηλαφήσαισαν, 477.

INDEX II.

TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Genesis.
 18: 8.—607.
 32: 12.—85.
 Deuteronomy.
 32: 42.—580.
 Judges.
 Chap. 5.—568 sq.
 Job.
 17: 14.—107.
 Psalms.
 Ps. 16.—51 sqq.
 55: 24.—107.
 Ecclesiastes.
 9: 4.—87.
 Isaiah.
 8: 21 sq.—522.
 9: 1—6.—522.
 9: 2.—101.
 11: 6 sq.—385.
 32: 1.—87.
 40: 19.—729.
 41: 2, 10.—719.
 41: 27.—729.
 43: 22.—729.
 44: 27.—712.
 45: 8.—719.
 46: 13.—719.
 47: 13.—715.
 48: 10.—715.
 48: 18.—719.
 51: 5.—719.
 52: 4.—730.
 54: 15.—715.
 54: 17.—719.
 56: 1.—719.
 56: 12.—716.
 57: 5.—731.
 58: 2.—719.
 61: 1, 2.—720.
 61: 10.—716.
 66: 18.—716.</p> | <p>Jeremiah.
 4: 19—26.—521.
 Matthew.
 12: 33.—485.
 12: 36.—481.
 14: 6.—646.
 17: 24.—648.
 25: 36.—647.
 Mark.
 15: 43.—645.
 Luke.
 2: 24.—649.
 7: 4.—662.
 John.
 4: 24.—490.
 10: 32.—171.
 Acts.
 3: 16.—171.
 11: 28.—648.
 22: 7.—647.
 Romans.
 2: 21.—466.
 3: 25.—172.
 4: 25.—172.
 5: 14.—136.
 8: 18—25.—363 sq.
 10: 12.—759.
 10: 13.—758.
 14: 6—8.—759.
 16: 2.—759.
 1 Corinthians.
 2: 4 sq.—462.
 3: 5.—767.
 4: 19.—767.
 7: 10, 12.—767.
 8: 2.—172.
 11: 32.—767.
 14: 37.—768.
 15: 24 sq.—752.
 16: 7.—768.</p> | <p>2 Corinthians.
 3: 11.—172.
 3: 16—18.—762.
 5: 6, 8.—762.
 8: 19.—768.
 10: 17, 18.—768.
 Galatians.
 4: 19 sq.—133.
 Ephesians.
 1: 7.—469.
 4: 17.—768.
 5: 19.—764.
 Colossians.
 1: 24.—563.
 2: 9.—748.
 1 Thess.
 4: 6, 5: 27.—769.
 1 Timothy.
 1: 20.—645.
 2 Timothy.
 1: 16, 18.—769.
 2: 14, 22.—769.
 Hebrews.
 1: 10.—758.
 11: 19.—137.
 12: 14.—770.
 James.
 1: 19.—466.
 2: 18.—485.
 3: 1.—466.
 3: 6.—485.
 5: 6.—485.
 2 Peter.
 1: 3.—171.
 3: 5.—172.
 Revelation.
 1: 4.—741.
 1: 5, 6.—173.
 2: 17.—740.
 19: 12.—740.
 21: 1 sq.—384.</p> |
|---|--|---|

INDEX III.

SUBJECTS, ETC.

A.

Arabic Lexicon of Freytag, 197.

Aramaean Language of Babylon, its rise, 318—introduced into Palestine by the Chaldeans, 320—by the Persians, 321—maintains itself under Alexander the Great, 323—under the Greek-Egyptian sovereigns 323—not necessarily changed under the Syro-Macedonian kings, 325—several inscriptions in Palmyra composed in this language, 327—was the common language of the regions of Parthia and Mesopotamia, 328—maintained its ground under Antiochus Epiphanes, 329—was the common language of the army of Judas Maccabeus, 330—coins struck in this language, 331—used by Christ in teaching, 340—by writers in the first centuries after Christ, 341—used by the Jewish princes, who resided at Rome, 347—no essential difference in the language spoken by Christ, and that spoken in the times of Ezra, 351—not spoken with equal correctness by all the inhabitants of Palestine, 355.

Arminius, public opinion respecting him erroneous, 227—sensitiveness respecting his doctrine, 227—his birth, 229—by whom educated, 229—enters the family of P. Bertius, 230—sent by the senate of Amsterdam to Geneva, 230—his attachment to the philosophy of Ramus, 230—goes to Basle, where he declines a doctorate in theology, 231—returns again to Geneva, 231—goes to Italy, 233—suspected of being favourable to popery, 234—settled as a pastor at Amsterdam, 235—his popularity, 235—his doubts respecting certain positions of Beza

and Calvin, 240—accused of Pelagianism, 241—publishes his lectures on Rom. ix. 241—corresponds with F. Junius, 242—elected professor of divinity at Leyden, 243—his lectures on predestination opposed by Gomar, 243—applies to the States General, 244—publishes theses against the Pope, 245—summoned to appear before the States General, 247—his death, 248—eulogies composed on this occasion, 248—his views of predestination, 269, 293—of the providence of God, 270—of man's free will, 271—of God's grace, 272—of the perseverance of the saints, 272—of the assurance of salvation, 273—of man's ability to keep all the commandments of God, 273—of the divinity of Christ, 274—of justification, 278—of special grace, 280—of regeneration, 282—his views of regeneration similar to those of Beza and Dr Owen, 289—his views of original sin, 290—remarks on his character, talents, etc. 299.

Anquetil du Perron, and *Zend-Avesta*, 407.

B.

Beza, his advice to Arminius, 232—his notes on Rom. 9: 11, 17, 240—his views of regeneration, 285.

Biblia Hebraica, various, 186.

Book Trade in Germany, 431.

Bretschneider, review of his lexicon 554—commended for his regard to the true character of the New Testament language, 561—in grammatical arrangement inferior to Wahl, 562—remarks on his definition of βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, 565.

Buttmann, general view of the Greek language and its dialects, 692.

C.

Calvin, his commentary on Ps. xvi. 53—his view of predestination, 236—his commentary on Rom. 9: 18, 238—on Rom. 9: 17, 239—a supralapsarian, 239.
Catechetical Instruction in Germ. 423.
Le Clerc, his views of Ps. xvi. 57—character of by Michaelis, 73.
Correspondence, Foreign, 776.
Course of Study at the German universities, 201.

D.

Deborah, Song of, see *Interpretation*.
Diodati, on the language of Christ, etc. 314.
Directions to theological students, 614. See *Halle*.
Doepke, Hermeneutik der n.t. Schriftsteller, 193.
Dort, Synod of, 253. See *Synod*.
Double Sense, remarks on, 63.

E.

Eclectic Review, 778, 779.
Encyclopaedia, 213, 616.
Episcopius, his birth, education, etc. 252—appears to make his defence before the synod of Dort, 253—disclaims its jurisdiction, 254—is banished with his companions, 258.
Ernesti, on the lang. of Palestine, 315.
Esdraelon, plain of, 599.

F.

Forced Interpretation. See *Interpretation*.
Francke, his character, 28—founder of the orphan house, 30—statue, 32.
Freitag's Arabic Lexicon, 197.

G.

Genuineness of Isaiah, chap. xl.—lxvi. 700—introduction, 700—when first questioned, 703—objections considered, 705—positive grounds of its authenticity, 722.
Germany, general love of antiquity, 4—of history, 5—fondness for music, 427—neglect of public worship, 442—of family worship, 444,—of the Sabbath, 444—want of united Christian effort, 447.
German Churches, constitution of, 202—their dependence upon the civil power, 422—their inactivity, 439—few new churches, 440—evils of church and state, 450.
German Clergy, examination for license to preach, 415—examina-

tion *pro ministerio*, 417—entrance to the ministry, 419—religious catechetical instruction, 423—religious worship, 427—neglect of former writers, 429—libraries, 430—learning of the clergy, 434—professional intercourse, 437.

German Students, their freedom at the universities, 16, 223—method of taking notes, 17—causes of their diligence, 44—preparatory course at the gymnasia, 15, 205.

German Theological Seminaries, 218, 626—other institutions for theological students, 627—academic regulations, etc. 631—pedagogical seminaries, 636—directions for theological students, 614—general view of the theological study, 615.—See *Halle*.

German Universities, the faculties which they comprise, 7—founded by and dependent on their respective governments, 8—benefits of the arrangement of instructors, 10—their lectures, 12—students must go through a preparatory course at the gymnasia, 15, 205—their freedom at the universities, 16, 223—method of taking notes, 17—university of Berlin, 19—its number of students, 21—library, 22—university of Bonn, 23—Breslau, 24—Erlangen, 24—Freiburg, 25—Giessen, 25—Göttingen, 25—its library, 27—Greifswalde, 28—Halle, 28—Heidelberg, 31—Jena, 33—Kiel, 34—Koenigsberg, 34—Leipsic, 34—Marburg, 35—Munich, 35—Rostock, 36—Tübingen, 36—Würzburg, 36—Austrian universities, Vienna, Prague, Pesth, and Innsbruck, 36—universities on the German plan, Basle, Strasburg, Dorpat, Copenhagen, 39—reasons for the success of the German protestant universities, 40—diligence of the students, 44—causes of this diligence, 44—evils of the universities, 47—course of study, 201—ceremony of matriculation, 207—advantages to an American student, 208—students in the theological department not examined in respect to their motives for entering the sacred office, 211—introductory lectures, or *Encyclopaedia*, 213—theoretical, 214—practical, 217—

- abstract of lectures in the universities of Halle and Berlin, 219—university degrees, 410.
- Gesenius*, his great literary acquisitions, 29—his view of Ps. xvi. 59—of Isaiah xl. sq. 705—his Hebrew Lexicons, 187—translation of Isaiah 2d ed. 190.
- Gomar*, his attack upon a lecture of Arminius, 243—disclaims the authority of the States General, 244—challenges Martinus to a public contest, 266.
- Grammatical accuracy of the writers of the New Testament*, 160.
- Greek Language*, spoken extensively in Asia, 532—edicts in Tyre, Sidon, and Askelon in the Greek and Latin language, 533—Greek inscription in a temple on Mount Lebanon, 535—this language spoken by the Roman governors in Palestine, 541—spoken by the Roman emperors, 542—the Jews permitted to compose books in this language, 543—to write a bill of divorce, 544—this language first forbidden, when Titus threatened Jerusalem, 544—proof that this language was understood in Palestine from a scene in Paul's life, 546—of the Hellenists who resided at Jerusalem, 547—results of the argument that this language was spoken in Palestine, 550—origin and progress of the later Greek language, 650—general view of the Greek language and its dialects, 692.
- Greek Style of the New Testament*, 473 640—its characteristics, 643—negligence of interpreters, 644—mistakes in criticism, 647—nature and character of the Greek idiom found in the N. Testament, 649—origin and progress of the later Greek language, 650—its sources, 656—its characteristics, viz. from words, 658—peculiar orthography, 659—peculiar inflection, as nouns and verbs, 661—heterogeneous words, 667—peculiar forms of words, 668—words peculiar to ancient dialects, or altogether new, 679—new signification of words, 684.
- H.
- Hahn*, brief notice of, 111—his Leipzig disputation, 112—on interpretation, 117—remarks on his definition of interpretation, 139—his *Lehrbuch*, 193—extract of a letter from, 408.
- Halle*, directions for theological students entering the university, 614—general view of theological study, exegetical, 617—systematic, 618—historical, 620—practical, 621—orphphan house, 30.
- Hebrew Bibles*, 186—Heb. literature, neglected in this country and in England, 492—prejudice against its study, 493—mistake with regard to the Jews, 493—the allegation, that their language was poor and barbarous, refuted, 494—this language radically the same with the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic, 495—many of the Hebrew writings lost, 496—remarks on the originality of the language, 496—objection with respect to its limited extent, answered, 498—mischief done by an erroneous method of instruction, 501—the claims of this study on intelligent youth in general, 503—the Hebrew Scriptures a collection of valuable relics of antiquity, 504—they contain much useful history, 506—are lessons of moral wisdom, 506—character of the Hebrew poetry, 508—the style of the Hebrew writings, 512—inspiration their grand excellence, 517—remarks on their divinity, 517—an objection against introducing them into a course of education not strictly theological, answered, 526—connexion between the study of the Old and New Testaments, 528—course of Hebrew study at Highbury and Homerton, 776 sq.
- Heinsius*, his testimony respecting Arminius, 259.
- Hellenists*, definition and remarks respecting them, 358, 547—difference between them and Hebrews, 548.
- Henderson*, Dr Ebenezer, letter to Prof. Stuart, 776.
- Hengstenberg*, notice of, 21—on the genuineness of the latter part of Isaiah, 700.
- Herod*, places Greek inhabitants in Jewish towns, 537—favours the Greeks, 540—builds a theatre in Cesarea for the Greeks, 540.
- Highbury College*, course of Hebrew Study, 777.

Homerton, Hebrew study at, 778.

Hug, Greek lang. in Palestine, 530.

I.

Inspiration of the prophets, not incompatible with their voluntary agency, 143, 147—the prophets knew the import of what they uttered, 144—nature of this inspiration, 702, 706.

Interpretation, characteristics of a correct theory, 125—erroneous methods of interpretation, *traditional*, 127—*philosophical*, 128—*allegorical*, 130—of types, 135—simplicity of interpretation, 452—its definition, 454—necessary interpretation, 455—simplicity in the interpreter, 457—*forced* interpretation, 464—its definition, 465—its characteristics, 469—its causes, 470.

— of Ps. xvi.—difficulties attending this Psalm, 53—Calvin's commentary, 53—views of Le Clerc and Rupert, 57—views of Rosenmueller and Gesenius, 59—of De Wette, 60—of Eusebius, 61 remarks on the *double sense*, 63—this Psalm prophetic of Christ, 65—the apostle Peter's quotation, 67—Paul's quotation, 69—view of Michaelis, 73—translation of the psalm, 75—its interpretation, 76—objections answered, 105.

— of Rom. viii. 18—25, 363—general design of the passage, 366.

— of the Song of Deborah and Barak, 568—the circumstances which gave rise to this song, 569—analysis of the song, 571—its translation, 572—remarks on its antiquity, 575—on its poetical rhythm, 578—notes on the translation, 579.

Isaiah, Ch. XL.—LXVI. See *Genuineness*.

Italian education, 182—universities, 183—duties of their professors, 184—*theol. literature*, 177—interpretation of the Scriptures little studied, 182.

J.

James I. takes part in the dispute between Arminius and Gomar, 252—burns the book of Vorstius, 252.

Jehovah, never written in Hebrew with the proper vowel-points, 738—pronunciation unknown, 739—a sacred mystery, 740.

Josephus, his testimony relative to the Jewish language in the time of Christ, 344, 542.

K.

Kant, notice of, 114—his proposed method of interpretation, 118.

KΥΠΙΟΣ, meaning of, 733—its classic meaning, 735—meaning in the Septuagint, 736—its senses in the N. Testament, 741—senses as applied to Christ, 745—as used by Paul, 755—results, 771.

L.

Language, its laws, 166—causes which effect a change, 333.

Language of Palestine, in the time of Christ; importance of this subject, 309—its bearing on the sources of interpretation, 310—origin of the belief in the Hebrew original of Matthew's gospel, 311—Greek language spoken by the Roman governors in Palestine, 541—the Jews permitted to compose books in this language, 543.

Lee, Prof. letter to the Editor, 780—letter to J. Scott, Esq. 783—prospectus of lectures, 781.

Lexicographers of the New Testament, must have a good acquaintance with exegetical learning, 562—also with the peculiar connexion between the Old and New Testament ideas, 564—must remember the history and age of a word, 689—must give a perfect exposition of its signification, 690—regard must be had to the anomalous use of words, 691.

M.

Maccabees, coins of, 331.

Megiddo, where situated, 598, 602.

Michaelis, his view of Ps. xvi. 72—his character of Le Clerc, 73.

N.

Neander, his merits as an ecclesiastical historian, 21.

O.

Oriental translation committee, objects and proceedings of, 194—oriental literature at St. Petersburg, 197.

Orphan house at Halle, 30.

Owen, Dr. views of regeneration, 285.

P.

Palestine, language of in the time of Christ, 539, 550—its character, 351—cities peopled with Greeks, 536, sq.

Palmyra, inscriptions at, 327, 532.
Paul, addresses the Jews in the later Hebrew dialect, 344, 546.
Persian manuscripts, at St. Petersburg, 197.
Plain of Esdraelon, 599.
Planck, Henry, notice of, 638—his *Essay de Indole*, etc. transl. 640 sq.
Poetry, Hebrew, character of, 508—improved by David, 510.
Predestination, Calvin's views of, 236—views of Arminius, 269, 293—difficulties respecting the views of Arminius, 270—danger of speculating on predestination, 295.
Prophets, knew the import of what they uttered, 144—differed in respect to their knowledge of the future, 520.
Psalms XVI. interpretation of, 51. See *Interpretation*.

R.

Ramus, when and where born, 231—attacks the philosophy of Aristotle, 231—accused of sapping the foundations of religion, 231—made royal professor of philosophy and eloquence at Paris, 231—massacred, 231.
Reinhard's Plan of the Founder of Christianity, 194.
Remonstrants, 251.
Romans VIII. 18--25, interpretation of, 363. See *Interpretation*.
Rosenmueller, his views of Ps. xvi. 59—Scholia in Proverbia, 190.
De Rossi, J. B. on the language of Christ, etc. 315.

S.

Sabbath, view of in Germany, 443.
Schleiermacher, Christl. Glauben, 193—*as a catechist*, 423—character of his writings, 780.
Simplicity of Interpretation, defined, 454.
Smith, Dr John Pye, letter to Prof. Stuart, 778—to the Editor, 779.
Song of Deborah and Barak, interpretation of, 568. See *Interpretation*.
Students. See *German Students*.
Sublapsarianism, 235.
Supralapsarianism, 235.
Synod of Dort, of whom composed, 253—debars the remonstrants from all attendance, 255—publishes the

result of its deliberations, 257—remarks respecting this synod, 258.

T.

Taanach, where situated, 598, 603.
Talmudists, their declaration concerning the language of Palestine, 348.
Targums, when prepared, 332—Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, 337—Aramaean Targums lie at the foundation of the Alexandrine version, 337—quoted by Christ and his apostles, 338—used by Josephus in the composition of his history, 339—reason why they were prepared, 350.
Testamentum Novum Graece, cur. Scholz. 190—cur. Knapp, Ed. 4ta. 192.
Theological Education in Germany, See *Germany*.
Theological Seminaries in Germany, 218, 626. See *Germany*.
Tholuck, notice of, 29—on Italian theological literature, 177—critique on the lexicons of Wahl and Bretschneider, 554—his view in respect to *κρίσις*, 380.
Tittman, J. A. H. notice of, 160, on grammat. accuracy of N. T. 160—simplicity of interpretation, 452—forced interpretation, 464.

U.

Universities. See *Germany*.

V.

Vossius on the language of Palestine, 313.

W.

Wahl, the superiority of his lexicon, 554—remarks on the logical arrangement of the new edition, 554—disadvantages of an unyielding adherence to system, 556—reference to the article *βασιλεία*, 557—his care in selecting proof passages from the classics, 559—remarks on his definition of *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 567.
De Wette, Translation and Commentary on the Psalms, 3d ed. 190.
Wiseman, notice of, 181—his *Horae Syriacae*, 181.

Z.

Zend-Avesta, 407.



32101 063584666

1950

1950

1950

