

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 3N4P 5

20 18

June 11

period
180

יהודה



3 0 11

174.55

~~157 11~~

~~155.87~~

====

174.55

S. A.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

CONDUCTED BY
EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D.

Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

VOLUME THIRD.

Nos. IX—XII.

ANDOVER :
FLAGG, GOULD & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS.
1833.

U

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

NO. IX.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. SOURCES OF HEBREW PHILOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY. By Prof. Gesenius, of Halle. Translated by the Editor.	1	ART. III. AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS. COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THEIR LIVES AND SYSTEMS. From Neander.	66
Introductory Notice	1	Translated by L. Woods, Jr.	66
1. <i>Usus Loquendi</i> of the Old Testament	3	Introductory Notice, by the Editor	66
2. Traditional Knowledge	5	Augustine and Pelagius	74
3. Kindred Languages	15	ART. IV. HINTS RESPECTING COMMENTARIES. By Prof. Stuart	130
ART. II. ON THE FORCE OF GREEK PREPOSITIONS IN COMPOUND VERBS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Prof. Tittmann, of Leipsic. Translated by the Editor	45	ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES.	186
		1. Slavonic Version of the Bible, in a letter from M. Kopitar	186
		2. American Works in press	186
		3. European Publications	187

NO. X.

ART. I. THE DOCTRINES OF PAUL AND JAMES RESPECTING FAITH AND WORKS COMPARED WITH THE TEACHING OF OUR LORD. From Knapp's "Scripta varii Argumenti." With an Appendix from Neander. Translated by W. Thompson	189	2. Name, Settlement, and early History	250
The Doctrines, etc.	189	3. Subsequent History	256
Appendix from Neander	220	4. Cities and Towns of Ancient Idumea	271
ART. II. CHRISTIANITY CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE PERFECTABILITY OF OUR MORAL BEING. From the "Archives du Christianisme." Translated by Rev. J. Wheeler. With additional Remarks	229	ART. IV. IS THE MANNER OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM PRESCRIBED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT? By Prof. Stuart	288
ART. III. SKETCHES OF IDUMEA AND ITS PRESENT INHABITANTS. From the Travels of Borchardt and Legh. With an Historical Introduction, by the Editor	247	1. Classical Use of <i>βαπτισμ</i>	288
Historical Introduction	247	2. Septuagint and Apocryphal Usage	306
1. General Situation and Extent of Idumea	248	3. New Testament Usage where not spoken of the Rite	309
		4. Does <i>βαπτισμ</i> necessarily imply immersion?	312
		5. General Usage in New Testament	312
		6. Circumstances attending Baptism	319
		7. Jewish Proselyte Baptism	338
		8. Baptism in the early Christian Churches	355
		9. Is the <i>Mode</i> of Baptism essential?	363
		ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES.	
		Gesenius' Hebrew and Latin Lexicon	391
		Other Works	392

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

NO XI.

ART. I. SKETCHES OF IDUMEA AND ITS PRESENT INHABITANTS. <i>Second Article.</i> From Burckhardt's "Travels in Syria, etc."	393	5. Collection and Arrangement . . .	463
ART. II. INTRODUCTION TO THE PSALMS. From De Wette. Translated by Prof. Torrey . . .	445	6. Inscriptions . . .	467
1. Poetic Character and Contents . . .	446	7. Rhythm and Music of the Psalms . . .	478
2. Origin of the Hebrew lyric Poetry . . .	450	8. Historical Interpretation . . .	514
3. Authors of the Psalms . . .	456	9. Exegetical Helps . . .	516
4. Earlier and later Character . . .	460	ART. III. HINTS TO STUDENTS ON THE USE OF THE EYES. By Edward Reynolds M. D. . . .	518
		ART. IV. AUGUSTINE ON THE ART OF PREACHING. Translated by O. A. Taylor . . .	509

NO. XII.

ART. I. SKETCHES OF IDUMEA AND ITS PRESENT INHABITANTS. <i>Third Article.</i> From the notes of Mr Legh . . .	613	MOON, JOSH. X. 12—15. From the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung." Translated by the Editor . . .	721
ART. II. GODHEAD OF THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. From Hengstenberg's "Christologie." Translated by Prof. Howe . . .	652	ART. VI. IMPORT OF THE NAME JEHOVAH. EXPOSITION OF EXOD. VI. 2, 3. By E. Ballantine, Instr. in Union Theol. Sem. . . .	730
ART. III. WANT OF AGREEMENT AMONG INTERPRETERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. <i>With a Critique on the Expositions of Matt. 5: 3—5.</i> By Prof. Tholuck, of Halle. Translated by the Editor . . .	684	ART. VII. DURATION OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM. By Prof. Mills . . .	748
ART. IV. DISCOURSE ON THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. By Eugene Bur nouf. Translated by the Editor . . .	707	ART. VIII. LITERARY NOTICES. Champollion—Wilken's History of the Crusades . . .	755
ART. V. ON THE STANDING STILL OF THE SUN AND		Bible Atlas—Codex Apocr. N. T.—Tittmann de Synon. N. T.—Wetstein's N. T. . . .	756
		Corpus Observationum N. T.—Olshausen's Comm. II.—Neander's History of the Apostolic Age . . .	757
		Schott's Chronology of Paul . . .	758
		Miscellaneous . . .	758
		INDEXES to Vol. III. . . .	761

CORRIGENDA.

- Vol. II. p. 772. l. 14, read *minutes* instead of *degrees*.
 " p. 776. l. 5, the same.
 Vol. III. p. 240. l. 10 fr. bott. read *found* instead of *founded*.
 " p. 241. l. 12, read *wisdom* instead of *medium*.
 " p. 242. l. 7, read *above* instead of *alone*.
 " p. 249. l. 24, read *hours* instead of *miles*. This will make the statement to be, that the mountainous tract of Idumea is from 25 to 35 miles broad.
 " p. 319. l. 3 fr. bott. read *Jesus* for *Johs*.
 " p. 320. l. 4, the same.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. IX.

JANUARY, 1833.

ART. I.—ON THE SOURCES OF HEBREW PHILOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY.

By William Gesenius, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. Translated from the German by the Editor.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

THE following article has been selected for publication in this work, as presenting the best condensed view extant of the whole subject on which it treats; including a particular account of all the Shemitish languages and dialects, and a critical review and estimate of their philology and general literature, and of the best aids for gaining an acquaintance with them. It may truly be regarded, as is said in the text, as an outline, and a valuable one, of the philological hermeneutics of the Old Testament. The object of the writer, however, having more particular reference to Hebrew lexicography, I have ventured occasionally in the notes to designate also the more important *grammatical* helps, in order that the reader may have the whole field at once before his view. And as it is often important for the student to know, whether the works referred to are accessible in this country, I have printed in *Italic* the titles of all those works which are found in the library of the Andover Theological Seminary; and which it will be seen constitute a very great proportion of the whole. In the notes, the references by figures are preserved, for the accommodation of those who may wish to compare the original.—The present dissertation was first prefixed by Gesenius to the second edition of his *Manual Hebrew and*

VOL. III. No. 9.

1

German Lexicon, Leipz. 1823; and again reprinted before the third edition of the same work, Leipz. 1828. It has never yet appeared in an English dress. EDITOR.

SOURCES OF HEBREW LEXICOGRAPHY.

THE object of this dissertation, which may be regarded as a concise sketch of the philological hermeneutics of the Old Testament, is to lead on the youthful philologist to the habit of independent investigation, by introducing him at once as it were into the workshop of Hebrew philology, and making him acquainted with all the instruments and helps by which he is to be aided in his progress.

When we examine the ultimate sources of our knowledge of the significations of Hebrew words, we find that they may properly be traced back to the following *three*:

I. The *usage of the Old Testament* itself, so far as this can be determined from the connexion of single passages, and the comparison of all those places in which a word or phrase occurs.

II. The *traditional knowledge* of the Hebrew language which has been retained by the Jews, and which is now to be sought, partly in the *ancient versions*, and partly in the *Jewish commentaries and lexicons*.

III. The comparison of the *kindred languages*, all of which, it is true, in the monuments of them now extant, are younger than the Hebrew of the Old Testament; but yet are in fact more copious than the Biblical Hebrew, and are either living languages, or have been grammatically and lexically* treated of by native grammarians, or at least are extant in several writers; so that in regard to the signification of words, there can be in them comparatively much less doubt, than in the Hebrew.

To make use of all these sources with critical judgment and with a correct estimate of the value of each; and, in the special

* I have ventured here and elsewhere to make use of the words *lexical* and *lexically*, as being regularly formed from the Greek *λεξικός*, just as *grammatical* comes from *γραμματικός*. The word *lexical* refers to the theory or principles on which a lexicon should properly be constructed; while *lexicographical* has reference to the application of this theory or these principles to practice, i. e. to the actual compilation of a lexicon. We can therefore speak of the *lexical* character and aspect of a language, in distinction from the *grammatical*; while the *lexicography* of a language is something quite different.—EDITOR.

cases where they sometimes are discordant with each other, to search out and establish the proper relation among them and also with the context;—this is the office and the duty of the truly learned lexicographer, who investigates for himself, and who then assuredly cannot rest satisfied with merely making use of his immediate predecessors.*

I. *Usus Loquendi of the Old Testament.*

If now we consider these three sources separately, the first, or the *use of the Bible itself*, is of the highest importance, and must necessarily constitute the basis of every lexicon. Indeed, this is entirely sufficient for determining the usage in respect to all words of frequent occurrence, whether they are found in the kindred dialects or not. It suffices also for the specification of the constructions and phrases which are formed with different words; and affords a multitude of fine philological observations, of which many an interpreter, who makes a great show with versions, has not the least idea. This source however must often fail the inquirer, when he seeks for the fundamental idea or for the etymology of words; where *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* and words of infrequent occurrence are to be illustrated, and the context leaves him in the lurch; to say nothing of the circumstance, that a knowledge of only one limited dialect, studied without connexion with the whole stock to which it pertains, can never admit of a vivid apprehension of the sense. To what results the exclusive or partial use of this source leads, is shewn by the lexicons of *Stock* and *Gusset*, which, partly on theological grounds, have been restricted to this source, because forsooth the Bible must be intelligible in and through itself; not to mention the by-paths into which Neumann and others¹ have in this manner fallen.

* Although every comparison must in some degree be lame, yet the task of illustrating philologically the Old Testament, has not inappropriately been compared with that which an interpreter of some monument of the ancient German language would undertake, e. g. of *Ulphilas* or of the *Nibelunglied*; where, besides the context and the connexion of the piece itself, he would have, on the one hand, the aid of ancient, though not cotemporary, and of course not entirely authentic, versions; and, on the other hand, would be able to compare all the modern languages which have sprung from the ancient German stock.

¹ Fabre d' Olivet, *Le Hebraïsme dévoilé*, Paris 1815, 16. 2 vols 4to.
—See the *Jen. Allg. L. Z.* 1818, No. 216, 217.

As helps for finding all the passages where a word, and also its forms and derivatives, occur, the following two concordances may be recommended: *Marii a Calasio* Concordantiae Hebraicae*, Romae 1621, and Lond. 1747-49, 4 vols. folio; and *J. Buxtorfii (patris) Concordantiae Bibliorum Hebraicae, cum praef. J. Buxtorfii fil.* Basileae 1632, fol. The first of these has a Latin translation along with the original passages; but has also the inconvenience, that the forms and derivatives of the same root are all mixed up together; while in Buxtorf the passages are arranged separately according to the order of the forms and derivatives,—a far more convenient method, which much facilitates consultation. The work of Calasio is a tolerably exact translation of the concordance of R. Isaac or Mordecai Nathan; that of Buxtorf is a remoulding of the same. The particles and proper names are wanting in both. For the particles we have: *Noldii Concordantiae Particularum Ebraeo-Chaldaicarum*, ed. Tympe, Jenae 1734, quarto; and for the proper names: *Lankisch Concordantiae Bibliorum Germanico-Hebraico-Graecae*, Leipz. and Frankf. 1696, folio,—where however the names are arranged according to the German orthography of Luther.

But besides the peculiarly important business of the philologist, to search out every where the most appropriate parallel passages, with reference to the meaning of words, to phrases, and to other constructions,† it will also be of use to take account of the following circumstances, in the philological observations to be drawn from the Bible itself.

1. The student will compare all those words which are either kindred or antithetic in their meaning, and will notice the analogous modifications of signification which are formed with them. Whoever, for instance, has observed, how to a Hebrew *wisdom* is very generally synonymous with *virtue* and *piety*, *folly* with *vice* and *impiety*, *sweet savour* with *good will*; and how the words for *righteousness* and *virtue* are used also for *deliverance* and *prosperity*; will be able clearly to apprehend a multitude of philological phenomena, and will easily cause many difficulties

* He was a Franciscan monk, and Professor of Hebrew at Rome.

† For this object the 'Hallische Bibel' of J. H. and C. B. Michaelis, as also their *Annotationes uberiores ad libros V. T. Hagiographos*, will render good service.

to vanish. In this respect, however, a comparison of the kindred dialects is productive of far more fruit.²

2. Let the inquirer make use particularly of those exegetically parallel passages, in which the sense of an obscure word is also expressed by one that is more known; especially when this is done by the same writer.³

3. In the poetical books, the parallelism of the members often gives a hint as to the meaning of obscure words; although this help must be employed with caution, because the parallel members are not always synonymous, but often contain only a similar or even a progressive sense.⁴

4. Observe carefully the individual *usus loquendi* of each writer, and explain it first of all from himself, and then from other writers who are most nearly related to him. Such kindred classes of writers are e. g. Job and the writings ascribed to Solomon; the Hebrew sections of Daniel and Ezra; the Chronicles and the book of Esther; the earlier prophets, Isaiah, Hosea, Micah, Amos; and again those who lived after the exile. In all this, however, it will be understood of course, that the results of critical investigation* are to be taken into the account; and the heterogeneous parts of one and the same book to be carefully distinguished.

II. Traditional knowledge of the Hebrew among the Jews.

As the second source of Hebrew philology, we have desig-

² Compare, in the lexicon of the author, the roots **נָבַל** and **נָבַח**; **בָּאֵשׁ**, **בָּשָׂם**, **בָּצֹדֵק** no. 6. Also of antithetic words, **יָטַב** and **טוֹב**, **יָרַע** and **רָוַח**, **מָצָא** and **חָטָא**, etc.

³ See e. g. **טְבוּר הָאָרֶץ** Judg. 9: 37, comp. **רְאֵשֵׁי הָאָרֶץ** v. 36, and Ez. 38: 12, comp. 6: 2. 33: 28. 35: 12. So **צָדֵק** *deliverance, salvation*, Ps. 132: 9, comp. **יָשַׁע** v. 16. **פְּלִגְשֵׁיָהֶם** *their paramours*, masc. Ez. 23: 20, comp. **מְאֻהָבֵיהָ** v. 5. **פְּחֻזֵּי דְהַמְלָךְ** Dan. 1: 5, 15, comp. **מְאֻהָבֵי** v. 10. That however there are cases, where parallel passages cannot be exegetically applied, is obvious; e. g. where a later writer has transcribed an earlier one, and has occasionally altered the sense. See the author's *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 37 sq.

⁴ The rabbins also have often misapplied parallelisms in this way. E. g. when they take **בְּרִמְלֵי** *Carmel*, Cant. 7: 6, for **בְּרִמְיָל** *crimson*, because of the parallel **אַרְגָּמָן** *purple*; so also **אַרְאָלָם** (parall. **מְלֻאָבִים**) Is. 33: 7, for *messengers* instead of *heroes*.

* *Die Ergebnisse der Kritik*; see the note in Vol. II. p. 552.—Ed.

nated above *Jewish tradition*, which is preserved, first, in the different ancient versions, and then, in the rabbinical commentaries and lexicons. In order to obtain a clear view of the nature of this tradition, so as to be able to assign to it a proper authority and consideration, we must here carefully distinguish the different periods and even parties, in and among which we find this traditional knowledge preserved. The period when the *Alexandrine* (and perhaps also the oldest Chaldee) version was made, falls so near, or even perhaps (so far as concerns the Pentateuch) coincides with, the time when the Hebrew was yet a living language, that we may properly suppose the translators to have been acquainted with the Hebrew idiom from the living intercourse of society, and not merely from the study of the Bible in the schools. Although the more ancient Hebrew was probably for the most part already supplanted in the mouth of the common people by the Chaldee and Greek; yet books were still often written in Hebrew, as the books of Daniel* and Sirach shew; and it was still known to all educated persons, as the language of the national literature.⁵ Hence we may explain the interesting circumstance, that the Alexandrine interpreters especially have often assigned to a Hebrew word a signification, which is no where actually found in the Bible, but which is found in the kindred languages, and even in the Arabic. Now since it cannot be supposed, that they derived it from a knowledge of these languages, and especially the Arabic, it is plain, that such significations are also Hebrew, and came to them by tradition.⁶ On the other hand, the student will not place too much confidence even in this comparatively purest tradition, when he considers that already in the latest books of the canon there are evident traces, how the ancient richness of the language had by degrees died away; and also much that was no longer clear and

* The author and some other critics, as is well known, place the composition of the book of Daniel as low down as the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. This view has been ably refuted by Hengstenberg in his late work: *Die Authentie des Daniel*, Berl. 1831.—Ed.

⁵ See *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 44, 79.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 78. A view of the significations which the Alexandrine translators have given to Hebrew words in different places, see in Kircher's *Concordantiae V. T. Graecae*, Frankf. 1607, quarto; in the *Index* at the end of *Tyrom's Concordance*, and in the *Lexicon Hebraicum* annexed to *Origenis Hexapla ed. Montfaucon*, II. p. 401 sq.

familiar even to a person who himself wrote Hebrew.⁷ To this also we must add, that just these earliest interpreters, viz. the Alexandrine, are often deficient in the requisite exactness in respect to grammar and orthography;⁸ as indeed it is a usual fact, that a conscientiously accurate and philological mode of treating a language and its monuments, is first introduced by study and observation after it has ceased to be a living tongue.

Such a mode of treatment in regard to the Hebrew, is found in a far higher degree, in the labours of the Jews of Palestine and Babylonia, who had already the aid of their own kindred dialect; and the *Chaldee* versions prepared by them, present us with that interpretation of the Hebrew text, which had been handed down by tradition in the Jewish schools, and upon which at a later period the authors of the vowel points and the Jewish grammarians have farther built. The conception of the sense exhibited in the earlier Targums is certainly in a good degree true and correct; although it is often hidden behind absurd paraphrases and interpolated later *theologoumena*.⁹—The *Syriac* version, the most literal of all the ancient translations now extant, and probably the work of a Syrian Christian, must be regarded more as a production of learned study, than of living tradition; and we find in it, along with a good degree of grammatical knowledge of the Hebrew and an occasional application of the *Syriac usus loquendi*, also an eclectic use of the Greek, and more seldom of the Chaldaic version.¹⁰ The same is the case with the *Latin* version of

⁷ See the remarks on certain passages of the Chronicles, *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 40 sq.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 79.

⁹ The Targums are found in the rabbinic Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf, and accompanied by Latin versions, in the *Polyglotta*. There are three of them on the Pentateuch; of Onkelos, (see *Winer de Onkelosi ejusque Paraphrasi Chaldaica*, Lips. 1820,) Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Targum of Jerusalem. On Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, there is none. The Targum on Chronicles was first published from an Erfurth manuscript by Beck, Augsb. 1680—83, 4to. and from a Cambridge manuscript by Wilkins, Amstelod. 1715, 4to. For the Targum of Jonathan on the prophets, see the author's *Commentary on Isaiah*, I. p. 65 sq. [See further on the Targums the American edition of Calmet's Dict. in octavo, art. TARGUMS, which is by the Editor; also the Chaldee Manual of Mr. Riggs, just published.—ED.]

¹⁰ A new edition of the Syriac version, with many, though not sufficient corrections and amendments, was published by Prof. Lee, Lond. 1823, 4to. [It is printed with great accuracy and beauty. See

Jerome; the basis of which lies in the instruction which he received from learned Palestine Jews, and the constant comparison of the LXX, as also of the other three Greek versions then extant, viz. of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.* In the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, which cannot have been made later than in the second century after Christ, the received interpretation of the sect of the Samaritans, which had been separated from the Jews from the time of Alexander, lies at the foundation; among whom, however, the student will in vain look for the philological accuracy of the Palestine Jews in the explanation, as well as for their critical scrupulousness in the preservation, of the original text.¹¹ That Onkelos was used in making this version, as is confidently affirmed, is ungrounded; while, on the other hand, this seems to have been the case in the Persian translation.¹²—The immediate Arabic versions also are not without value in this respect; among which the most ancient is that of *R. Saadias Gaon*, the first Hebrew grammarian, who died in A. D. 942. It covers, so far as it is yet known, the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and Job; and contains, along with the earlier tradition, much also which is the result of independent thought and study, though indeed often subtle and forced.¹³ It has been used in the still unprinted Samaritan-Arabic version of Abusaid.¹⁴ Among the latest labours of the Jews in translation, belongs the Moorish-Arabic version of the Pentateuch published by Erpenius,¹⁵ commonly known as the *Arabs Erpenii*; as also the

the *A. L. Z.* 1832, No. 4. On the character of the Syriac version, see *Hirzel de Pentateuchi Versionis Syriacæ indole, etc.* Zurich, 1825. *Comp. A. L. Z.* 1832, No. 5.—Ed.

* See Calmet *ibid.* art. VERSIONS.—Ed.

¹¹ *Winer de Versionis Pentat. Samar. indole Dissert. critico-exegetica*, Lips. 1817. The text is found in the *Paris and London Polyglotts*.

¹² *Rosenmueller de Versione Pentateuchi Persica*, Lips. 1813.

¹³ His version of the *Pentateuch* stands in the *London Polyglott* with Arabic letters and vowels; the manuscripts are written in the Hebrew character. That of *Isaiah* was published by *Paulus*, Jena 1790, 91, 8vo. That of *Job* is found in the Bodleian library at Oxford, Cod. Huntington. 511; Uri's Catalogue, Codd. orient. No. 45. Of this last I have taken a copy.

¹⁴ See De Sacy, in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscr. et des belles Lett.* T. XLIX.

¹⁵ *Pentateuchus Mosis Arabice*, Lugd. Bat. 1622. 4to.

tasteless Greek version probably of a Byzantine Jew, found in a manuscript in St. Mark's library at Venice, and called the *Græca Veneta*; which indeed will ever remain interesting enough for the history of interpretation.¹⁶ Of the mediate versions,* this of course is not the place to speak.

Let us delay for a while the progress of our discussion, in order to subjoin some remarks upon the use and value of these versions.

1. The first efforts of the interpreter must here, of course, be directed to obtain a correct understanding of the version itself,—a task for which the ways are by no means so well broken, as one would have expected. At the very outset, the lexical helps yet extant for the *Septuagint* are in the highest degree imperfect. The authors of them, while they often give only an incomplete account of what the Greek translator meant in his frequently obscure expressions, and seem scarcely to have thought of any scientific arrangement of the significations of a word, merely write out from the concordance the Hebrew words for which each Greek word stands; busy themselves with conjectures, how the translator came to render so or so; and not unfrequently, in order to bring about a correspondence, force upon the Greek word the meaning of the Hebrew one, and *vice versa*.¹⁷ As helps for the understanding of difficult passages,

¹⁶ The manuscript contains the Pentateuch, the writings of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel. The first has been published by C. F. Ammon, Erlang. 1790, 91, in 3 vols. 8vo. and the other books by Villoison, Strasb. 1784, 8vo.

* See the article VERSIONS in Calmet.—ED.

¹⁷ The most convenient concordance of the Septuagint is that of Tromm, pastor of Groningen, who died 1717. *A. Trommii Concordantiæ Græcæ Versionis vulgo dictæ LXX Interpretum*, Amst. et Traj. ad Rh. 1718, 2 vols. fol. It contains also the words from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and from the *Hexapla*, ed. Montfaucon. The earlier one of Kircher, (see note 6,) is principally arranged in an inverted order, i. e. according to the order of the Hebrew words. The order of Tromm is followed by the lexicon of J. C. Biel, under the title: *Novus Thesaurus philologicus, seu Lexicon in LXX et alios Interpretes et Scriptores apocryphos V. T. ed. Mutzenbecher*, 3 tom. 8vo. Hag. Com. 1779. It was however already finished in 1745. To this work Schleusner, Bretschneider, and Kreyssig have published supplements. The more recent work of Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philol. criticus, seu Lexicon in LXX cet. post Bielium et alios viros doctos edidit et con-*

recourse may also be had to the Scholiasts and Glossists, among whom some have particular reference to the LXX, as Cyril and Olympiodorus; but more especially to the commentators and writers of *Catenæ* in the Greek church, Eusebius, Theodoret, Cyril, Chrysostom, Procopius, and sometimes Jerome.—For understanding the *Chaldee* versions, the lexicon of *Buxtorf* leaves very much less to be desired.—As to the *Syriac* version, the understanding of it, or of single difficult words in it, already made business for the Syriac-Arabian philologists of the ninth century, as we shall see further on; and hence we may easily conceive, that our lexicons, drawn as they are in a very imperfect manner from those works, as well as the Latin translation of the Syrian version in the Polyglotts,* cannot every where present us with certain and authentic information.¹⁸ The *Arabian* versions of Saadias are sometimes rendered obscure by the *un-Arabic* Hebraizing style of them;¹⁹ but still more is the *Samaritan* version here and there marked by important difficulties, which have their ground indeed in the deficiency of other monuments of the Samaritan language, but yet might doubtless for the most part be removed, by a careful comparison and comprehensive knowledge of the other Aramaean dialects.

2. But the interpreter of these versions will also not unfrequently meet with *critical* difficulties, which have their source in the still very imperfect condition of the texts. That of the LXX, as is well known, is perhaps in the worst state of all; and the various readings given in the Oxford edition of Holmes

gressit J. F. S. 5 tom. 8vo. 1820, 21, is merely an enlargement and remodelling of Biel, and not a new work; and the whole former mode of treatment, so ill adapted to a lexicon, is retained. A far more appropriate arrangement is presented by Böckel, in his specimen of such a lexicon, containing the letter Z: *Novae Clavis in Graecos Interpretes V. T. ita adornatae, ut etiam Lexici in N. F. libros usum præbere possit etc. Specimen*, Lips. 1820. 4to.

* This was made by two modern Syrians, who resided at Paris, Gabriel Sionita and Abraham Echellensis.

¹⁸ The Arabic version, which, not only in Job and the prophets, but also in the greater part of the historical books, is drawn from the Syriac, is here not unfrequently of exegetical use for this its nearest source. See *Roediger de Arabicæ libror. V. T. historicorum Versionis origine et indole*, Halae 1828.

¹⁹ See the *Allgem. L. Z.* 1822, No. 155.

and Parsons,²⁰ as drawn from manuscripts and after-versions, lead us to the conviction, that after all the critical and uncritical revisions of this version, a restoration of the original text by means of the aids remaining to us, is scarcely possible; but yet that the Vatican Codex probably approaches comparatively the nearest to this. That also the other texts in the London Polyglott stand greatly in need of critical revision, and especially of a new collation of the manuscripts, is well known to all who have ever attempted such a revision;²¹ and it is therefore so much the more to be regretted, that the plan proposed some years since in England, of publishing a Polyglott corrected throughout from manuscripts, should have fallen to the ground.

3. In order to make the proper use of a version in particular instances, it is necessary for the student to obtain a complete view of its general character; so that he may not be led to regard mere arbitrary renderings, allusions to later times, or *quid pro quo's*, as authorities and sober explanations; and thus either build upon them as such, or at least feel perplexity in particular cases. It has for instance been thought strange, that the proper name מַלְאָכִי, *Malachi*, Mal. 1: 1, should be translated *my messenger*, and explained as referring to Ezra the scribe; while at the same time it has been overlooked, that the Targum of Jonathan very often treats proper names in this manner; e. g. 2 Sam. 17: 7. Is. 7: 3, 6.—In this particular respect, very much that is useful has been done by way of preparation in recent times.²²

4. Since it is a traditional interpretation which lies at the basis of the versions, their value of course as historical testimony rises with their antiquity, and sinks with their modernness. Here too we may distinguish in a measure two lines of tradition,—that of the Alexandrine, and that of the Palestine Jews. The coincidence of both these voices, testifies to a direct and consistent tradition.

²⁰ 'Vetus Testamentum Græcum cum variis Lectionibus.' T. I. ed. R. Holmes, Oxon. 1798. Tom. II—V. ed. Jac. Parsons. ib. 1820—27. Compare the *Allgem. L. Z.* 1816, No. 1 sq. 1832, No. 1 sq. Much may also be gained from the Hexapla-Syriac version; see *Middeldorff Cura Hexaplares in librum Jobi*, Vratisl. 1817.

²¹ See Prof. Lee on the Syriac version, in the *Classical Journal*, No. XLVI, p. 245 sq.

²² See, among other works, those referred to above in the Notes 9—12, and others by *Winer*, *Hirzel*, *Roediger*, (note 18.) etc.

5. What the student has to expect from the versions, and that exclusively, is information as to the *usus* of words, especially as to their signification in a particular place, and as to their general meaning, which is often expressed by other words. What the versions can never furnish, and what from their nature they never ought to furnish, is a specification of the primitive significations and etymology of words,—a species of knowledge which in general we must not look for in those ages. As exceptions to this remark, however, we may name Aquila, a few of whose fragments only are extant, and the Venetian translator; both of whom attempted to let a glimmer of the etymology be visible in their translations; somewhat as Schultens has attempted it in modern times.

At the point where the versions cease, begins, in the history of Jewish and biblical literature, the grammatical investigation and culture of the Hebrew language, and the compilation of lexicons and philological commentaries; and the merit of having here first broken the way, belongs to the Jews who spoke Arabic, in Babylon, Spain, and on the coast of Africa. The information which I have elsewhere²³ given on this subject, was not and could not be complete and authentic, because the most important works of all are yet unprinted; and therefore the following notices, written after having seen, examined, and in part made extracts from the manuscripts, may stand here as supplementary.

The earliest lexicographical attempt in respect to the Hebrew, of which we have any knowledge, comprises *seventy* difficult words, which the above-mentioned Saadias Gaon arranged together, explained briefly in Arabic, and compared with the Talmudic.²⁴—The first complete lexicon, which lies in manuscript at Berlin among other places, was composed by *Menahem ben Saruk* (מְנַחֵם בֶּן סָרֻק), in the beginning of the eleventh century. The chief merit of this work, however, consists in the collection and orderly arrangement of the roots, of which it presents the first example; and it is an interesting circumstance, that the biliteral roots, (so he calls the verbs לָה, עָל, עָר,) the trilateral, and the quadrilateral, are all placed by themselves. For exegesis he rarely presents any thing of importance; and draws conjectures

²³ *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 95 sq.

²⁴ The manuscript lies at Oxford; Cod. Huntington. No. 373. Uri's Catal. Codd. Mss. orient. Bibl. Bodleianae No. 485. Nicoll's Catalogue p. 7.

mostly from the connexion, or leaves it for others to draw them.²⁵ His labours are wholly unimportant in comparison with the excellent work, which the Spanish physician *Rabbi Jonah* (ר' יונה) as the Jews call him, or *Abulwalid Merwan ben Gannach* according to his Arabian name,²⁶ composed under the name of *Book of Roots*, and from which the afterwards more celebrated Kimchi has borrowed his best illustrations. In this lexicon, the traditional interpretation of the Jewish schools is indeed cited and used; but the author frequently breaks over the limits of this authority, and often makes a happy use of his own investigations and conjectures by the help of the Talmudic and Arabic,—the more happy indeed, because the latter was his native tongue; so that this rabbin may with strict propriety be regarded, as the forerunner of an Edward Pococke, Bochart, and Albert Schultens. Some few unimportant fragments have been published by Pococke and Schnurrer;²⁷ and to the more complete extracts which I have made from the original manuscript, I am indebted for several explanations given in my Hebrew lexicon, which will be recognized as a real addition to our lexical knowledge of the Hebrew. The explanations of

²⁵ Abulwalid quotes him under the word *תפארת*, and cites also a treatise by *Ben Librat*, which is probably a criticism or confutation of the work.

²⁶ The Jews who live among the Arabs have mostly two names, one Hebrew and the other Arabic; e. g. *יהודה זרינג* and *Abu Sacharya*; as also in the time of the Greek dominion they bore Hebrew and Greek names; e. g. *Jonathan* and *Alexander Jannaeus*; *Salome* and *Alexandra*. So also in France and Germany at present, the Jews have mostly each a Hebrew and German or French name; and this necessarily, according to the laws of Napoleon.

²⁷ The copy in the Bodleian library at Oxford, (Uri's Catal. Codd. orient. 456, 457,) was brought by Dr E. Pococke from the East, and often used by him in his commentaries on Hosea and Joel; see his *Theological Works*, Lond. 1740, 2 vols. fol. It is therefore strange that A. Schultens, who must have been ignorant of Pococke's writings, should say of this work: *Magno redemptum vellem opus quod sequentium Rabbiorum, quibus Arabica minus prompta erunt, livor pressit. Superasse tamen dicitur, et spes est, cum tempore emersurum. Orig. Hebr.* p. 290. At a later period Schnurrer made some extracts from it, but published very few of them; see his *Dissertationes philol. crit.* p. 46.—Some instances of the aid derived by the author from the work of Abulwalid, may be seen in his lexicon under the articles *תורר*, *תצור*, *תצור*, *תצור*, etc.

Judah ben Karish (ר' יהודה בן קריש), which are drawn from the same sources, are only systematically arranged, and are of similar value.²⁸ Both these last wrote in Arabic; in Hebrew, however, we have R. Salomo Parchon, (before 1161,) from whose works De Rossi has extracted the most important, but still not very valuable, glosses.²⁹ But among the learned Jews, R. David Kimchi³⁰ soon surpassed all others in renown, and has remained even to the present time the classical lexicographer of the Hebrew. This celebrity he has certainly deserved, by the skilful use he has made of his predecessors, and especially of those who wrote in Arabic. To those who can have access to no copy of this now rare lexicon, its place may be in some degree supplied by the lexicon of *Pagninus* in the edition of *Mercer*, which is a translation and remoulding of the work of Kimchi, and contains the quintessence of the rabbinic interpreters.³¹

Among the Jewish commentators, *Jarchi*, *Aben Ezra*, *Kimchi*, and *Tanchum* of Jerusalem, are the chief who occupy themselves with the explanation of words; though all these commentators have fixed with tolerable exactness the limits of the lexicon and of exegetical commentary, and in the latter are usually more brief with the lexical part, in order to gain room for the grammatical difficulties and the development of the sense. For characterising the three first it may be sufficient to remark, that

²⁸ See extracts by Schnurrer in *Eichhorn's Bibliothek*, III. p. 951 sq. Two copies of the whole manuscript are in my possession, that of Gagnier (in Arabic letters) and that of Schnurrer.

²⁹ 'Lexicon Hebraicum selectum, quo ex antiquo et inedito R. Parchonis Lexico novas et diversas rariorum ac difficiliorum vocum significationes sistit J. B. de Rossi, Parmae 1805, 8vo.' Most of the explanations are drawn conjecturally from the connexion; as indeed the Rabbins are very wont to do.

³⁰ His work appeared first at Naples, 1490. The Venetian edition of 1522, small folio, which is before me, bears a Hebrew title, and under it a Latin one: 'Thesaurus linguae sanctae, sive Dictionarium Hebraicum.'

³¹ אוצר לשון הקודש, h. e. *Thesaurus Linguae Sanctae, sive Lexicon Hebraicum*, auctore S. Pagnino Lucensi: nunc etc. recognitum opera Jo. Merceri, Antonii Cevalerii, et B. Cornelii Bertrami. Lugd. 1575, fol. 2 Tom. In the notes, the false translations of Kimchi's text by Pagninus are often corrected. [The copy of this work in the Andover library bears date *Colon. Allobrog.* i. e. Geneva, 1614. See *Wolf Hist. Lexicor. Heb.* p. 93.—ED.]

Jarchi is almost wholly a traditional-talmudic interpreter; Aben Ezra beyond comparison more independent, more free from prejudice, and of sounder judgment; Kimchi a more skilful grammarian and compiler.³² From Tanchum of Jerusalem, who flourished in the thirteenth century, we have also an Arabic commentary on the earlier prophets, i. e. the historical books, in manuscript at Oxford; from which Pococke and Schnurrer have selected and published specimens; and of which I have also through the latter a *fac-simile* and copy.³³

In order to read these Jewish interpreters with ease, whether they wrote in Hebrew or Arabic, some practice is certainly necessary; and especially the latter, whose manuscripts are all written with Hebrew characters, and contain many grammatical expressions which are not found in the lexicons. But the labour expended in this way does not often remain unrewarded. The hermeneutical value of these writers depends, in general, on the sources from which they draw, viz. tradition; Talmudic, Chaldaic, and Arabic usage; and the connexion: and then, in particular, it depends on the greater or less degree of sagacity and sound judgment in the individual; in which respect R. Jonah or Abulwalid holds the first place, while the so renowned Jarchi can properly claim only one of the lowest.

III. Kindred Languages.

The third, and indeed the most copious and important source of Hebrew lexicography, are the languages kindred with the Hebrew, usually denominated, (in the absence of any appropriate appellation already employed by earlier writers,) the *Shem-itish* languages; an acquaintance with which in a lexical respect, and particularly for the *etymological* part of our investigations, is indispensable; since the two first sources already treated of, afford for the most part only information, and that not complete, in respect to the *usus loquendi*. We shall give here, in the first place, some general historical notices in regard to these kindred dialects, having reference especially to the history and criticism of their lexicography; and then subjoin some remarks upon the proper use and application of them.

³² See the author's *Commentary on Isaiah*, I. p. 119 sq.

³³ 'R. Tanchum Hieros. ad libros V. T. Commentarii Arabici Specimen etc.' Tubing. 1791. 4to. Pococke intended to have published the whole; see his *Theol. Works*, p. 45.

The Shemitish stock of languages divides itself, in general, into three principal branches: *First*, the *Aramaeian*, which was anciently spoken in Syria, Babylonia, and Mesopotamia, and may be subdivided into the *Syriac* or *West Aramaean*, and *Chaldaic* or *East Aramaean*. Besides these, we have still some relics in the dialect of the *Samaritans*, *Zubians*, and of *Palmyra*, which also belong to the Aramaean branch.—*Second*, the *Canaanitish* branch in Palestine and Phœnicia. To this belongs the *Hebrew* of the Old Testament, with the few remnants of the *Phœnician* and *Punic* dialects; also the later Hebrew, or *talmudic* and *rabbinic*; which however is again intermingled with Aramaean.—*Third*, the *Arabic* language, of which the *Ethiopic* is an early secondary branch. Of both these again, there are later half corrupted dialects; viz. of the former the *Moorish* and *Maltese* dialects, and of the latter the *Amharic*.

1. We begin with the *Aramaeian* dialects, as the most simple, and in which also, next to the Hebrew, we possess the most ancient documents. The earliest trace of the Aramaean dialect in Mesopotamia, occurs in Gen. 31: 47; and even should this passage, as Vater assumes,³⁴ not demonstrate, that already in the time of the patriarchs a different dialect from that of Palestine was spoken in Mesopotamia, still it proves this with certainty for the time of the writer, whom we cannot place later than the time of David or Solomon.* During the captivity, the exiled Hebrews learned to speak the East Aramaean dialect, as the mother tongue of the kingdom of Babylon, and brought it back with them to their native land; where at first it only corrupted and gave an Aramaean tinge to the ancient Hebrew,³⁵ but afterwards entirely supplanted it. This was especially the case, when, under the Macedonic-Syrian dominion, new influences were superadded from other quarters. In Syria proper, at the same time, the Syriac language received an intermixture of Greek

³⁴ *Commentar über d. Pentat.* in loc.

* It is well known that Gesenius places the date of the composition of the Pentateuch, in the time above specified. This view however is ably refuted by Prof. Stuart, in the article published in the preceding number of this work. Vol. II. p. 688 sq.—Ed.

³⁵ At that time also many Aramaean words found their way into the ancient Persian dialects, but with Persian terminations. See them collected in *Von Bohlen's Symbolae ad interpretationem Sac. Cod. ex lingua Persica*, Lips. 1822. 4to. p. 10 sq.

words, which afterwards acquired and retained the right of citizenship.

The earliest document still extant in the proper *Syriac* dialect, is the version of the Old and New Testament, which most probably belongs to the end of the second century of the Christian era; about which time we find the Syrian literature in general to have been flourishing and productive.³⁶ It embraced chiefly the christian theological literature, such as biblical exegesis, doctrinal theology and polemics, martyrologies and liturgies; but also history, philosophy, and the natural sciences.³⁷ The Gnostic Bardesanes, a cotemporary of the Antonines, was the first writer of hymns; and Ephraem Syrus the most celebrated teacher and theologian in the orthodox church. It was chiefly Nestorians, however, who translated the Greek philosophers and physicians into their language; and in this way became afterwards, in the eighth century, the teachers of the Arabians. So late as in the thirteenth century, the Syrians had their last classical writer in Barhebraeus, (ob. 1286,) Jacobite *Maphrian* or suffragan bishop at Maraga; since which time the language has been ever more and more supplanted by the Arabic, until at last it has become limited to a few unimportant districts, and even here, e. g. in mount Lebanon, is more the language of books and of the learned, than the living language of a people.³⁸ The

³⁶ See *Hug's Einleit. in das N. T.* I. p. 364 sq.

³⁷ See *Ebedjesu Catal. libror. Chaldaicorum* (i. e. *Syriacorum*) in *Assemani Biblioth.* tom. II. Hoffmann has also given a concise history of the Syriac literature in *Berthold's Krit. Journal*, vol. XIV; and a more copious one in the Prolegomena to his *Grammatica Syriaca*, Hal. 1827. 4to.

³⁸ *Burckhardt's Travels in Syria and the Holy Land*, p. 22, 186. [The statement in the text would seem to be rather too restricted. Niebuhr remarks, (*Beschreibung von Arabien*, p. 91 sq. *Reisebeschreibung*, II. p. 352,) that the Syriac or Chaldee is still the vernacular language of the Syrian Christians in very many villages around Merdun and Mosul; and this is also supported by the statements of Brown in his *Travels in Africa, Egypt and Syria*, p. 405. *Volney* indeed contradicts the statement; but his authority is notoriously of very little value, in opposition to the well known conscientious accuracy of Niebuhr. The passing testimony of Burckhardt, as above cited, goes also to corroborate Niebuhr's statement. Hoffmann in his Prolegomena (l. c.) has endeavoured to overthrow the testimony of Niebuhr and Brown, by that of Volney, and by the fact that more recent travellers have not

manuscript treasures of the Syriac literature are great; the most of which are preserved in the library of the Vatican; and from these J. S. Assemani has published extracts of very great importance.³⁹ But of all these treasures, comparatively very little has been printed.⁴⁰

Of particular importance for our object, is the origin of the ancient native lexicons, with which we must be well acquainted, in order to judge correctly and fully of those which are now extant. The need of such helps was principally felt for the first time in the ninth and tenth centuries; during which period, under the first Abassides, many heads and hands were busied with

mentioned the circumstance. In 1831, Messrs. Smith and Dwight, American missionaries, in their tour through Armenia, visited a number of villages of Syrian Christians in the neighbourhood of Tebriz, among whom *the Syriac is still the common and vernacular language*. They found there also an intelligent monk, a native of Mesopotamia, who assured them that this was also the vernacular language of his own country, and gave them information entirely corresponding with the statements of Niebuhr. The language is still written with the Syriac character; and Messrs. Smith and Dwight obtained copies of several religious tracts, which were said to be all the modern literature existing in the language. These are now in the hands of Mr Smith, in this country; and the Editor hopes to receive from him farther information on this interesting subject, to be communicated to the public through this work.—That this language has sometimes been called the *Chaldaic*, is probably to be accounted for, as Mr Smith suggests, from the fact, that many of the Syrian Christians having gone over to the Roman Catholic communion, the pope constituted them into a separate religious community, and gave them the appellation of the *Chaldee church*, of which there is, in the same sense, a *Chaldee patriarch*; and for the same reason they now give this name to their language.—ED.

³⁹ J. S. Assemani *Biblioth. orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, 3 tom. in 4 vol. fol. Romae 1719–25.

⁴⁰ The most important printed works are the following: *Barhebraei Chronicon ed. Bruns et Kirsch, Syr. et Lat.* Lips. 1789. 2 tom. 4to. with which, however, the numerous corrections of the text and translation must be used, which have been made by Lorsbach, Arnoldi, F. G. Mayer, and Bernstein; those of the last from a new collation of the manuscripts. *S. Ephraemi Syri Opera Omnia*, Rom. 1737. 6 tom. fol. of which the three first volumes contain the Syriac works, and were edited by *Petrus Benedictus*. ‘Steph. Ev. Assemani *Acta Martyrum orient. et occidentalium.*’ 2 partes, Romae 1748. fol.

translating scientific works into Arabic, chiefly those which had been already translated from the Greek.⁴¹ Since, at the same time, many words and passages of the Syriac version of the Bible had become unintelligible to common readers, (as is in some degree the case with the English version, and still more with that of Luther,) theologians occupied themselves with explaining them, and sometimes arranged their illustrations in the manner of a lexicon, in which they borrowed the explanations from the works of earlier ecclesiastical teachers. Out of such preliminary labours by Bar Serushwoi,⁴² Isa Almerwesi,⁴³ Honain ben Isaac,⁴⁴ and others, were afterwards compiled the works still extant of the two lexicographers Isa ben Ali and Abulhassan Bar Bahlul. The first was a Nestorian physician at Bagdad, celebrated for his knowledge of diseases of the eye, and an immediate pupil of Honain ben Isaac.⁴⁵ His work is shorter than that of Bar Bahlul, but compiled with more precision. The manuscripts of it, however, differ exceedingly; since many of them contain the very important additions of Abraham Diaconus.⁴⁶ The work of Bar Bahlul,⁴⁷ who flourished about 965, is far more copious, and brings together with great diligence, but less judg-

⁴¹ See Abulpharag. Hist. Dynast. p. 246 sq. also the article 'Arabische Literatur' in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopaedia.

⁴² He was bishop of Hirta about A. D. 900, and wrote Questions on the biblical text and a Vocabulary of the same with Arabic explanations. See *Assemani Biblioth. Orient.* III. i. p. 261. II. p. 287.

⁴³ Author of a Syriac lexicon; *Assemani* l. c. III. i. p. 258.

⁴⁴ A very celebrated Christian physician, and the translator of numerous works from the Greek and Syriac into Arabic; see Abulpharag. Hist. Dynast. p. 263 sq. Casiri Bibl. Escorial. I. 286.

⁴⁵ See the Biography of Arabian Physicians by Ibn-Oseibe; Oxf. Mss. Cod. Pococke 356. fol. 138, or Cap. X. No. 36.

⁴⁶ The proof of this is found in the preface of an Oxford manuscript, Cod. 119 in Uri. There are four manuscripts of this work at Oxford, (Uri No. 119-22,) one at Paris, and one at Leyden; of which last there is a bad transcript at Göttingen, which J. D. Michaelis made some use of in his notes to *Castell*.

⁴⁷ See *Assemani Bibl. Orient.* III. i. p. 201. Casiri Bibl. Escorial. I. p. 261. At Oxford there are two manuscripts of this work; one in which the Arabic is written with the *Neski* character, and the other in Syriac (Carshôn) letters. A manuscript of this last kind, and probably written by the same transcriber, is at Cambridge.

ment, the different versions and explanations which earlier translators and lexicographers had given of Syriac words. From the fact that these views are often so contradictory and fluctuating, one sees that the knowledge of the signification of many Syriac words was already lost. In both works the significations are expressed partly by easier Syriac words, and partly in Arabic. The arrangement is strictly alphabetical, so that even the futures, participles, etc. must be sought for under ܕ and ܡ. The Arabic in the manuscripts is commonly written with the Syriac (Carshûn) letters. From these works Castell has drawn the Syriac part of his *Heptaglotton*,* so far as it is not vouched for by passages from the Bible; but not without frequent and important misapprehensions of his sources;⁴⁸ which moreover have already had mediately an injurious influence on Hebrew philology. The lexicons of Ferrarius and Thomas a Novaria⁴⁹ are also drawn from such domestic vocabularies, and from the oral instruction of Maronites at Rome. But there is still wanting a Syriac lexicon in which we may put entire confidence, drawn from the perusal of the Syrian writers themselves, but still with a renewed and careful use of those earlier lexicographers; such an one, in short, as Lorsbach⁵⁰ had in preparation, and as is now promised by Quatremère and Bernstein. For the New Testament alone, we possess a very complete lexicon in the work of Schaaf.⁵¹

It is however a mistaken hope, which has been occasionally expressed, that, by the complete publication of these native lexicons, a greater and hitherto unknown richness and copious-

* Afterwards published separately, with some corrections, by J. D. Michaelis, Götting. 1787, 88. 4to.—ED.

⁴⁸ Many similar errors exist also in the Samaritan part of the *Heptaglotton*; and still more in the Arabic part, of which below. See the author's *Anecdota Orientalia*, Fasc. I. Lips. 1824.

⁴⁹ Jo. Bapt. Ferrarii (e. soc. Jesu) Nomenclator Syriacus, Romae 1622. 4to. Th. a Novaria Thesaurus Arabico-Syro-Latinus, Romae 1636. 8vo.

⁵⁰ Very valuable contributions, containing especially illustrations from the Persian, see in his *Archiv für morgenl. Literatur*, Part 1 and 2. Lorsbach's copy of *Castelli Lex. Syr. ed. Michaelis*, with numerous additions and notes, is now in the library at St. Petersburg.

⁵¹ *Car. Schaaf Lexicon Syriacum Concordantiale*, Lugd. Bat. 1709. 4to.

ness of the Syriac language would be disclosed. They contain comparatively very little of genuine Syriac philological treasures, which the published lexicons do not already possess; inasmuch as they occupy much room in the explanation of Greek words. On the other hand, through the critical use of all these glossaries, our knowledge of the language would be *corrected* in an important degree; although it must not be overlooked, that they are themselves not always infallible witnesses.*

The *Chaldee* or *East Aramaean*, the mother tongue of the Babylonian empire and of the later Jews, is known to us only through the written works of Jewish authors; on which account it is here and there mixed with Hebraisms. This is the case particularly in the Chaldee sections of the books of Daniel and Ezra † but less so in the numerous Targums or versions of the Bible. At any rate, however, the Chaldee maintains the right of an independent dialect; and is not to be regarded, as some have supposed, merely as a mixture of the Hebrew and Syriac. In its general character, it approaches nearest to the Hebrew, even in pronunciation; and is indispensable for the interpretation of the later biblical writers, on whom it exerted a strong influence. The grammar of the language is simpler and has been less copiously treated of than that of the Hebrew; ‡ but in a

* A diligent use of these original lexicons appears in the writings of Lud. de Dieu, Adler, Bernstein.—[The chief *grammatical* helps for learning the Syriac, are the following: *H. Opitii Syriasmus*, Kiel, 1691. 4to. *C. B. Michaelis Syriasmus*, Hal. 1741. 4to. *J. D. Michaelis Gramm. Syriaca*, Hal. 1784. 4to, a new edition of the preceding work, with improvements. *Jahn Elem. Aram. Lat. red. et auxit Oberleitner*, Viennae 1820. *Hoffmann Grammatica Syriaca*, Hal. 1827. 4to. nominally an enlarged edition of Michaelis; but in fact a new and complete work. *Uhlemann Elementarlehre der Syr. Sprache*, Berl. 1829, a neat and very useful compend. The Chrestomathies, all of which have also glossaries, are those of *Michaelis*, Gott. 1783—86; *Kirsch*, Leipz. 1789; *Grimm*, Lemgo 1795; *Hahn*, Leipz. 1825; and *Oberleitner*, Vienna 1826—7. This last is the most complete.—EDITOR.

† Where e. g. the occurrence of *Hophal*, the plural ending ܢܢܢܢ, the orthography ܢܢܢܢ for ܢܢܢܢ as feminine ending, are Hebraisms.

‡ The following are the chief *grammatical* works on the Chaldee: *H. Opitii Chaldaismus etc.* Kiel 1696. 4to. *J. D. Michaelis Grammatica Chald.* Gott. 1771. 8vo. *G. B. Winer Grammatik der bibl. u. targum. Chaldaismus*, Leipz. 1824. The principal Chrestomathies are those of *Bauer*, Nurenb. 1792; *Jahn*, Vienna 1800; *Grimm*, Lemgo 1801; *Wi-*

lexical respect it is perhaps not behind the latter. In Buxtorf's lexicon we possess a very laborious and, for the most part, sufficiently extensive help of this kind.⁵³

The Samaritan dialect has come down to us only in the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, and in a small number of Samaritan hymns. It agrees most nearly with the Jerusalem dialect of the Chaldee; but has also, in common with the adjacent Galilean dialect, the arbitrary interchange of the guttural letters, (which were all pronounced alike and soft like *ם*,) and exhibits much more of Hebraism than the Chaldee. This dialect has had great influence upon the readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch,* and a multitude of these readings exhibit genuine Samaritan forms; whence a knowledge of this dialect is indispensable to the understanding of this recension and its various readings. The lexical compilations of J. Morinus and of Castell in his *Heptaglott*, are neither complete in themselves, nor given with sufficient critical skill; and although the latter made use of the manuscript poems (*Liturgia Damascena*) now in the British Museum, still this was not done with the requisite care; so that these, as well as the Pentateuch, still present a rich field to be gleaned.⁵⁴ The text is without vowels, and is perhaps pronounced most correctly in the Chaldaic manner.†

ner, Leipz. 1825. But the most complete work on Chaldee grammar is that recently published in this country by Mr. Riggs: *The Chaldee Manual*, Andover 1832. This work contains also a chrestomathy, (including the biblical Chaldee,) with notes, and a full glossary.—ED.

⁵³ J. Buxtorfi *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum*, Basil. 1640. folio.

* That is, the Hebrew Pentateuch preserved by the Samaritans, and written in their character; not the Samaritan version. On this Pentateuch see *Gesenii de Pent. Sam. origine, indole, et auctoritate Com.* Hal. 1815. 4to. A review of this treatise by Prof. Stuart is contained in the preceding number of this work, vol. II. p. 681.—The principal grammatical aid for learning the Samaritan, is *C. Cellarii Horae Samaritanæ*, Frankf. 1705. 4to.—ED.

⁵⁴ The most important of these poems have been published by the author, with notes, under the title: *Anecdota Orientalia*, Fasc. I. Lips. 1824. [See the notice by Prof. Stuart in the preceding number of this work, vol. II. p. 722.—ED.]

† An instance of the illustrations to be drawn from the Samaritan, may be seen in *יָקִים*, *what lives and moves*, from *יָקִים* in Sam. *to live*, kindred with *to stand firm, exist, be*.

But in this arbitrary interchange of the guttural letters, the Samaritan is far exceeded by the *Zabian* dialect, i. e. the dialect in which the religious books of the Zabians, Nazaraeans, Mendaeans, or Christians of St. John, are written. These writings, which contain Gnostic, mythic, and philosophical speculations, similar to the *Zend-Avesta*, are indeed, in their present shape, in part younger than the rise of Islamism; but still the language, as well as the ideas and historical allusions, point to an earlier origin of the principal contents, and would seem to belong at least in the earliest centuries of the Christian era. The peculiarities of the dialect may be explained, by assuming the rise of the sect to have been, according to their own tradition, in Galilee, and under the Chaldee jurisdiction. Besides the interchange of the gutturals, there are also in this dialect numerous exchanges of other letters, and likewise transpositions.* The forms are now Syriac, now Chaldaic; and then again the idiom is peculiar. Many words have also been adopted from the Persian. These writings are important in behalf of our lexical investigations, because of their very considerable extent and compass; but the inaccuracy of the language and orthography renders it difficult to understand them; especially, since in those works already printed, the requisite care and exactness has not every where been applied. Their written character has this peculiarity, viz. that the vowels stand as vowel letters in the text; but in the printed works this has been restored to the analogy of the Syriac.⁵⁵

* E. g. the exchange of ג and כ, ר and ז, ב and ט, ל and ר. Transpositions, as ירד for ירל *to bear*, לגרא for רגלא *foot*, etc.

⁵⁵ Of the five books, *Diwan*, Book of Adam, Book of John, *Kho-lasteh*, Book of the Zodiac, only the second has been published in full: *Codex Nasaraeus, liber Adami appellatus, Syriace transcriptus Latineque redditus a Malth. Norberg*, 3 tom. Lond. Gothor. 1815-16. 4to. To this belongs: *Lexidion Codicis Nasaraei*, 1816, and *Onomasticon Codicis Nasar.* 1817. 4to. Compare the *Jen. A. L. Z.* 1821, No. 14.—Of the third treatise, Lorschach has published and very learnedly illustrated single extracts, in *Stäudlin's Beyträge zur Philos. u. Gesch. der Rel. u. Sittenlehre*, Th. 5, and in his own *Museum für bibl. u. morgen b. Lit.* Bd. I. St. 1.—For the historical relations of the sect, and for the dialect, see the *Jen. A. L. Z.* 1817, No. 48 sq. and the *Probeheft zur Ersch and Gruber's Encyclop.* art. *Zabier*.—Some examples of interesting illustrations presented by this dialect, may also be seen in the author's lexicon, under the articles גברא, גברד, גברד, גברש, גברש, גברש, etc.

The *Palmyrene* dialect is, with small deviations, Syriac; but is written with letters similar to the Hebrew square character, which stands about in the same relation to the Palmyrene, as a square engrossing hand does to a running hand. The inscriptions in this dialect upon the ruins of Tadmor or Palmyra in Syria, which are partly accompanied by Greek translations, and extend from the period just before the birth of Christ into the third century, are not in themselves sufficiently numerous and important, and are not in all cases copied and explained with sufficient accuracy, to furnish any extensive philological booty. The names of the Syrian months (אלול, טבת) which occur in them, and the different epithets of Baal, are probably the most important instances.⁵⁶

2. To the second, or *Canaanitish* branch of the Shemitish stock, belong, besides the Hebrew itself, the Phœnician and Talmudic dialects.

The *Phœnician*, to judge from the inscriptions and single words which have been read with certainty, corresponds, a few unimportant deviations excepted,* with the Hebrew. But the orthography has this peculiarity, that the vowel letters ו and י, when they quiesce, are usually omitted; a circumstance which may be regarded as a relic of the most ancient orthography.⁵⁷ The monuments of this dialect, however, which are now extant, are not very ancient. The comparatively more important inscriptions belong in the time immediately before Christ; to judge from the form of the Greek letters in those which are bilingual, and from the mythological allusions; while the coins

⁵⁶ Two of these inscriptions have been brought to Oxford, and there accurately copied in Chandler's *Marmora Oxoniensia* No. X, XI; and thence also in *Kopp's Bilder u. Schriften der Vorzeit*, II. p. 251, 257. A collection of the whole is found in Robert Wood's *Ruins of Palmyra*, Lond. 1753. fol. For the reading and explanation of these inscriptions, the path has been broken by Barthelemy, 'Reflexions sur l' alphabet et sur la langue dont on se servoit autrefois à Palmyre,' Paris 1754. 4to. and by Swinton in the *Philosophical Transactions*, vol. XLVIII. where they are also copied.

* E. g. that the article is often written with א instead of ה, as in Arabic; and also some Aramaean words.

⁵⁷ See the author's *Lehrgebäude* p. 51. *Hartmann's O. G. Tychsen oder Wanderungen etc.* II. i. p. 277 sq. On the analogy of the Arabic, see Adler's *Descript. Codd. Cuficor. Hafniae* 1780. p. 28 sq.

belong to the period of the Seleucidae and Romans; e. g. the Tyrian coins, so far as they have dates, between B. C. 166 and A. D. 153.⁵⁸ It will be readily conceived, that these remains, which present such difficulties in a palaeographical respect, stand beyond all comparison more in need of the aid of the Hebrew *usus loquendi* for their explanation, than they are adapted to afford any illustration of the biblical idioms; and it might almost seem, as if they deserved here no place. Nevertheless, it is also conceivable, that an obscure word in the Bible may occur in an inscription in some connexion which shall cast light upon the biblical passage; and such in fact is in several instances the case.*

But the most nearly related to the biblical Hebrew is the *Talmudic* idiom, especially in the first and earliest part of the Talmud, the Mishna; which, it is true, was first reduced to its present form in the third century after Christ, (about A. D. 190 or 220,) but is in part composed of elements which are much older. It cannot well be doubted, that much of the ancient Hebrew idiom has been retained in it; and not a few difficult words of the Bible are very happily illustrated from it.⁵⁹ The

⁵⁸ The earlier literature respecting the monuments of the Phœnician dialect is found quite complete in *Hartmann* l. c. To this have since been added: *Kopp Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit*, I. p. 197 sq. II. p. 178 sq. Comp. the *Jen. A. L. Z.* 1820. No. 39. H. A. Hamacker 'Diatribæ philol. crit. aliquot monumentorum Punicor. nuper in Africa repertorum interpretationem exhibens etc.' Lugd. Bat. 1822. 4to. Also several smaller treatises by *Münter*, *Lindberg*, and others; comp. the *A. L. Z.* 1825, No. 64. Some of the author's own attempts at deciphering inscriptions and the legends of coins, are published in the *A. L. Z.* 1825, No. 63, 64. and 1826, No. 110, 111. A treatise containing a review of the most important monuments of the Phœnician language in a palaeological and philological respect, together with attempts at deciphering and a critical catalogue of letters and words already derived from this source, and communicating also some other monuments as yet unknown, now lies nearly ready for the press. A catalogue of Phœnician words derived from earlier documents, but which may now be augmented nearly three fold, see in the *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 227 sq.

* For one instance, see the article *רָמַן* in the author's lexicon.

⁵⁹ See the articles *אָבֵס*, *אָשְׁפָה*, *בְּאֲשִׁים*, *גְּבַעַל*, *דְּדָה*, etc. in the author's lexicon. The *Mishna* has been most capably published by *Surenhusius*, (Amst. 1698-1702. 6 tom. folio,) with a Latin version

antiquity of the earlier talmudic dialect appears from this circumstance among others, that a multitude of words in the Talmud were not less obscure to the learned rabbins of the middle ages, than the biblical glosses; so that they were obliged to compile lexicons and commentaries upon it, in which they also often made use of the Arabic language with great advantage.⁶⁰ The younger portions of the Talmud are much less to be confided in; here the tradition appears less pure; and in the age when they were written, the learned Jews were most of all estranged from a genuine literal interpretation.⁶¹ In this and in

and the commentaries of *R. Moses Maimonides* and *R. Obadias de Bartenora*; as also single tracts of more recent commentators, among whom *Guisius* is by far the most learned, and has often made good use of the Arabic. On the philological use of the Mishna for Hebrew lexicography, see *A. T. Hartmann's Supplementa ad Gesenii Lex. Heb. e Mishna petita*, Rostochii 1813. Compare also his *Thesauri Ling. Heb. e Mishna augendi*, P. I.—III. ib. 1825, 26. 4to.

⁶⁰ The most celebrated lexicon of the Talmud is the *Arùch*, (הערך) the alphabetically arranged book, by Nathan Bar Jehiel of Rome (ob. 1106), with the additions of Mussaphia (ob. 1674), and which has quite recently been published, with notes, by M. J. Landau, under the title: 'Rabbinisch-Aramäisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch,' Prague 1819—24. 5 vols. Buxtorf indeed made use of this lexicon, (see note 53 above,) but did not thereby render it superfluous.—A very important work is the still unpublished lexicon of R. Tanchum of Jerusalem, 'alMorshid,' in three manuscripts of the Bodleian library, Uri's Catal. p. 91, 93, 94. It explains difficult words in Arabic, and often refers back to the Bible. *Guisius* alone, in his notes on several talmudic tracts, has often made use of it.

⁶¹ The *Gemara*, which is an explanation and enlargement of the *Mishna*, is divided into the shorter one of Jerusalem, which is not fully complete and was composed about A. D. 230—270, or according to others nearly a century later,—and the much later and more prolix one of Babylon, compiled in the sixth century. The former is less esteemed by the later Jews, and has therefore been less frequently printed, viz. at *Venice*, fol. without date; *Cracow* 1609 fol. *Dessau* and *Berlin* 1743 and 1757. fol. Of the latter there have been ten editions, among which that of *Amsterdam* 1644, 12 vols. sm. folio, and that of *Frankfort on the Main*, 1715 sq. are the most highly esteemed. See *Wolf's Biblioth. Heb.* II. p. 895 sq. *Schöttgen de Messia* p. 839. The latest edition is that of *Vienna* 1806, 12 vols. fol.—The dialect of the two Talmuds is also different; the first being composed in the dialect of Jerusalem, and the latter in that of Babylon.

the *Rabbinical* dialect,—a learned language, founded on a basis of ancient Hebrew and Chaldee, and so adapted as to meet the necessity of treating on many subjects unknown to the ancient Hebrews, as grammar, philosophy, etc.—it often happens, that infrequent biblical words are employed in significations which the rabbins attribute to them from mere conjecture, and not seldom incorrectly enough;* and there is certainly reason here to be distrustful.⁶²

3. But the most important by far of all the languages kindred to the Hebrew, and in every respect the most fertile source of Hebrew etymology and lexicography, is the *Arabic*, one of the richest and most cultivated, and also in its literary history one of the most important, languages in the world.⁶³ We know however only the northern and principal dialect [of the Koreish], which prevailed in the region of Mecca, and which, being elevated by Mohammed to the language of books and the universal dialect of the people, has entirely supplanted the southern or Hamyaric dialect; unless indeed this latter, as is very probable, is for the most part preserved in the Ethiopic language. The Arabic literature, and consequently our knowledge of the language, commences shortly before Mohammed,⁶⁴ with numerous speci-

* Some examples of a false apprehension of biblical words, which have passed over into the idiom of the Talmud and of the rabbins, are the following: רִגְלִים *festival*, from Ex. 23: 14, where וְשַׁבְּתָה רִגְלֵיךָ signifies *three times*; תְּרֵצְנִים *grape-kernels*, instead of *unripe grapes*, according to the Samaritan, Arabic, and the etymology; בְּזָדָה *louse*, instead of *gnat*; and especially the names of countries, as אֲשַׁכְּזִי *Germany*, סְפַרְדַּי *Spain*.

⁶² This distrust, however, is carried too far by Michaelis, in his *Beurtheilung der Mittel die ausgestorbene Heb. Sprache verstehen zu lernen*, § 40, 41.

⁶³ The more copious details of what can here be merely hinted at, as also the proofs, may be seen in the author's articles 'Arabische Sprache' and 'Arabische Literatur,' in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopaedia. Compare also the literary histories of Eichhorn, Wachler, and others. The printed works in Arabic literature, up to 1811, are collected in Schnurrer's *Bibliotheca Arabica*, Hal. 1811; but this work needs now a large supplement, as the study of Arabic has greatly flourished since that time. But far more extensive and important works still lie concealed from the public eye, unprinted, in the libraries.

⁶⁴ Against the hypothesis of Arabic poems reaching back to the age of Solomon, see De Sacy in the *Mémoires de Literature*, tom. L. p. 247 sq.

mens of highly original and genuine popular poetry, of various contents; the shorter of which are contained in the collection called the *Hamâsa* ;* while seven larger ones bear the name of *Moallakât*.† These were soon followed by the *Koran* itself, which veneration towards the prophet soon elevated to the rank of the loftiest model of language and of poetry; and also by a number of elegant poets, who are as yet least of all known to us. After the earliest Abassides and the building of Bagdad in the ninth century, the national literature assumed also a scientific character. This latter literature grew up in a foreign soil; and contains treatises upon philosophy, mathematics, and the natural sciences, partly translated from the Greek, and partly imitated after Greek models. The christian literature of the Arabians, viz. the different versions of the Bible by Jews and Christians, may also here be mentioned. The strictly national literature of the Arabians, however, consists of an extensive series of poets, grammarians, rhetoricians, historians, and geographers, which does not close until the fourteenth century. The poetry, which has partly a lyrical character, and partly wears the external form of prose, was often in the hands of the grammarians; a circumstance which indeed often gives it a more learned and laboured form and manner, but at the same time

* Extracts from the *Hamâsa* were published by *A. Schultens* in his work: *Monumenta vetustiora Arabiae etc.* L. B. 1740. Some of these are also appended to the editions of the *Arabic Grammar of Erpenius*. But the most complete and perfect edition is the following: *Hamasae Carmina cum Tebrizii Scholiis*, ed. *G. W. Freytag*, Tom. I. *Textus*, Bonnæ 1828. 4to. A second volume is promised, to contain a Latin version and notes.—EDITOR.

† That is, *the suspended*; because, it is said, on account of their peculiar excellence, they were inscribed upon fine linen in letters of gold and suspended at the gate of the temple at Mecca. The names of the authors, in the order in which they are usually ranged in the manuscripts are, *Amralkeis*, *Tarafa*, *Caab ben Zoheir*, *Lebid*, *Antara*, *Amru*, *Hareth*. They have all been published separately in the following editions, of which the more recent ones are accompanied by scholia, and are the best: *Amralkeis*, by *Lette*, L. B. 1748; by *Hengstenberg*, Bonn 1823. *Tarafa*, by *Reiske*, L. B. 1742; by *Vullers*, Bonn 1829. *Zoheir*, by *Lette*, L. B. 1748; by *Rosenmüller*, Leipz. 1792, and again in his *Analecta Arabica*, Pars II, Leipz. 1826; by *Freytag*, Hal. 1823. *Lebid*, by *Peiper*, Bresl. 1828. *Antara*, by *Wilmet*, L. B. 1826. *Amru*, by *Kosegarten*, Jena 1819. *Hareth*, by *Vullers*, Bonn 1827.—EDITOR.

increases its value to the philologist. In history and geography, the style and manner are simple, often indeed careless; and the whole wears rather the character of compilation.

For our purpose, it is particularly important to become acquainted with the lexical works upon the Arabic language, compiled by native grammarians; and with the manner in which our modern lexicons have been derived from them. Here, two classical lexicographers meet us at the outset. The first is Abû Nasr Ismael ebn Hammad al Djauhari, (i. e. the jeweller,) commonly called Djauhari or Jauhari, who died in 398 of the Hegira, or A. D. 1107, a Turk by birth; who, after many journeys among the tribes most celebrated for the purity of their language, compiled a dictionary to which he gave the title of *the pure*; in which he has collected about forty thousand words, but with the exclusion of provincialisms and phrases not entirely pure. It is arranged, like most of the Arabic lexicons, according to the *final* letters; and the significations are supported by numerous citations, mostly from poets and grammarians now lost.⁶⁵ The second is *Medjeddin Mohammed ben Yakûb el Firuzabadi*, known most commonly by the latter name, of Firuzabad in Persia, who died in 817 of the Hegira, or A. D. 1415. He was the author of a yet more complete dictionary under the title of *the Kamoos, or the Ocean*; ⁶⁶ in which all words, even the most infrequent, are inserted; but with the omission of the citations of authorities, of which at least not very many occur. The number of words amounts to about *sixty* thousand; and the

⁶⁵ A Turkish translation of this work was printed at Constantino-ple in 1728, in 2 vols. folio. The translator's name is Wan-Kuli, i. e. *servus Wanensis*, properly Mohammed ben Mustapha of Wan in Armenia. A Specimen of Djauhari was published in Arabic and Latin by E. Scheid, 1774. 4to. Complete manuscripts are rare.

⁶⁶ After this work had lain for centuries inaccessible to oriental philologists, except a few,—of whom the Hollanders, as A. Schultens, Scheid, and N. W. Schroeder, have most frequently made use of it—it has at length appeared complete in print: *The Kamoos, or the Ocean, an Arabic Dictionary, etc.* Calcutta 1817, 2 vols. folio. See the Leipz. Lit. Z. 1818, No. 200. *Allg. L. Z.* 1820, No. 121 sq. In the Arabic preface the author speaks of another monstrous work of *sixty* volumes, called the *Lamé*, which he had previously composed, and of which the *Kamoos* is only an abstract; but the passage leaves it doubtful, whether he had actually executed this work, or only begun it. See De Sacy in the *Journal des Savans*, Juin 1819.

compiler states, that he gives in this work the fruits of his perusal of two thousand of the most applauded Arabic writers.

From these two original lexicons, have been chiefly derived all the modern Arabic lexicons; and that in the following order. The earliest, by Antonio Giggeius,* contains a translation of the *Kamoos*, the words only being arranged in the occidental manner according to the initial letters. But not only is the general arrangement of the work exceedingly inconvenient, inasmuch as the significations and derivatives of each root stand confusedly mingled together; but the translation also, as we are now in a situation to perceive, is not to be confided in, and is full of errors; arising no doubt partly from the false readings of the probably incorrect manuscript, and partly also from a false apprehension of the meaning of the original, in consequence of the no small difficulties which attend the perusal of it. The Latin, moreover, is barbarous, and often leaves the reader in doubt as to the sense which the translator means to express. A better work, beyond all comparison, is that of *J. Golius*,† which is as yet the most useful Arabic lexicon. This author, who had opportunity to perfect his knowledge of the language in the East, took *Djahhari* as his basis, supplied from the *Kamoos* what was deficient, and made use besides of many other lexicographers and writers with much learning and judgment.‡ But he wholly neglected the proper arrangement of the significations; so that the primitive signification sometimes stands last. Something more was done in this respect by *Castell* in the Arabic part of his *Heptaglotton*; he also supported the different significations by quotations from the biblical versions and from some writers on medicine and natural history, e. g. *Avicenna*, and supplied also many words and forms from the *Kamoos*. But just these supplements are not at all to be depended on; because he has mostly, if not exclusively, made use only of *Giggeius*; and the scholar has cause here to be very much upon his guard. The very useful dictionary for other purposes, compiled by *Francis a Mesgnien Meninski*, and republished by *Bernhard von Je-*

* *Thesaurus Linguae Arabiae*, Mediol. 1632. 4 vols. fol.

† *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, L. B. 1653. fol.

‡ See his preface.—*Golius* was for a time with the Dutch ambassador in Morocco; travelled in 1625 and the following years, in the Levant, to Aleppo, Arabia, and Mesopotamia; and died in 1687 as Professor of Arabic at Leyden.

nisch, 1780–1802, in 4 vols. folio, is rendered less useful for etymological investigation, from the very circumstance of its strictly alphabetical arrangement; and besides, the Turkish and Persian are the principal objects in it.

While now these writers, and especially the Kamoos, are most invaluable and authentic sources for the knowledge of the existing idiom, yet the scholar must not seek with the same confidence in them for etymological research, for remarks upon the primitive significations of words, and the like. For these objects the Arabic Scholiasts on difficult writers, as on Hariri and the Moallakat, are much more fruitful sources; and A. Schultens especially deserves great praise for his labour in working up and developing this rough mass of facts, although he may have here and there gone too far in his etymological conjectures. Many etymologies of Schultens' school, lexically treated, and with a cautious separation of what is conjecture and what is fact, are found in *Willmet's Arabic Lexicon*; in which at the same time special reference is had to certain Arabic writers.* The object to be aimed at in a new lexicon, such as that of Professor Freytag of Bonn, which is now in press at Halle, is partly a renewed use of the native lexicographers and a certain number of the best authors,⁶⁷ and partly the above mentioned more correct arrangement and deduction of the significations.

The personal and continued perusal of Arabic writers will be indispensable to the truly learned interpreter of the Old Testament; and will always be to him a rich source of parallels and comparisons for language in the broadest sense of the word, as also for ideas, poetical figures, etc. But still, the lexical helps which are extant, will suffice for him who knows how to employ them; and will enable him to determine almost every where the proper *usus loquendi*, and to detect the errors which have

* The Koran, a portion of Hariri, and Ebn Arabshah. The title of the work is: *Lexicon Ling. Arabicae in Coranum, Haririum, et Vitam Timuri*, L. B. 1784.

⁶⁷ The late Professor Berg of Duisburg had made very important collections for this purpose; his copy of Golius, written full with copious citations, is now in the university library at Bonn. Good service may also be rendered by the Arabic Index to *Hariri*, which De Sacy has subjoined to his splendid edition of the *Mekamath* (Paris 1822. fol.) in reference to the Arabic commentary. [The first volume of the lexicon of Freytag was published in 1830; for a notice of it, see the *Bibl. Repos.* vol. I. p. 197, 198.—Ed.]

found their way into many philological helps, partly through a careless use and misunderstanding of the lexicons, and partly through the mistakes which have crept into the most usual of the lexicons themselves.⁶⁸

In a language so copious and so widely extended as the Arabic, it could not well be expected that there should not be a great variety of dialectical differences; and we find in fact that many a dialectical idiom of this sort corresponds more nearly to the Hebrew, than the common Arabic language of books. This is particularly the case with the so called *Vulgar Arabic*; which indeed much more resembles the Hebrew, both in a grammatical respect by its fewer and shorter forms, and also in its far less degree of copiousness. Even the still remoter dialects of the Moors and of the natives of Morocco and Malta,⁶⁹ contain many peculiarities, which connect themselves back with the most ancient idioms; just as it is often the case, that the same phenomena of language often repeat themselves unexpectedly, in the remotest periods and districts of the same people.*

⁶⁸ The best grammars of the Arabic language are the following: *Erpenii Grammatica Arabica*, ed. A. Schultens, L. B. 1767. 4to. *Jahn Arabische Sprachlehre*, Vienna 1796. *De Sacy Grammaire Arabe*, 2 tom. Paris 1810; reprinted with large additions, 1832. *Rosenmüller Institutiones ad fundam. linguæ Arabicæ, etc.* Lips. 1818. *T. C. Tychsen Grammatik der Arabischen Schriftsprache für den ersten Unterricht*, Gött. 1823; a very useful compendium, but full of typographical errors. *Ewald Grammatica critica linguæ Arabicæ, etc.* Vol. I. Gött. 1831.—Ed.

⁶⁹ "Ktyb yl Klym mâti 'mfysser byl-latin u byt-taljân, seu Liber dictionum Melitensium, h. e. Mich. Ant. Vassalli Lexicon Melitense-Latino-Italum," Romæ 1796. 4to.—However much a certain pride of ancestry may dispose the Maltese themselves to refer their language back to the ancient Punic, still all its peculiarities may be most naturally explained, as the best helps sufficiently shew, from the modern vulgar Arabic, without the necessity of going back to so early a source.

* In the dialect of the Tayitic Arabs, **نو**, like the Hebrew **וְ**, stands for the relative; in that of Yemen, **نَو** i. q. **הַיְהוּדָה**, *myrtle*, and **وْتَب** i. q. **וְיָשַׁב**, *to sit*. In Maltese we find e. g. *ghad*, fut. *ighid*, (**غان** fut. **يُعَبِّد**) *to say, relate, declare*, i. q. **עוּר**, **הַיְהוּדָה**.

In the *Ethiopic* language*, we possess a very remarkable relic of the Hamyaric, or dialect of southern Arabia, which, since the time of Mohammed, has been wholly supplanted by the present written Arabic; the Ethiopic people having been, as is well known, a colony from southern Arabia, which wandered across the Red sea.⁷⁰ Its peculiar written character also seems to be of Arabian origin, and to have been primitively the same with that of the ancient Hamyaric.⁷¹ The language accords in general, indeed, most nearly with the Arabic, but is less rich and cultivated; and has quite a number of words in common with the Hebrew and Aramaean, which are not found in the Arabic.⁷² The literature is exclusively of an historical and ecclesiastical nature; but of the not unimportant historical writings, nothing has as yet appeared in print. The date of these writings falls between the introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia under Constantine the Great, and the fourteenth century; when this language, by a revolution in the government, was supplanted by the *Amharic*, which is still spoken in Abyssinia, while the *Geez* dialect is employed only as a written language for every species of written works or documents. The Ethiopic, both in a lexical and grammatical respect, has been handled with uncommon skill and learning by J. Ludolf; whose Grammar and Lexicon, in the second editions of them,⁷³ are among the best philological

* Called at present in Abyssinia the *Geez* language, and used exclusively in the church and as the language of writing and books; while the *Amharic* is the spoken language of the court and people.—Ed.

⁷⁰ See the *Syllabus Vocum harmonicarum*, subjoined to Ludolf's *Lexicon Aethiopicum*, Ed. 2.

⁷¹ See on the Shemitish origin of this alphabet, the author's article 'Amharische Sprache', in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopaedia; in which deduction Kopp, some years later, though independently, coincides; *Bilder u. Schriften der Vorzeit*, II. p. 344.

⁷² See Ludolf's *Comment. ad Hist. Aethiopicam*, p. 57; and also generally the author's article 'Aethiopische Sprache und Literatur' in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopaedia, II. p. 110 sq.

⁷³ *Jobi Ludolfi Grammatica Aethiopica*, Ed. II. Francf. ad. M. 1702, fol. *Lexicon Aethiopicum*, Ed. II. ibid. 1699, fol. The first edition of these works (by Wansleben, Lond. 1661, 4to.) is very imperfect; and has been mostly incorporated into Castell's *Heptaglotton*. Among the later philologists who have devoted themselves to the Shemitish languages, only a few have exhibited satisfactory proofs of any funda-

works connected with the Shemitish languages. In the composition of both, he made use of many manuscripts, and also enjoyed the oral instruction of Abba Gregorius, a learned Abyssinian priest.*

The present spoken language of Abyssinia, the *Amharic*,⁷⁴ is poor in words and in grammatical forms; and is more interesting for the Hebrew scholar in a grammatical, than in a lexical respect. At least I am aware of almost no coincidences with the Hebrew, which do not already exist in the Ethiopic.⁷⁵

4. Finally, it is proper briefly to mention here those languages out of which, though not indeed *kindred* with the Hebrew, single words have yet been adopted into the Hebrew, and, with slight changes, naturalized there.⁷⁶ Such are the following.

(a) The ancient *Egyptian* language; which is known to us through some ancient original monuments, the partial deciphering of which seems to have been reserved for very recent times;⁷⁷

mental acquaintance with the Ethiopic. Very recently, however, *Hupfield*, *Dorn*, and *Drechsler*, have treated of particular departments of it in a distinguished manner; though their remarks do not comprehend the whole subject.

* Several illustrations drawn from the Ethiopic may be found in the author's lexicon, under the articles *מְקַר*, *מְקַר*, *מְקַר*, *מְקַר*, *מְקַר*.

⁷⁴ See *Ersch and Gruber's Encycl.* II. p. 355, where at the same time the connexion of this dialect with the Shemitish stock is vindicated against *Adelung* and *Vater*.

⁷⁵ *Ludolfi Grammatica Amharica et Lexicon Amharicum*, 1698, fol.

⁷⁶ *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 59 sq. The endeavour to give foreign words a meaning by means of a slight change, so that they may seem to have an etymology in one's own mother tongue, is found among all nations, and particularly among the Greeks and Germans. [Among the English too in some instances; e. g. the word *asparagus* is usually pronounced and understood by the common people as *sparrow-grass*.—Ed.]

⁷⁷ What concerns the palaeography and in part the philology also of these ancient hieroglyphic monuments, may be best and most concisely seen in *Kosegarten de prisca Aegyptiorum Literatura, Comment. I.* Weim. 1828, 4to. In this work the investigations of *Young*, *Champollion*, and others, are presented, with the grounds of them, and the whole enriched with new observations. [See also *Greppo's Essay on the Hieroglyphic System*, Boston, 1830. The results of *Champollion's* researches in Egypt are announced as being in a state of preparation for publication in a splendid form; and the progress of the work will

through single glosses in Greek writers; and through its daughter, the Coptic language.⁷⁸ The words adopted from it into the Hebrew relate chiefly to Egyptian objects, and were probably introduced during the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt.⁷⁹

(b) The *Persian* language; from the earlier dialects of which many proper names and appellatives were adopted during the time of the Persian dominion. It is true that these ancient dialects, *Zend*, *Pehlvi*, and *Parsi*,⁸⁰ in which the *Zend-Avesta* is written, are only imperfectly known; but still they are not so remote from the present Persian language, that illustrations of what occurs in the Bible may not also be drawn from the latter.⁸¹ The same is the case with many Assyrian and Babylonian

probably not be interrupted by the recent death of that accomplished scholar.—Ed.

⁷⁸ See La Croze's *Lexicon Aegyptico-Latinum*, Oxon. 1775. [Also Ch. Scholz. *Grammatica Aegypt. etc.* ed. Woide, *ibid.* 1778. Kircher *Prodromus Coptus sive Aegyptiacus*, Rom. 1636.—Ed.]

⁷⁹ See in the author's lexicon the articles אֶרֶץ, אֶרֶץ, אֶרֶץ. Also Ign. de Rossi *Etymol. Aegypt.* p. 24. Jablonsky *Opusc. ed. Te Water*, I. p. 45, 374. II. p. 160. [Bibl. Repos. Vol. I. p. 581.]

⁸⁰ See the lists of words in the *Zend-Avesta by Anquetil du Perron*, Tom. III. p. 433; or Th. III. p. 141 of *Kleuker's translation*. Also *Rask über das Alter und die Aechtheit der Zend Sprache*, Berl. 1826; and scattered notices in the works quoted in note 81. The publication of the originals of the *Zend-Avesta* is greatly to be desired, from a collation of all the manuscripts now at Paris, Oxford, and especially at Copenhagen, and with a grammar and glossary. Who would not wish and hope, that the scholar [Rask] who procured them at the expense of such personal sacrifices, would appropriate to himself the still greater merit of thus preparing them for the public! [The publication of the *Zend-Avesta* in the original has been commenced by Prof. Olshausen of Kiel; see a fuller notice of this undertaking in the *Bibl. Repos.* I. p. 407.—Ed.]

⁸¹ Original Persian lexicons are the '*Borhani Kati*', Calcutta 1815; and the '*Seven Seas*' by the Prince of Oude, printed at Lucknow in 7 vols. folio, of which the seventh contains a grammar. The Persian part of *Castell's Heptaglott* is neither complete, nor entirely to be depended on. [Other Persian lexicons are *Meninski's*, (see p. 30 above,) and *Richardson's Dictionary, Persian, Arabic, and English*, as edited by *Wilkins* 1806, and by *Johnson* 1829, 4to. The best Persian grammars are that of *Sir William Jones*, last published as revised by *Prof. Lee*; that of *Dombay*, Vienna 1804; and that of *F. Wilken*, Leipz. 1804.—Ed.]

names, as *Nebuchadnezzar* (נְבוּכַדְנֶצַר), *Salmanasar* (שַׁלְמַנְאֶסַר), which belong without doubt to the same stock.

(c) Of less importance are the words which stand in connexion with the *Indian* languages, viz. some objects in natural history found in eastern Asia, the names of which came to the Hebrews along with the things themselves, from the East Indies.⁸³

(d) *Greek* words are not found at all in the biblical Hebrew; but frequently in the Chaldee sections of Daniel and Ezra; especially names for musical instruments, which the orientals would seem to have adopted from the Greeks.⁸³

After these historical notices of the kindred dialects, some remarks upon the proper use of them may here appropriately follow.

1. First of all, it must never be forgotten, that the Hebrew, with all its affinity for its sister tongues, has nevertheless its own *settled* and *independent* idiom, which indeed very seldom coincides *entirely* and *exactly* with that of the kindred languages; but for the most part only so, that at one time the form, and at another the signification and *usus loquendi*, have received different modifications in different dialects. The well known relation between the German and Slavonic languages, and that which exists among all those languages which have sprung from the Latin, afford a sufficient illustration of this principle;⁸⁴ and it is a very obvious, though frequent error, when an interpreter, instead of carefully observing the peculiarities of each dialect in a family of languages, has forced upon one of them the *usus loquendi* of

⁸² See in the lexicon the articles אֶהָלִים, קוֹה, תְּבִיִּים.

⁸³ See the articles סִימֶפְזִיָּה, פֶּסֶם־תְּרִיךְ, and others.

⁸⁴ Compare Eng. *journey* and Fr. *ournée*, day; Lat. *sentire*, to feel, and Ital. *to hear*; Lat. *mirari*, to wonder, and Span. *mirare*, to behold, whence *mirage*, *miroir*; Lat. *mittere*, to send, and Fr. *mettre*, to place; Eng. *meat* and Fr. *mets*, dish, mess; Eng. *dish* and Germ. *Tisch*, table; Eng. *stove* and Germ. *stube*, room, etc. So לֶחֶם, *bread*, and ^{5 11} *flesh*; בָּשָׂר, *flesh*, and, ^{5 11} בִּשְׂמֵר, *skin*.—An ancient anecdote respecting the settled nature of the idiom even in the different dialects of Arabia, as a warning against a false intermixture of dialects, see in *Pococke's Spec. Hist. Arabum*, p. 151.

another.⁸⁵ It is very frequently the case, that a word which in one dialect is common and predominant, is in a kindred one at least rare and poetical;⁸⁶ what in the one is good and elegant, is in another low and vulgar. The Hebrew also, like every branch of a widely extended stock of languages, has its own idioms,—provincialisms as it were,—which are found in no kindred language at all, or only in a very remote degree of affinity.⁸⁷

2. That to the *Arabic* language, the most copious of all the kindred tongues, and for the knowledge of which we also have the best and surest helps, belongs the first place among all this class of philological auxiliaries, has already been mentioned above. But on the other hand it is not to be denied, that the *Aramaean* idiom is often much nearer the Hebrew, especially in the writers of the silver age; and while interpreters have often neglected to apply this principle,⁸⁸ they have been led astray by the very comparison of the Arabic, into several by-paths. Not unfrequently in a particular passage, instead of an established Hebrew idiom, by mere arbitrary caprice the Arabic *usus* has been applied;⁸⁹ often the wholly remote Arabic signification has been with violence placed in connexion with the Hebrew one;

⁸⁵ The Dutch school have erred most frequently in ascribing an Arabic signification to Hebrew words; and also here and there in assigning to an Arabic word a Hebrew signification, contrary to the usage.

⁸⁶ On the similarity of Hebrew poetical usage with the common usage of the Syriac, see below in note 97.

⁸⁷ Among these peculiar words, are often found in Hebrew, as in all languages, just the most common ones; as *בָּרַת, עִיר, אָרָם*, etc.

⁸⁸ Thus *בָּרַת* signifies *to collect*, as in Chaldee, and not as it is often explained *to call*, from the Arabic; *אֶשׁ* is *lightning, flame*, as in Aramaean, not *bird of prey*, from the Arabic. In the interpretation of the book of Job especially, the Aramaean usage is to be applied rather than the Arabic.

⁸⁹ Compare note 85. So the very frequent word *בָּרַת*, also, according to Michaelis, (*Supplem.* p. 330,) because he forgot a rule of grammar, (*Lehrgeb.* p. 728,) must be made to mean in Gen. 10: 21, *a multitude*, from *בָּרַת*, *to be many*, etc. Even Schultens declared himself against this misuse, *Opp. Min.* p. 274; but still more fully, as to this and similar ones, the yet living Dutch philologist Willmet, in the Preface to his *Lexicon Arabicum*, p. xiii.

and the former brought forward as the primitive signification of the root ; and often have these interpreters thus lost themselves in the most far-fetched etymological hypotheses.⁹⁰

3. Since the differences among the kindred languages often rest on a change of the radical letters, it must necessarily be one of the first objects of the student to make himself familiar with these ; for which purpose the first articles respectively under each of the letters in the author's lexicon, are particularly designed. Changes of this sort are sometimes regular and predominant, as the transition of the Hebrew **ש, ז, י**, into the Chaldaic **ח, ט, ד** ; of **צ** into **ע**, etc. or they are sometimes less frequent ; and then the greater or less number of instances, can in doubtful cases determine the degree of probability. Transpositions of the consonants, also, occur very frequently in a comparison of the kindred dialects ; especially in respect to the sibilants and Resh.⁹¹

4. A particularly rich and fruitful branch of the comparison with the kindred dialects, and one as yet too little pursued, is the *analogy of significations* ; inasmuch as in words of kindred meaning in the dialects, the significations, for the most part, are modified and derived from one another, in the same manner as in Hebrew,—a comparison so much the more instructive, the more remote the ideas associated in the mind of an oriental sometimes lie from one another. The student must therefore search not merely for words corresponding as to form, (which often indeed are not at all to be drawn into comparison,) but also for those which correspond in signification, and which often afford the most striking illustrations. The Hebrew, like the Arab, uses the expression *little man or boy in the eye*, for 'apple of the eye' ; *overcome or vanquished by wine*, for 'drunken' ; *to boil over*, for 'haughty, arrogant' ; *to shine, glitter*, for 'to flourish, become green' ; *to cover, clothe*, for 'to act secretly, deceive' ; *to make fruit*, for 'to yield, bear' ; *to know a woman*, for 'to have intercourse', etc.⁹²—although each expresses these ideas with different words, viz. with those by which these ideas

⁹⁰ So especially many later Hollanders, as Lette, Kuypers, Venema ; A. Schultens only in his later writings, as his *Commentary on the Proverbs*.

⁹¹ See the examples in the *Lehrgebäude*, p. 142, 143.

⁹² See in the author's lexicon the articles **הַיָּדָם** and **בָּלַע** ; **אֵינֹן** ; **זָרַע**, **רָרַע**, **עָטָה**, **פָּרַי**, **בָּגַד**, **זָיִד**, **נָדָה**, and others.

are commonly expressed in his own tongue.⁹³ Enough too has not yet been done for the comparison of phrases, peculiar tropes, and poetical figures; especially since A. Schultens, who in his earlier works made a noble beginning, became afterwards buried in his etymologies, and lost this point entirely out of view.⁹⁴

It remains to specify some of the more important views, by which I have in general been guided in the plan of my own lexicographical labors. These have been, besides the application of the principles of philological hermeneutics laid down in the preceding pages, chiefly the following.

1. A stricter separation of that which belongs to the lexicon, from that which falls within the contiguous province of the grammarian and commentator. In respect to grammar especially, the lexicon ought not, in the manner of a concordance, to take up and explain every *form* that occurs, and which is sufficiently clear from the paradigms; but so much the more carefully should it notice and specify, which of the different possible forms* in any particular word is *in use*, and where also any modification of the signification connects itself with a difference

⁹³ Other oriental and occidental languages also often furnish interesting parallels of this nature. So in the article שׁוֹרֵץ, besides the illustrations drawn from the Arabic, others are also furnished by the Persian, Coptic, Greek, Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese languages. See the examples in the author's *Thesaurus Ling. Heb.* p. 86.

⁹⁴ Among the earlier Hebrew philologists, the most faithful, most learned, and soundest comparison of the kindred Shemitish dialects, is found in the works of Lud. de Dieu, (*Critica Sacra*, Amst. 1693,) E. Pococke, J. H. Hottinger, S. Bochart, (especially in his *Hieroicoicon*, 1646, fol. ed. Rosenmueller, Leipz. 1793-95. 4to.) C. B. Michaelis, A. Schultens, N. W. Schroeder; compare *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 117. Among the moderns may be named Rosenmueller, Jahn, and others like them.—That the young biblical philologist should be at once led to take a right direction in regard to the comparison of the kindred dialects, may assuredly be sufficiently provided for through oral academical instruction; especially if reference is every where had, in the study of the Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, and Ethiopic, to the coincidence or variation of the dialects in a grammatical and lexical respect, and also in regard to form and signification, and to literal and tropical modes of expression.

* E. g. Med. A. E. O. Fut. A. E. O.

of form.⁹⁵ The explanation of difficult *forms* of words is, properly speaking, not the province of the lexicographer, but of the grammarian; still, I have endeavoured to aid the necessities of the beginner as much as possible, by a constant reference to grammatical works, and by subjoining to the lexicon an analytical index.⁹⁶

2. The complete specification of the *constructions* and *phrases* formed with words; for which only a slight beginning has been made in former lexicons. How important it is, that along with the verbs, the particles with which they are construed should also be specified, is apparent from the circumstance, that in all the Shemitish languages this construction of the verbs with particles takes the place of *composite* verbs, and the signification is by this means often essentially changed; on which account also the earlier Arabian lexicographers have bestowed great care upon this point. This, and the specification of whole phrases, may be termed the *syntactical* part of lexicography; and when both are introduced, the lexicon first ceases to be a mere vocabulary.

3. A third principal point may be named the *historical* mode of treating the language; i. e. an attentive observation of the different classes of Hebrew diction, and of the *usus* peculiar to each of them in respect to the words themselves, their forms, and significations. Here belong, first, the *poetical* diction, and secondly, the later *Aramaean* colouring of the language in the writings composed during and after the Babylonish exile; as also many peculiarities of individual books.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ The arrangement of the Arabic lexicons is in this respect most excellent, with their short specifications, *Fut. A. O. I. Med. Ksr. Fath. Damm. c c a.* (constr. cum accus.) etc.

⁹⁶ How very much the observation of grammatical analogy, and especially of the formation of words, serves to aid and promote lexicographical study, will be obvious in the altered appearance of many articles in the successive editions of the author's lexicon; see the articles אָח, אֵית, בְּלָח, מָט, מִרְרָה, הִרְרָן, etc. [The analytical index referred to in the text, which in the third edition of the lexicon occupies twelve very closely printed pages, is omitted in the American translation.—ED.]

⁹⁷ See the *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 21 sq. A tolerably complete collection of words, forms, and significations, belonging to the later Aramaic period, see *ibid.* p. 28. A list of the most important exclusively poetic words and forms, which in like manner stand in close

4. The lexicographer will also often come in contact with the criticism of the text; not alone that of the words only, but also with the so called higher criticism. It will be necessary for him, on the one hand, to have formed a definite idea of the condition of the text in a critical respect; and, on the other, to have made up his mind as to what he will adopt from the mass of critical apparatus.

In this latter respect, it is doubtless incumbent on a lexicon which shall be entirely full and complete, to adopt and illustrate every thing which needs explanation in the various readings of the Samaritan text and of the Jewish manuscripts; since these readings have been handed down to us (though in part unjustly) as appertaining to the philology of the Hebrew language; and because also our common editions of the Hebrew Bible can in no case be regarded as being alone the sufficient standard and basis of a lexicon. But this particular point, which no lexicographer as yet has kept in view, may be best reserved for the author's larger lexicon; while it will be sufficient for the plan of the present manual, to insert and explain all the variations which are contained in the *Kethib* and *Keri*.

To state here in few words my creed, as to the condition of the Hebrew text in a critical respect. It cannot be denied, that through the anxious care of the Jewish critics, the text has been in general very well preserved;⁹⁸ while, on the other hand, it is clear from the very important variations of parallel passages, that this care was first applied at a late period, and after the formation of the canon; and that at an earlier date, when the text was still treated with a certain degree of freedom, many errors had crept in through negligence and false criticism, which cannot be detected and corrected by the aid of the few younger helps which we now possess.⁹⁹ In such cases, therefore, we can decide only on internal grounds; and here also conjecture is in its place; though this latter must be practised far less frequently, and with more knowledge and circumspection, than has

connexion with the Aramaic idiom, is in the original subjoined in this place. Compare the Index to the author's *Lehrgebäude*, under the head of *Poetische Formen*.

⁹⁸ Compare the striking remarks of Eichhorn, *Praef. ad Koecheri Biblioth. Heb. novam*, T. II.

⁹⁹ See the author's *Commentar über Jes. Th. I. p. 44.*

been formerly done by notorious conjectural critics, Houbigant, Reiske, and even Lowth, J. D. Michaelis, and others.¹⁰⁰

That also the versions and various readings contain many corrections of the printed *textus receptus*, is not to be denied; only, this source has commonly been too highly estimated, and it has not been sufficiently borne in mind, that many of these critical documents must be rejected from the series of credible witnesses; inasmuch as they rest upon texts, not faithfully transmitted, but arbitrarily altered.¹⁰¹ A certain *exegetical* use of the various readings has also been overlooked by most interpreters, viz. in so far as another reading may not be indeed preferable to the received one as it respects documentary evidence, but yet contains a hint for the interpreter, provided the author of it understood the somewhat obscure text correctly, and introduced an easier reading in the place of the more difficult one.¹⁰²

How much also it is incumbent upon the lexicographer to pay a close attention to the results of the so called higher criticism, is rendered especially apparent by the relation existing between the parallel passages of the books of Chronicles and those of Samuel and the Kings,¹⁰³ of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and the like.

¹⁰⁰ Some examples of self evident errors, the explanation of which ought never to have been attempted, and which would long since have been banished from the text of any classic writer, are the following: גַּהּ for גָּהּ Ez. 47: 13. יך Kethib for יר 1 Sam. 4: 13. בַּסּ for בָּסּ Ex. 17: 16, comp. v. 15.—Other false readings, for the correction of which the versions point out the proper way, see in the lexicon under the articles אֲבָתָה, אֲבָל, אֲפַע, אֲבַג, אֲבָהָה, etc. In regard to mere conjecture, also, I could well coincide, as to principle, with the positions of Prof. Olshausen of Kiel in his late work, *Emendationen zum A. T.* Kiel 1827; although I could not assent to several of the particular conjectures suggested in that work.—The proper names in the genealogical catalogues *swarm* with errors.

¹⁰¹ So the Samaritan codex and the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch. See the author's *Commentatio de Pent. Sam.* Hal. 1815. P. II. [See also the review of this *Commentatio* by Prof. Stuart in the preceding number of this work.—ED.]

¹⁰² A few examples from Job may here suffice: c. 6: 25 בְּמַרְצֵוּ, 1 Cod. בְּמַלְצֵוּ, after the Targum and Jarchi. 9:26 אֲבָה, 44 Codd. אֲיָהּ, according to which אֲבָה is probably to be read. 15: 29 מִזֶּהָם, 1 Cod. מִזֶּהָם. 30: 13 בְּחַסֵּי, 4 Codd. בְּחַסֵּי. 30: 24 בְּהֵן, 26 Codd. בְּהֵם.

¹⁰³ See the articles תַּרְשִׁישׁ, אֲמָה.

Here the character of each text must be studied and apprehended by itself, and interpreted accordingly; and it would be just as great an error, to endeavour to *explain* the one text from the other, as it would be to attempt to make them *critically conform* to each other.¹⁰⁴

5. A point neglected by former lexicographers was the insertion of all the *proper names* of persons and places; which indeed ought the more necessarily to receive their proper place in a lexicon, because they really constitute a part of the language, being all of them originally *appellatives*; in which, moreover, very many verbal roots have been preserved, that occur no where else.¹⁰⁵

6. Finally, very particular attention has been bestowed on all those articles, which depend on a knowledge of *oriental antiquities*, whether natural history, geography, mythology, etc. In the natural history of the Bible, there has indeed been less opportunity to make additions to the rich materials of Bochart, Celsius, and Oedmann, from any later writers or sources;¹⁰⁶ but so much the more perhaps has been gained for the geography and religious history of the East, since the previous labours of Bochart, J. D. Michaelis, Reland, and others.¹⁰⁷ In a geographical respect, while on the one hand, through a comparison of the

¹⁰⁴ See under גַּרְיָ and גַּרְיָ, and the author's *Commentar zu Jes. 15: 2*.

¹⁰⁵ *Gesch. der Heb. Sprache*, p. 49.

¹⁰⁶ *S. Bocharti Hierozoicon, seu de Animalibus S. S.* Lond. 1663, fol. *Lugd. Bat.* 1712, fol. ed. Rosenmueller Lips. 1793. 3 vols. 4to. *Ol. Celsii Hierobotanicon, seu de Plantis S. S.* Upsal. 1745—7. 2 vols. 8vo. *S. Oedmann Vermischte Sammlungen aus der Naturkunde zur Erklärung der heil. Schrift, aus dem Schwedischen*, Rostock 1786—95, 6 Parts, 8vo. More recent contributions have been made by *Forskaal*, *J. E. Faber*, *C. Sprengel*, and others.

¹⁰⁷ For the ancient foreign geography of the Bible: *S. Bocharti Geographia Sacra, P. I. Phaleg, seu de Dispersione gentium*; (a commentary on Gen. c. 10;) *P. II. Canaan, seu de Colonia et Sermone Phoenicum*, 1646, 1681, 1707, 1712. *J. D. Michaelis Spicilegium Geographiæ Hebraeorum exteræ post Bochartum*, P. I. Gott. 1768. P. II. 1780, 4to.—For that of Palestine: *Eusebii Onomasticon, seu liber de Locis Hebraicis, c. versione Lat. Hieronymi, etc.* ed. *J. Clericus*, Amst. 1707, fol. *Relandi Palaestina ex veteribus monumentis illustrata*, Ultraj. Ed. 2. 1714. 4to. This is still the standard work. See the complete literature of biblical geography in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclop. art. 'Biblische Geographie.'*

geographical notions of the Orientals, as well as of the Greeks and Romans, some modern interpreters have come to find and acknowledge mythic geographical ideas in the Old Testament;¹⁰⁸ so, on the other hand, the classic soil of the Bible has recently been repeatedly visited by several distinguished travellers; and especially, very much has been gained for the details of the topography of Palestine and Egypt.¹⁰⁹

In regard to the mythology of the Aramaean nations, I have not scrupled, in the proper articles of the lexicon, to adopt the hypothesis which I have more fully explained in another place,* that it was originally connected with the worship of the stars, and more especially of the planets. I have ventured to do this, in the hope that it may meet the approbation of the distinguished scholar,† who has recently poured so much light upon this branch of archaeology.

¹⁰⁸ See the author's *Comm. zu Jes. Th. II.* 316 sq. Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclop.* l. c.

¹⁰⁹ Much light has been thrown upon the ancient geography of Egypt in consequence of the French expedition, and through the study of Coptic writers; especially in the following works: Ed. Quatremère *Mémoires géographiques et historiques sur l'Égypte*, 2 vols. Paris 1811—12. Champollion *l'Égypte sous les Pharaons*, Tom. I. II. *Description géographique*, Paris, 1814.—For the geography of Palestine, the most important contributions are those of U. F. Seetzen in *Zach's Monathl. Correspondenz*, Vol. XII. sq. *Burckhard's Travels in Syria and the Holy Land*, Lond. 1822. 4to. and *Leigh's Account of his Visit to Wady Mousa*, etc. appended as a Supplement to the work of *Mc Michael*. All these, however, cast in general more light on the later geography of the New Testament, than on that of the Old.—The author of this article has long been making preparations for a critical Atlas of the Bible, and hopes soon to be able to come to the execution of his plan. In the mean time, he would refer the student, for the sacred geography both of Palestine and the adjacent lands, to *Rosenmueller's Handbuch der biblischen Alterthumskunde*, Bd. I.—III. *Biblische Geographie*, Leipz. 1823—28; in which the latest travels and discoveries have been noticed and introduced.

* *Beilage zum Commentar über Jes. Th. II.* p. 327 sq.

† This sentence was written in 1823, and refers either to Creuzer, who published the second edition of his *Symbolik* in 1819—23; or more probably to Bishop Münter of Copenhagen, whose work entitled *die Religion der Carthager*, was also republished in 1821, and followed by an Appendix addressed to Creuzer in 1822.—ED.

ART. II. ON THE FORCE OF THE GREEK PREPOSITIONS IN
COMPOUND VERBS, AS EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

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

THE negligence and inconsideration, with which lexicographers and grammarians in general have proceeded in assigning the force and significancy of the Greek particles, cannot have escaped the notice of any correct Greek scholar; and in no species of particles, perhaps, have these faults been more frequently conspicuous, than in respect to the prepositions. This would seem, at first view, the more surprising; since it is doubtless more easy to perceive and express the relations in which different things stand toward each other, which is the office of the preposition, than it is to explain the way in which an object of thought, or the act itself of thinking, stands connected with the thinking mind, which is a principal use of the conjunction. There are, however, various causes, which have contributed to introduce confusion in respect to the force and use of the Greek prepositions. A principal one of these, no doubt, has been the circumstance, that where their power appeared to be somewhat uncertain, it has been customary to regard them as without any force, and pronounce them pleonastic. This has been very common among interpreters of the New Testament; who would seem almost to have been upon the watch for pleonasm, whenever any uncertainty or obscurity could be detected in the employment of prepositions. Hence the lexicons of the New Testament are filled with observations of this nature; and at the close of almost every article which treats of a preposition, we find the remark, "*haud raro redundat.*"

In regard, especially, to those prepositions which are compounded with verbs, it is a common and indeed a very general opinion, that such prepositions often do not at all affect the force of the verbs; and that therefore the force and meaning of a

* See the Introductory Notice in vol. I. p. 160, of this work. The Programm, of which this article is a translation, was first printed in 1814.—This article was prepared for the press in season for the preceding Number. The German journals received since that time, announce the decease of the distinguished author, on the 30th^o of December 1831, in the 59th year of his age. He was the Senior Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic.—Ed.

compound verb differs frequently in no respect from those of the simple verb. The source of this opinion is to be found, partly in a want of attention to the niceties of language, and partly in the desire of avoiding some particular interpretations. Thus, in former times, when it was the fashion to look for an emphatic meaning in many verbs where there is none, the most false interpretations were not unfrequently brought forward on no ground whatever, except a certain supposed emphasis imparted to the compound verb by the accession of the preposition. Hence too it was, that other interpreters were led more decidedly to deny, that the force of the verb was in all cases affected by the preposition; in many cases, at least, they affirmed, no emphasis was to be sought in compound verbs. This was doubtless Ernesti's meaning, when he says,* that 'in Greek verbs we must take care not to suppose that any accession of meaning is necessarily made by the accession of prepositions, especially *ἀνά, ἀπό, πρό, σύν, ἐκ, περί*, nor must we draw arguments from this supposed emphasis, as is done by many, and oftentimes very incongruously; inasmuch as use and observation sufficiently teach us, that these prepositions do not always affect the signification of the simple verbs, and indeed are very frequently redundant.' The learned writer is obviously here speaking of *emphasis*, which, it must be conceded, is not always produced by the prepositions. But still, the precept which he gives, is ambiguous; for it is one thing to impart an *emphasis*; another, to produce an *accession* to the force and meaning of the simple verb; and still another, to *change* the meaning of the simple verb. It is this ambiguity, which seems to have led astray those who have since written on this topic; especially Fischer, whose dissertation on the subject is devoid of every thing like fixed rule or settled principle.†

It does not indeed require much study, to demonstrate by numerous examples, that prepositions in themselves *never* produce *emphasis*, and that they do not always *change* the signification of the simple verbs; but it is more difficult to shew precisely what force such prepositions really have, either constantly or in certain circumstances. No one, so far as I know, has treated of this subject in such a manner, as to have reduced this part of grammar to certain and fixed laws; and although individual authors

* *Institutio Interp. N. T. P. I. s. 2. c. 5. § 8.* Stuart's Transl. § 168.

† *Prolus. de Vitiis Lexicor. N. T. Prolus. V. p. 119 sq.*

have written on particular points with judgment and discrimination, still the subject of the Greek prepositions, as a whole, has not yet been properly discussed, especially with reference to the writers of the New Testament. Some interpreters indeed, having adopted the opinion that the New Testament writers scarcely spoke the Greek language, and were at least total strangers to all its grammatical principles and laws, have not thought it worth their while even to look at the force of the particles, and more particularly of the prepositions; and hence it has arisen, that in most of the lexicons of the New Testament, the prepositions are treated of so ineptly and unskillfully. Another class of interpreters, supposing it to be the safest course to avoid a nice explication of every thing which they did not understand, or which seemed to them unsettled and indefinite, took refuge in pleonasm, and taught, with great confidence, that prepositions in composition with verbs are often redundant. This they did the more earnestly, because they recollected that many false interpretations and heterodox opinions rested for support solely on the emphasis alleged to exist in certain compound verbs, e. g. in *προορίζειν*, *προγνωσκειν*. Others again have admitted, that prepositions sometimes add no new signification to that of the simple verb, while yet they sometimes augment the latter; but they have given no certain rules by which to distinguish, when the signification is thus augmented or when it remains unaffected.

Among the writers of this latter class, who are thus wavering and uncertain in regard to these particles, we may rank most of the ancient grammarians and scholiasts; who, when the force of a construction was not obvious to them, have not hesitated to declare, *περιττήν εἶναι τὴν πρόθεσιν*, 'the preposition is redundant;' while yet, in other places, they have developed the force and meaning of the prepositions with far more subtlety than correctness. Thus for instance,—to use the same examples which Fischer (l. c.) has adduced in support of his views,—the Scholiast on Aristophanes says of the verb *παραιτησώμεθα*, *ad. Equit. v. 37*, *περιττή ἢ παρά· ἔστι γὰρ αἰτησώμεθα, παρακαλέσωμεν. Πλεονάζουσι γὰρ καὶ ἔλλειπουνσι ταῖς προθέσεσιν Ἀττικοί.* 'The *παρά* is superfluous; the verb is i. q. *αἰτεσώμεθα* or *παρακαλέσωμεν*. The Attics often make pleonasms and ellipses with the prepositions.' But surely the preposition is never wholly superfluous in *παραιτεῖν*, and least of all in this place. *Αἰτεῖν* is simply *to ask for* any thing; but *παραιτεῖν* is so *to ask as to deprecate the opposite*; a meaning perfectly well adapted to this

passage. The same Scholiast further says, *ad Plutum* v. 499, τὸ δὲ ἀνερωτά ἢ περιττὴν ἔχει τὴν πρόθεσιν ἢ δηλωτικὸν ἔστι τοῦ πολλακίς ἐρωτᾶν. 'In ἀνερωτά the preposition is either redundant, or else it indicates repeated questioning.' Fischer thought the first solution to be the true one, but incorrectly; for ἀνερωτᾶν is most appropriately employed in this place to mark repeated questioning, and not a simple interrogation (ἐρωτᾶν); as indeed the Scholiast explains it in the sequel. The same indefiniteness and want of consistency occurs in other grammarians, and even in Eustathius.* This is certainly a grievous fault in the interpretation of any book; but ought to be more particularly avoided by an interpreter of the New Testament; inasmuch as the greatest care is here necessary, lest, by neglecting the real force and significance of the prepositions, either the sense should be deprived of its full weight, or at least the same idea should not be apprehended in the same manner as it was by the writer himself. From considerations like these, I have thought it would not be labour lost, to give the subject a more careful discussion. But as the limits of this essay forbid a complete view, it will be proper to confine ourselves to a succinct exposition of the various ways, in which the force of the prepositions is manifested in connexion with verbs.

Prepositions are usually connected with verbs in a threefold manner. They are either subjoined to the simple verb as a complement, as ὀρμᾶν ἐπὶ τι,—or they are compounded with the verb, as ἐφορμᾶν,—or they are subjoined to a verb already compounded with the same or another preposition, as ἐφορμᾶν εἰς πόλεμον, ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας. The plan of this essay includes neither the first nor the last of these modes of expression; but only the second, in which the prepositions are so joined with the verbs, as to form with them one compound word.† It

* So p. 1009, 49. Προθέσεις παρέλκουσι ἐν παρενθέσει μηδὲν προστιθεῖσαι τῇ σημασίᾳ τῶν ἀπλῶν. 'Prepositions are redundant in composition, adding nothing to the significations of the simple words.' The contrary and more correct doctrine is given on p. 217, 18. 727, 19. 936, 48. 1553, 14.

† One of the writers who has done most justice to the subject of prepositions in composition, is Abresch *ad Cattleri Gazophyl. Graec.* p. 60. But he appears not to have been sufficiently aware, that the different force which the same preposition exhibits when compounded with different verbs, arises out of the signification of the verb with which it is thus connected, while the preposition itself always retains

will be proper, nevertheless, to premise a few remarks upon those other methods of connexion; because from the first of them we learn the cause why prepositions are connected with

its own proper force and significancy. I prefer to subjoin here some examples taken from Cattier himself, in order the more clearly to illustrate my meaning; since in the text I have discussed the subject only in general terms.

Ἄμφι, according to Cattier, denotes in composition, *circum*, as in *ἀμφιβάλλω*, and also *dubitation*, as in *ἀμφισβητέω*. But in both these instances *ἀμφι* has its own proper signification; it denotes strictly, *utrimque*, on both sides, on either hand, as does also the adverb *ἀμφίς*. Hence *ἀμφισβητέειν* is to go or tend towards one side and the other; as *ἀμφιβάλλειν* is to cast on either side; whence *ἀμφιβολος*, wounded or attacked on both sides, (Thucyd. 4. 32.) metaph. *fluctuating*, *dubious*, *uncertain*; and so also *ἀμφιβάλλειν*, to fluctuate, be in doubt. The reason why *ἀμφισβητέειν* signifies to be in doubt, lies not in the preposition, but in the verb; for every one who is in doubt, inclines or tends first to one side and then the other, so long as he has not decided what to do.—We might affirm, with the same right, that *ἀμφί* signifies defence, as in *ἀμφιβάλειν*, e. g. *ὅς χρόσση ἀμφιβέθηκας*, and other examples; but this no one would tolerate.—The proper signification of *ἀμφί* then is *utrimque*; and when this preposition is joined in composition with verbs, it superadds this sense to the idea expressed by the verb. Thus *νοεῖν* is to think, and *ἀμφινοεῖν* is so to think that the mind wavers on one side and the other, i. e. to doubt. The Scholiast on Sophocles therefore is incorrect, when he says *ad Antigone*. v. 376, *ἀμφινοῶ περισηή ἢ ἀμφί*, ‘the *ἀμφί* is redundant.’ The author of the *Etymologicum* is therefore also wrong, when he says that *ἀμφί* and *περί* are synonymous; for *περί* is properly *circa* or *circum*, about, around. It therefore not only superadds a far different sense from that of *ἀμφί*, to verbs with which it is connected; but it also not unfrequently simply augments or gives intensity or comprehensiveness to the meaning of the simple verb; because the simple action expressed by the verb is made, by the addition of *περί*, to comprehend as it were the whole of the object, as being affected on every side and in all its parts. Thus, as *ἀμφινοεῖν* is to think waveringly, so *περινοεῖν* is to think carefully, to consider on all sides, to excogitate; and *περινοία*, solertia, ingenuity. Hence also both these prepositions are united with one verb, as *ἀμφιπεριπλάζισθα*, to wander about hither and thither, Orph. Lith. 80; and *ἀμφιπεριστροφῆν*, Iliad VIII. 348, comp. Eustath. 716, 49; *ἀμφιπεριφθινύθειν*, Hom. Hymn. Ven. 271. In like manner they are also sometimes used together as separate prepositions; e. g. Iliad. II. 305. XVII. 760. comp. Eusth. p. 1126, extr.

Ἄπό in composition, Cattier says, signifies negation, as *ἀπόφημι*;

verbs at all ; while from the third we may most clearly perceive how inconsiderately, in phrases of this sort, the lexicographers have so often recurred to pleonasm.

despondency, as ἀπειπεῖν ; *acquittal*, as ἀποψηφίζεῖν ; *completion*, as ἀπεργάζεσθαι. Abresch adds other significations ; but that which he first subjoins, (in ἀπειναι, ἀποκοιμᾶσθαι, ἀποκρύπτειν, etc.) he ought to have marked as being properly the primary and common sense of ἀπό in composition. In ἀπόφημι it is not the preposition that denotes *negation*, but the whole verb ; he who denies or refuses a thing, declares that thing to be remote from his mind or will (ἀπονεύει). On the other hand, κατάφημι is to *affirm*, to *assent*, (κατανεύειν,) to annex or superadd, as it were, one's own views or feelings to a thing. So also ἀποψηφίζεῖν is to *set any one free by vote* ; not because ἀπό denotes *acquittal*, but because ψηφίζεῖν and ψηφίζεσθαι signify to *give one's suffrage* concerning any thing (περὶ τινος) ; and therefore, as καταψηφίζεῖν τινά is to *condemn by one's suffrage*, (ψηφίζεῖν κατὰ τινος,) so ἀποψηφίζεῖν τινά is to *acquit by suffrage* ; because he who is thus acquitted, is conceived of as freed, taken away, *from* the sentence. Hence also ἀποψηφίζεῖν is construed with the accusative, although the preposition governs only the genitive ; as also ἀπομάχεσθαι, ἀποδικάζειν, ἀπολογεῖσθαι, and others.

Διά retains every where its own signification, *through*, in composition ; but still it gives a variety of modification to the meaning of verbs, according to the different sense which belongs to the verbs themselves. In διακωλύειν, and διατελεῖν, for example, it does not of itself signify *continuance*, nor in διέρχεσθαι is it *praeter*, nor in διασώζεσθαι διά τινος is it *ex*, although it may be so rendered in Latin. Whoever διακωλύει, he κωλύει διά τινος, i. e. hinders *through* the whole time during which any thing is to be impeded ; whoever διέρχεται, he ἔρχεται διά τινος, i. e. comes *through* something, leaves it wholly behind him, whence διέρχεσθαι εἰς τι, to *arrive at* ; whoever διασώζεται, he σώζεται διά τινος, i. e. is preserved *through* the whole time of his being in danger. Hence σώζεσθαι ὡς διά πυρός 1 Cor. 3: 15, and διασωθῆναι δι' ὕδατος 1 Pet. 3: 20, is to be *preserved through the midst of the fire and the water* by which they were surrounded ; which, as to the sense, is indeed equivalent to being saved *ex igne vel aqua*. So Xenophon, *Anab.* V. 5. 7, διὰ πολλῶν καὶ δεινῶν πραγμάτων σεσωμένοι πάρεστε, 'ye stand here, preserved through many and great evils ;' but in III. 2. 7, σώζονται ἐκ πάντων δεινῶν, and *Hist. Graec.* VII. 1. 16, οἱ σωθέντες ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος. Thus also in all other verbs, διά fulfils its proper office, and signifies *through*, *per* ; it denotes that the thing in question *exists* or *takes place* in such a way, that it must be conceived of as existing or taking place *through* something which is opposed or interposed. But since a thing may be regarded in a twofold manner,

It is the nature of verbs, that they necessarily connect the notion of the thing which they express, with the conception of some other thing, which may stand to the former in the relation either

either as the subject on which the idea expressed by the verb depends, or as the object on which the idea expressed by the verb terminates, it follows that *διά* may require either the genitive (of the subject), or the accusative (of the object); and hence has arisen the twofold signification of *διά*, as denoting both manner and cause. And since that *through* which a thing is said to exist or take place, is to be conceived of as a sort of *medium*, which the whole thing has as it were pervaded or passed through, those verbs therefore which are compounded with *διά*, often express the notion of difference, perfection, dividing, distributing, dissipating, contending, and the like; in all which, nevertheless, the preposition itself retains its own proper force. Nor do I fear that any one will pronounce all this to be empty speculation; as if it were indifferent, whether we regard the preposition itself as having a different power, or consider the modification which takes place when a preposition is added, as arising out of the verbs themselves. Our lexicographers would surely not have described one and the same preposition as denoting every thing in composition, had they more closely observed the peculiar force and significancy of each.—But to return to the preposition *διά*. It is said to have the signification of *excellence* in *διαφέρειν, διέχειν*. True. But still it is one and the same signification of *διά* which causes *διέρχασθαι* to mean *pervenire*; *διαβαίνειν, transgredi*; and also *διαφέρειν, to differ*; *διέχειν, to be prominent*. This is clearly established as to *διέχειν* by the passages in Homer, *Iliad*. V. 100. XX. 416.

It is surprising that Abresch, in the place above cited, should follow the custom of so many writers, and attribute to the Greek prepositions almost as many significations as the Latin ones have, by which they are commonly rendered. Thus on p. 74 he writes, that *ἐξ* in composition sometimes denotes *in*; as *ἐκπεσεῖν εἰς χάσμα γῆς* in Pausanias; although the very passage of Lucian which he adduces, *Nigrin*. c. 36, *ἐκ μίσης τῆς ὁδοῦ καταπίπτειν*, might have shown him the true solution; for he who while walking along a path, falls into a ditch, falls *out* of the path, *ex via*, into the ditch. So the passage of Xenophon, *Hist. Gr.* V. 4. 17, *ὅπλα ἀναρπασθέντα ἐξέπεσον εἰς θάλατταν*. But the phrase *ἐκ μίσης τῆς ὁδοῦ καταπίπτειν* means, 'to fall *out of* or *at* the middle of the way,' i. e. after completing half the way.—The preposition *παρά* in composition, he says, signifies not only *eis, pròs, sùn, pròs*, but also *ἐξ* and *ἀπό*. But in all the examples that are adduced, it signifies nothing more than *juxta, nigh, near to, neben*, in which is also implied the idea of *praeter, by, bey, vorbey*. But this signification does indeed give a different modification to verbs, according to their

of cause or effect. To point out the nature or mode of this relation, it is often necessary to employ prepositions; whose office it is, when thus used with simple verbs, to shew whither the notion of the thing expressed by the verb, is to be referred. Thus when one says, ἔχω τι, he indicates that the possession of a certain thing is to be conceived of in connexion with himself; but when it is inquired, what is the mode or ratio of this possession, then there is need of a preposition; whether it be to shew from whom he has the thing, ἔχειν ἀπό τίνος vel παρά τίνος, or to designate where he has it, as ἔχειν ἐν χειρὶ, or ἔχειν μισθὸν παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ, Matt. 6: 1. Hence it is easy to see, how the entire

various simple meanings. Thus παρακλιεῖν is indeed to shut out, exclude, not surely because παρά signifies ex, but because when one is shut up not in this place, but in some place beside, (praeter,) he is of course conceived of as excluded from this place. So in Aristophanes, Eccles. 120, παριέναι may be rendered by prodire, to come forth, to approach, etc. [as if for προσιέναι,] for the connexion is, πάριτ' ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν, and immediately after we find κάθιζε παριών. But still even here παρά is properly juxta, and παριέναι is to come near, draw nigh, etc. like παρίρχομαι. In the same author we read, Thesmophor. 804, παρακίπτειν ἐκ τῆς θυρίδος, and a little before, ἐγκίπτειν. The former, they say, is here i. q. προκίπτειν, and παρά performs the office of πρό; while the latter, they say, is for ἐκκίπτειν. But in this sportive passage, παρακίπτειν is not 'to look out by thrusting the head through the window,' but 'to look out from within the window by inclining the head on one side,' as is done by modest females who do not wish to be seen from without. The notion of πρό lies here in the verb κίπτειν itself. The poet therefore immediately subjoins: κἄν αἰσχυνθεῖς ἀναχωρήσῃ, πολὺ μᾶλλον πᾶς ἐπιθυμεῖ αὐθις παρακύψαν ἰδεῖν. Neither is ἐγκίπτειν used for ἀνακίπτειν, as the Scholiast explains it, but it is 'to look out by inclining towards (the window),' and differs from παρακίπτειν, which the sacred writers have used to express the same idea, Luke 24: 12. John 20: 5, 11. The true force of the word is shewn by the examples which Wetstein has given, Nov. Test. T. I. p. 823; and especially by the passage from Aristophanes, Pac. 981 sq.—For these reasons I much doubt whether παρακύψαι in James 1: 25, means so much as 'to consider diligently, to know thoroughly;' it seems to denote simply to know, to have a knowledge of the law. The apostle says: "He who has a knowledge of the law, if he be not (γενόμενος) a forgetful hearer, but does that which the law prescribes, οἷτος μακάριος ἔσται, he shall be blessed." The word is also used of knowledge in general, not careful or perfect knowledge, in Lucian, I. Rediviv. p. 598. So also in 1 Pet. 1: 12, it signifies nothing more than simply to behold, to become acquainted with.

difference of signification has arisen in the phrases ἔχειν ἀπό τινος, and ἀπέχειν or ἀπέχεσθαι. In these latter words, the preposition when thus compounded with the verb, occasions plainly a new signification, directly opposite to the meaning of the simple verb; the thing to which the preposition points being no longer conceived of as *conjoined* with the notion of the thing expressed by the verb, but as *disjoined* from it. The case is different when ἀπέχειν signifies *to have received*, (not *to receive*), as ἀπέχειν μισθόν, Matt. 6: 2, 5, 16; for there ἀπό denotes not *disjunction*, but an accession made *from* some other quarter; so that those interpreters are in an error, who here make ἀπέχειν μισθόν signify nothing more than the simple ἔχειν. They differ in the same manner, as in English, *to have* and *to have away from*, i. e. to have taken away *from* another to one's self; *to have received*, as above. It might be more a matter of doubt, whether in the words ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπό τινος, the latter preposition is redundant or not; for the phrase expresses the same sense without the preposition; as Acts 15: 20 ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπό τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων, and verse 29 ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων. But these forms of expression seem to differ, not in the idea or thing itself, but merely in the mode of conceiving of it; just as they say in German, *sich von einer Sache enthalten*, and also, *sich einer Sache enthalten*, (i. e. to abstain from any thing,) where in the former mode of expression the notion of disjunction is referred particularly to the thing, and in the latter to the person.

If now these remarks should seem to any one to be speculative and refined rather than true and well founded, let him remember, that it is the object of all language, not alone to excite the same thought in the mind of others, but also so to excite the same thought, that it may be conceived, and as it were felt, in the same manner. Hence, wherever language is most highly cultivated, the more does it abound in the use of particles; whose chief province it is to indicate modes and relations, and as it were render them obvious to the senses. Thus it is not surprising, that the Hebrew language should need to employ whole phrases, where in Greek one verb compounded or connected with a preposition, is sufficient.

We may further remark, that when a preposition is subjoined to a verb already compounded with another preposition, it is done in order to designate more accurately the relations of those things, the idea of which is conjoined with the verb, i. e. that the designation of all the adjuncts and circumstances of the verb may

be complete. Thus in the phrases, *καταβαίνειν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ*, *ἀναβαίνειν εἰς ὕψος*, *ἀπαναγαγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, no one can doubt for a moment, that the prepositions are not redundant.

We turn now to the consideration of the various modes, in which the force of the prepositions is exhibited in compound verbs. Our examples, so far as possible, will all be drawn from the New Testament.

The force of the preposition in a compound verb, is in general of a twofold nature. It either *changes* the signification of the verb, so that the idea expressed by the compound is a different one from that of the simple verb; as in *ἔχειν to have*, *ἀπέχειν to abstain*, *ἀνέχειν to sustain*; *αἰτεῖν to ask*, *ἀπαιτεῖν to deprecate*; *ἀλγεῖν to sorrow*, *ἀπαλγεῖν to banish sorrow*; *καλύπτειν to conceal*, *ἀποκαλύπτειν to disclose*; *σοφίζειν to enlighten*, *κατασοφίζειν to delude*;—or else the preposition so *modifies* the meaning of the simple verb, that although the same idea is expressed, yet it is expressed under some certain relation and in a different manner. As to the first of these cases, there is no question; it is (so to speak) palpable, that such compounds have significations different from those of the corresponding simple verbs. The only matter of dispute is, respecting the second class of compounds, viz. those in which the main idea is the same as in the simple verbs. And it is chiefly because the diversity in the relations of things is so manifold, and the modes of conception in respect to the same thing so various, and because these modes and relations again are sometimes so indefinite and abstruse, that the custom has arisen in regard to this class of verbs, of affirming as a rule, that compound verbs often signify nothing different from, or more than, the corresponding simple verbs. Hence also comes the habit of loosely affirming, sometimes that the prepositions do not change the meaning of the simple verbs, sometimes that no accession of meaning is made by them to the simple verbs, and again that no emphasis is produced in such cases by prepositions. This ambiguity needs to be removed.

We suppose, then, that prepositions in this class of compound verbs, have this force, viz. that although the thing expressed by the compound verb, is the same with that, the notion of which is contained in the simple verb, yet in the compound verb it is conceived of or apprehended under a different relation and in a different mode. By *relation*, I here mean that relation which has place among the things or adjuncts which are connected

with the verb; by *mode*, I understand the way or manner in which the conception or apprehension of these adjuncts affects the mind. We shall treat of both of these successively.

I. The causes or sources of the ideas of *relation*, are the same circumstances by which the things or adjuncts themselves are connected together, viz. time, place or space, and the connexion of cause and effect. It is, indeed, the peculiar province of the prepositions, to point out these relations.

1. When therefore a preposition is compounded with a verb, it may serve, in the first place, to mark the relation of *time* which exists between two things, or to indicate that one of them may be the antecedent of the other. Thus when one is said *ὀρίζειν* *τι*, he is indeed conceived of as having determined something, but *when* he determined it is left uncertain; although it might perhaps be conjectured from other circumstances. But when, for instance, it is to be so expressed as to imply, that he came to the determination before the persons whom it is to affect, were alive, he would be properly said *προορίζειν*, to *fore-determine*; and it is therefore entirely false to say, as very many do,* that *προορίζειν* denotes nothing more than the simple *ὀρίζειν*. The same is the case with the verbs *γινώσκειν* and *προγινώσκειν*. When it is said of any one, *ἔγνω* *τι*, we conceive of something as having been his pleasure or determination; but as this may have been at any indefinite time, when we wish it to be understood as having been the fact a long time since, or of old, we must write *προέγνω*. Both these instances are found in Rom. 8: 29, 30. Indeed, if I mistake not, it is this very passage of Paul, that has given the chief occasion to the rule about the like force and signification of compound and simple verbs. The authors of this precept wished to take away all ground from those, who thought they perceived in these words traces of a special divine favour towards a certain class of persons.

2. The relation of *place* or of *space*, is threefold. We may conceive of any thing as *in* a place, as being removed *from* a place, and as coming *to* a place. It is the office also of the prepositions, when joined with verbs, to indicate one or the other of these relations. Nothing can be more obvious than this; for who will deny that the compound verbs *ἀναβαίνειν*, *καταβαίνειν*, *ἀναβάλλειν*, *καταβάλλειν*, *ἀνάγειν*, *κατάγειν*, *ἀπέρχεσθαι*, *προσερχεσθαι*, signify more than the corresponding simple ones? And

* Wahl has very properly abstained from precepts of this sort.

AUTHOR.

yet, in respect to certain similar verbs in the New Testament, interpreters are accustomed to teach, that their signification does not differ from that of the simple verbs. Thus *ἀναστενάξειν*, Mark 8: 12, they say, has simply the meaning *to sigh*, and not *to sigh deeply*, and is therefore used here in the same sense as *στενάξειν*. But although we concede that *ἀναστενάξειν* does not in itself, *per se*, denote *to sigh deeply*, yet it differs in signification from the simple *στενάξειν*. The latter indicates simply, that one *sighs*; but the preposition being prefixed causes us to conceive of him as drawing his sighs *upward* from the very bottom of his breast; just as we have in English the distinction between a *sigh* and a *deep* or *deep drawn sigh*. In this way the compound is much stronger than the simple verb. When the same interpreters also affirm, that *ἀναπληροῦν* means nothing more than *πληροῦν*, it is the same as if we should say in English, that there is no difference of meaning in the verbs *to fill*, *to fill up*, *to fill out*, *to fulfil*, etc.

The arguments by which this opinion has been usually supported, are chiefly two; *first*, that both simple and compound verbs are employed promiscuously in the same or similar constructions and phrases, e. g. *στενάξειν* and *ἀναστενάξειν*, *πληροῦν τὸν νόμον* and *ἀναπληροῦν τὸν νόμον*; *secondly*, that both simple and compound verbs are employed promiscuously in the New Testament as corresponding to the same Hebrew verbs. These arguments, however, are easily set aside. In the first place, although the simple verb contains the notion of the same thing, so that whether the simple or compound verb be employed the mind receives the same general idea, and on this account in many phrases both the simple and compound verb may be used promiscuously; yet this does not take place because the compound does not signify something more than the simple verb, but because the true force and meaning which the simple verb here expresses, is gathered from the other words of the sentence, or because the use of the simple verb, as is often the case, imparts strength to the expression. Although, therefore, we may concede, that *ἀναπληροῦν τὸν νόμον* and *πληροῦν τὸν νόμον*, may be said in the same sense; yet it does not thence follow, that *ἀναπληροῦν* and *πληροῦν* are synonymous, nor that the compound does not differ from the simple verb. If they were synonymous, then *πληροῦν* might be employed wherever *ἀναπληροῦν* is used; which, however, no one would be ready to admit. When also it is said, that Mark uses sometimes *στενάξειν*, and sometimes

•

ἀνασπενάξειν, and that this is a sure proof, that these verbs do not differ in sense, the assertion is too obviously unfounded to demand a refutation.—In the second place, it is said, that both simple and compound verbs often correspond to the same Hebrew verbs, and that the writers of the New Testament have every where translated the same Hebrew verbs, now by compound and now by the corresponding simple verbs; so that it would appear, that all verbs compounded with prepositions in the New Testament, are to be regarded as being in themselves of equal force and significancy with the simple verbs.* Yet those who are skilled in both these languages, and know the comparative poverty of the Hebrew, will easily understand of themselves, that no other conclusion can justly be drawn from this circumstance, than that the Greek writer was able, by means of compound verbs, to express various relations of things, which the Hebrew writer could only indicate by one and the same simple verb; the Hebrew language being wholly destitute of compound verbs.

The truth of the remarks which we have made above, in regard to the relations of place, which the prepositions in compound verbs so often serve to designate, is most conspicuously exhibited in those verbs which are compounded with two or three prepositions. In verbs of this sort, two or three relations of place, with reference to the same thing, are presented at once to the mind and as it were to the senses. And he would be in a great error, who should suppose that one or two of these prepositions were redundant. The Scholiast on Apollon. Rhod. III. 665, says of the word *ἐπιπρομολούσα* very absurdly, *περιτεύει ἢ ἐπὶ πρόθεσις*, ‘the preposition *ἐπὶ* is redundant;’ for the sense is, not only that she went out of doors (*πρό*), but that she also at the same time *came up to* or *upon*, *supervenisse* (*ἐπὶ*); and the compound verb expresses both these relations. Very clear examples are also found in the Homeric compounds, *ὑπεξαναδύς*, Iliad XIII. 352, and *ἐξυπανέστη*, ib. II. 267; which led Eustathius himself (217. 17) to a fuller and more careful explication of the force of the several prepositions. Many words of this kind are also found in the New Testament; but there are few of them which have not been inconsiderately marked by lexicographers with the usual sign, *i. q.*—implying that they are merely synonymous with the simple verbs. We give here some examples.

* Fischer l. c. p. 124.

Ἀνταναπληροῦν. This occurs once, Col. 1: 24, where it is said to be the same as *ἀναπληροῦν*. But this is wrong; for *ἀνταναπληροῦν* is not simply to fill up; but it is to fill up instead of something else, i. e. so as to supply the place of something which fails, to compensate. So in the examples cited in the note below.* Hence the words of Paul: *ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν σαρκί μου*, are not properly to be translated as they are usually given, *I fill up what yet remaineth of afflictions*, i. e. as they say, *I endure*. For *ὑστερήμα*, both in the Old and New Testament, does not denote what remains, *reliquum*, but what fails, *defectum*. Hence *ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων* is literally the deficiency of or in afflictions, i. e. the afflictions which are still deficient, or wanting; as in 1 Cor. 16: 17, *τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστερήμα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν*, *your deficiency these have supplied*; comp. Phil. 2: 30. In the passage before us, therefore, *ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν σαρκί μου*, the sense is, 'I supply, i. e. compensate, make good, that which is yet wanting to me of the afflictions which I endure for Christ's sake *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, in your behalf,' or, *τῶ ὑμῶν περισσεύματι*, that ye may the more abound, 2 Cor. 8: 14. The apostle had just said, *νῦν χαίρω τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, *I now rejoice in suffering for you*.

Ἀνταποδίδωμι. Fischer in treating of this word endeavours to shew, that the preposition *ἀντί* often has no force in composition. But in all the passages of the New Testament where this word occurs, *ἀντί* has manifestly its own peculiar power, as denoting opposition or reciprocity. So Rom. 11: 35 *ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ*, *or who hath first given to him, and it shall be requited unto him*. 2 Thess. 1: 6, *ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλιβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν*, *to requite affliction to those who afflict you*. The same force exists in the substantives *ἀνταπόδομα* and *ἀνταπόδοσις*. In Col. 3: 24, *ἀνταπόδοσις τῆς κληρονομίας* does not signify *the reward of piety*; for *κληρονομία* never has this sense; but the genitive, here as elsewhere, ex-

* Demosth. *περὶ Συμμορ.* p. 182. 20, *τοῖτων δὲ τῶν συμμοριῶν ἐκάστην διελεῖν κελεύω πέντε μέρη κατὰ δώδεκα ἄνδρας, ἀνταναπληροῦντας πρὸς τὸν εὐπορώτατον ἀεὶ τοὺς ἀπορωπάτους.* Dio Cass. XLIV. 48, *ἢ ὅσον καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐνέδει—τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων συντελείας ἀνταναπληρωθῆ.* Apollon. Alex. de Synt. I. p. 19. Sylb. *ἢ ἀντωνυμία—ἀνταναπληροῦσα καὶ τὴν θέσιν τοῦ ὀνόματος, καὶ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ ῥήματος.* III. p. 255, *ἢ ἑκάτερα ἀνταναπληρωθῆ τοῦ λείποντος.* Ibid. p. 330.

presses the thing itself in which ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις, *the reward, requital*, consists.

Ἀνταποκρίνομαι. This is not, as is often said, simply *to answer*; but carries the idea of reciprocity, *to answer in turn, to respond to the words of another, to reply*. So Luke 14: 6, οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἀνταποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ πρὸς ταῦτα, *they were not able to reply to those things*, viz. which Jesus, answering, ἀποκριθεὶς v. 5, had demanded of them. Hence in Rom. 9: 20, it denotes *to contend*. Interpreters might have learned from this one passage, that the preposition in this word is not superfluous.

Ἀντιπαρέρχομαι. It is true that there is nothing *emphatic* in this word, Luke 10: 31, 32. But it is false, that it is the same as the simple παρέρχομαι. The sense is, that the priest and Levite not only *passed by* the wounded man, but that they passed by on the *opposite side* of the way, i. e. they did not even approach him, (comp. v. 34,) but, as soon as they saw him at a distance, took their course as far from him as possible.

Ἀπεκδέχομαι. Here is no emphasis; but the compound of itself signifies more than the simple verb. The latter means, *to expect, to look out for, to wait for*; but the compound signifies *to wait for to the end, to wait out*; as I have shewn, *de Synonymis N. T.* c. VI.

Ἀπεκδύομαι. This is said to be the same with ἀποδύομαι and ἐκδύομαι. But the force of ἀπό and ἐκ here, is the same as in the preceding word. Both ἀποδύομαι and ἐκδύομαι signify *to put off, to strip off*; but with this difference, that in ἀποδύομαι the attention is directed more to the *thing* which is put off; while in ἐκδύομαι the *person* is more prominent, who puts off or lays aside any thing in which he was before enveloped. Comp. 2 Cor. 5: 3, 4. In ἀπεκδύομαι therefore, both these ideas are combined, so that it signifies *to put or strip off wholly, excutere*. So Col. 2: 15, ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχάς, is (in the proper sense of the middle voice) *excutiens potestates, despoiling principalities*.* The same sense occurs in Col. 3: 9, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, i. e. *wholly putting off, utterly renouncing*, the old man and his deeds. There is here no need of having recourse to Hebraism.

Ἐπαναπαύομαι is not the same with ἀναπαύομαι. The lat-

* So Cicero, *Orat. pro Leg. Agrar.* II. 60 or 23, *imperatores excutiant*. The passages adduced by Perizonius, *ad Aelian.* II. 30, are of the same nature. More correctly Dresig, *de Verbis Med.* I. 17.

ter is simply *to rest*; the former signifies *to rest upon*, as Luke 10: 6; then, *to lean upon, to confide in*, as if *to rest secure*, e. g. τῷ νόμῳ, Rom. 2: 17. Ἀναπαύεσθαι is not used in this sense.*

Ἐπανέρχεσθαι expresses more than ἀνέρχεσθαι. The latter signifies simply *to return*, in general; but in the former there lies the idea of *returning to the same place*. So Luke 10: 35, ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαι με, *when I shall return HITHER again*. Comp. Luke 19: 15.

Ἐπεκτείνεσθαι is incorrectly said to be the same with ἐκτείνειν. But it is more; for ἐκτείνειν is simply *to extend*; but ἐπεκτείνεσθαι is equivalent to ἐκτείνεσθαι πρὸς τι, *to extend one's self towards any thing*. So in Phil. 3: 14, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος, q. d. πρὸς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκτεινόμενος, *reaching forth TOWARDS those things which are before*.

Προκαταγγέλλειν, *to announce before hand*, and προκαταρτίζειν, *to prepare beforehand*, express more, as all concede, than the simple verbs καταγγέλλειν and καταρτίζειν. Why then, in the case of προγινώσκω and προορίζειν, should interpreters deny, that the preposition adds any thing to the signification of the verb? Because, forsooth, there seems to be nothing emphatic. They are indeed safe as to emphasis; but they ought not to have taught so inconsiderately, that the same preposition is significant in some verbs, and superfluous in others.

These examples may serve to remind interpreters of the New Testament, that they ought to proceed with more caution and accuracy in investigating the force of prepositions in compound verbs. †

* See Wetstein ad h. loc.

† It may be proper to remark here, for the sake of learners, that the Greeks, in compounding verbs with several prepositions at once, have taken care to place the prepositions in the order, in which the ideas themselves naturally succeed one another. Thus when ἀναδύειν, *to emerge*, is compounded with the two prepositions ὑπό and ἐξ, (not δύειν with three,) the former, ὑπό, is put first; because it is a more natural order of thought, first to conceive of the person emerging, τὸν ἀναδύοντα, as rising up *from a lower place*, and then as coming out or forth; to which then ἀναδύειν is also very nearly allied. So also ἐξάγω, ἐπεξάγω, ἀντεπεξάγω.

I have here gone upon the supposition, that in verbs of this sort, (ὑπεξαναδύειν, ἀντεπαξάγειν,) only the two first prepositions are to be taken into account; and the same is the case with several of the verbs adduced in the text. The reason is, that the third preposition, which

3. In the last place, the force of prepositions in composition is further shewn in that they serve to indicate the relation of *cause and effect*. This relation, however, is so extensive, that we cannot be

stands next to the simple verb and is first compounded with it, has in these instances the effect of changing the meaning of the simple verb, i. e. of expressing in conjunction with the simple verb a new and different meaning, which the verb would not bear without it; and therefore in such cases this preposition cannot be taken as distinct from this verb. It will be obvious to every one, that the full idea expressed by ἐξάγειν and ἀναδύειν, is not contained in ἄγειν and δύειν. Hence it may happen, that to verbs already compounded with a preposition, another preposition may be prefixed, which shall sometimes counterbalance or take away again the signification produced by the junction of the first preposition; e. g. σύνναγω, to collect, ἀποσύνναγω, to disperse; σσσιτέω, to eat together, ἀποσσιτέω, not to eat together. Still, however, the signification of the first compound must here be retained and regarded. [Indeed, the force of the preposition last added, goes to modify only this signification, and not that of the simple verb. Thus in ἀποσύνναγω, the effect of ἀπό in composition is very different, according as it is prefixed to συνάγω or ἄγω; in the latter case (ἀπάγω) it denotes merely to lead away; in the former (ἀποσυνάγω), it signifies 'to lead or cause to go away that which had previously been brought together,' i. e. to disperse.—ED.]

It is on these grounds, that the reading διαπατριβῆαι for παραδιτριβῆαι, 1 Tim. 6: 5, which is found in some manuscripts, seems to me to be false. The verb πατριβεῖν, to rub upon or against, is not used in the sense here required; but διατριβεῖν, to rub in pieces, wear away; whence διατριβή, a wearing away e. g. of time, leisure occupation, listlessness; and thence παραδιτριβή. I know indeed that Suidas has explained πατριβή by λογομαχία, disputation, in the words of an uncertain author: τὴν γενομένην πρὸς αὐτὸν πατριβὴν καὶ ζήλοτυπιαν. But it would seem rather to denote here collision, or, as we would say in common life, rubs. The apostle is speaking of the vain desires and tendencies (Theophylact very properly, ματαλας σχολάς) of διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων νοῦν, τῶν νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσεβειαν, men of corrupt mind, who regard gain as godliness. The idea of contention is foreign from his object. Indeed he expressly declares τὰς ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, questionings and strifes about words, to be the cause of these παραδιτριβῆαι, listless occupations, empty employment of time. On this account I prefer the common reading; although the other is found in many manuscripts. The reading appears to have already varied in the earliest ages; to judge from Chrysostom's exposition of the passage. He gives a double interpretation; one of which strictly pertains to παραδιτριβή, and the

surprised to find interpreters of the N. T. involved in various errors, while attempting to observe and to explain it. We have said that the relation of cause and effect, as here understood, is that relation, in which the thing signified by the verb, whether action or condition, stands connected either with the object of the verb, or with the person or thing of which the condition or action expressed by the verb is predicated, i. e. the subject of the verb. Of the former kind are the verbs *καταγελᾶν, καταγγέλλειν, κατακρίνειν, κατηγορεῖν, ἐπινοεῖν, κατανοεῖν, περινοεῖν*, for in all these the preposition refers to the person or thing which is the object of the action. Of the latter kind are *ἐννοεῖν, διανοεῖσθαι, ἐνεργεῖν, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι*, where the preposition points to the subject of the verb. The distinction between these two modes of this relation, is not always easy to be observed. It is here, indeed, that we are to look for a great part of the nicety and elegance of language in general, and especially of the Greek, which abounds particularly in verbs of this sort. It is therefore not surprising, that, since the Hebrew is wholly destitute of such verbs, the writers of the New Testament should employ sometimes compound verbs, and sometimes the phrases by which the idea was circumscribed in Hebrew; e. g. Rom. 8: 23, *στενάζομεν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, but Mark 8: 12, *ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι*. But it would be a false supposition to regard the preposition as merely pleonastic in constructions of this sort.—There are also verbs, and chiefly of the first kind above mentioned, in which the preposition is to be referred to the very idea or thing expressed by the verb itself; more especially in verbs formed from

other to *διαπαρατριβή*. His words are found *Homil. xvii. in Ep. I. ad Tim. Tom. XI. 648, διαπαρατριβαί· τουτέστι σχολή ἢ διατριβή· ἢ τοῦτό φησι διαπαρατριβαί· καθάπερ τὰ ψωραλέα τῶν προβάτων παρατριβόμενα νόσου καὶ τὰ ὑγιαίνοντα ἐμπύλησιν, οὕτως καὶ οἱ πονηροὶ ἄνδρες.* ‘The word *διαπαρατριβαί* signifies *leisure* or *leisure employment*. Or *διαπαρατριβαί* may mean thus: as the scabby part among the flocks, by coming in contact with the rest, (*παρατριβόμενα*, rubbing against them,) communicate disease to the healthy, so also these wicked men.’ In this extract I can scarcely doubt, but that, instead of the first *διαπαρατριβαί*, we ought to read *παραδιατριβαί*. Theophylact also appears to have had both readings before him; but Oecumenius explains *διαπαρατριβαί* in the same manner as Chrysostom. But even granting that *διαπαρατριβαί* were the correct reading, it certainly does not here mean *perverse disputations*; but rather *pertinacious contentions* or *collisions*. Zonaras explains *διαπαρατριβή* by *ἐνδολεχεία, duration*.

a substantive or adjective ; and in these, too, it would be a great mistake, to say that the preposition had no force at all. The verb *ἀνασταυροῦν* is an example, which some interpreters have absurdly rendered, *to fix again to the cross* ; while others with equal incorrectness have affirmed that the preposition *ἀνά* is without any force. There is indeed no emphasis attached to the preposition ; but yet it does as it were point to the thing or object contained in the verb itself, and thus cause it to be more vividly expressed ; it points to the *σταυρός*, and indicates the very act by which any one is affixed to the cross ; just as also *ἀνασκολοπιζειν*, *to impale*, is employed. Although, therefore, it may be conceded, that the same general idea might be expressed by the simple verb *σταυροῦν*, yet it would be less definite and lively ; and the preposition is therefore not redundant, but indicates the relation between the action and the object of the action. In compound verbs of this sort therefore, the preposition may be said to render the signification of the simple verbs more full and definite and vivid. This is clearly apparent in those verbs, whose proper signification is first produced by the junction of a preposition ; as *ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν* *to arrange under one head*, *προχειριζειν* *to cause to be at hand*, *κατοικεῖν* *to dwell*, *καταρτιζειν* *to repair*, and the like.

II. These examples lead us now to the consideration of that other species of force, which we have ascribed to prepositions in composition, viz. that through their influence *the same thing is conceived of or apprehended in a different mode*. By *mode* I here understand the way or manner in which the thing that is the object of thought or conception, affects the mind. Prepositions have then also this force, viz. that by changing the way or manner in which the mind itself is affected, they occasion a different mode of conception or of apprehension. For since the mind is variously affected according to the various ways in which the object of thought is presented to it, it follows that prepositions, which change the manner of presenting the object of thought, must also change the force of the verb itself. It is true indeed that another class of particles, the conjunctions, are the appropriate index of this relation between the object of thought and the mind ; yet nevertheless the prepositions also in compound verbs, have sometimes the same power, and render the thought or idea of the verb stronger and more vivid, by presenting it in such a way as more strongly to affect the mind.

There are various modes of this kind ; of which we can desig-

nate only the principal. It would carry us too far, to enumerate them all in detail. But the nature and effect of any predicated action or condition presented to the mind, by which the mind is to be affected, may be said to stand connected with, and to be particularly dependent upon, the accessory notions of *inclination, time and place,* and *proper efficiency*; and when the prepositions serve to indicate these, they augment by this means the power with which the main idea expressed by the simple verb, affects the mind; so that the *modus cogitandi*, the mode in which the idea of the verb is conceived or apprehended, is thus changed.

1. Certain prepositions, compounded with verbs, serve then in the first place to indicate a special *inclination*, or desire, as being conjoined with the action denoted by the verb; and although the signification itself is not increased nor extended by these prepositions, yet through their influence a thing is more vividly conceived of, and as it were more felt, than if merely the simple verb had been employed. Those who have not been able to form a correct judgment in respect to compound verbs of this sort, may seem, perhaps, to have a partial excuse in the circumstance, that when the proper significations of the prepositions, drawn as they are from the relations of tangible objects, are transferred to the actions of the mind, they become often in usage so refined and attenuated, that their true nature and character are no longer always obvious. Of this kind is the verb *καταφιλέω*, in which there is manifestly a stronger meaning, than in the simple verb; although, as interpreters say, the evangelists have used both verbs promiscuously and without distinction. But I know not by what right they affirm, that this compound does not differ from the simple verb in the New Testament; when they concede that in other Greek writers the compound has a greater force.

2. Related to this is the second mode above pointed out; when prepositions which refer to *time and place* are compounded with verbs, and serve to show a greater force or degree of action, and thus indicate also greater *inclination*. Of this kind are many verbs compounded with the preposition *διά*, as *διατηρεῖν, διακούειν, διαπονεῖν, διαφυλάσσειν*. This preposition properly indicates motion *through* space, and is then also spoken of the time *during* the flow of which any thing is conceived of as being done or taking place; whence also it is likewise employed to designate a cause. These compound verbs therefore have a

greater force and meaning, because they imply, that the action or condition expressed by the verb is not transient, but continues until the whole space and time to which it refers, shall have been covered by it; as *διασώζειν, διασαφειν, διαφθείσειν, δι-σχυρίζεσθαι*. Different from these are those compounds in which the proper notion of place is retained, as *διαγγέλλειν*; which nevertheless, some have said, is nothing more than synonymous with the simple *ἀγγέλλειν*.

3. The third and not the least frequent mode above mentioned, includes those verbs in which the prepositions increase the significancy of the simple verbs, by imparting the idea of *efficiency*; and this they do by indicating, that the condition or action signified by the verb, has reference to the *whole* thing, and will not cease until the whole is completed. Of this kind are *ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀποκτείνειν, ἀπολείπειν, ἀποθλίβειν, ἐκφυγεῖν*, and the like, which are commonly said to signify nothing more than the corresponding simple verbs. We grant, indeed, that the simple verbs may present to the mind the same main idea, but yet all will feel, that it must affect the mind in a different manner; and also that the force of the verb is augmented and the conception itself rendered more vivid and intense by the preposition; since it represents the action designated by the simple verb as being consummated and finished. The verb *ἀποκτείνειν*, *to kill*, has therefore a stronger meaning; because, in consequence of *ἀπό*, we conceive of the slayer, *τὸν κτείναντα*, as not desisting until he has accomplished his purpose. In like manner *ἀποθνήσκειν*, *to die*, is stronger, because it presents the idea of actual decease. It is also a mistake to say that *ἀποθλίβειν* is the same with the simple *θλίβειν*, *to press*; for it indicates, not only that a person or thing is *pressed*, which may be done on one side only; but that it is *pressed wholly, entirely*, on every side, in which sense it is spoken of grapes. It is likewise false to say that *ἀπολείπειν* does not differ from the simple *λείπειν*, *to lick*. Luke says elegantly, 16: 21, *οἱ κύνες ἀπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ, the dogs licked his sores sc. clean*. Who does not perceive that something more is expressed here, than if he had written *ἔλειχον*? The force which is thus imparted to the conception of the action, is also augmented by repeating the same preposition after the verb, as is said above.

There is still another class of verbs under this general head, which are very numerous, and in respect to which we must be very brief. Since now the mind is more excited, when it not

only forms a conception of a thing, but also sees and feels it as it were delineated in all its parts, it is obvious, that those compound verbs will have the greatest force, in which the prepositions produce such a full and complete image of the thing signified. These are chiefly such verbs as are compounded with two or more prepositions. Indeed, it was necessary to provide, not only that the thing designated should be conceived of in *some* manner, but also that it should be conceived of in *some certain* manner; and that the mind should be filled with a clear image of it, by viewing all the circumstances accurately and as they took place. As therefore they greatly mistake, who affirm respecting the compounds *ὑπεξαναδύς, ἐξυπανέστη, ἐπιπρομολοῦσα*, that one or another of these prepositions are redundant; so also it is a false position, that *παραπορεύεσθαι, παρῆναι, διοδεύειν*, and other like verbs, of which we have spoken above, have no broader signification than the corresponding simple ones. For although the simple verbs may present to the mind the same general idea, yet the compounds describe it more accurately, so that we see it, as it were, with our eyes; and in this way they excite a more vivid and stronger conception in the mind.

Should these brief observations lead any who are devoted to Greek and sacred literature, to a closer investigation of the force of the prepositions, our labour will not have been in vain.

ART. III.—AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS. COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THEIR LIVES AND SYSTEMS.

From Neander's 'Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche,' Vol. II. Pt. iii.
Translated by Leonard Woods, Jr.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

In here presenting for the first time to the American public, an important article from the pen of one so distinguished for learning and piety as the excellent Neander, the Editor deems it proper not only to state the few circumstances which are known concerning his life, but more especially to impart some information in respect to the general character of his mind and writings. In this way only can the reader be in a situation properly to

judge of the degree of weight due to his statements and reasonings; and it will probably be found, that to few writers can a higher degree of authority be ascribed, so far as this depends on profound learning, sound judgment, and unquestioned candour.

Augustus Neander, now Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, was born of Jewish parents at Hamburg, Jani. 16, 1789. At what time he passed over into the Lutheran church and received baptism, is unknown to the writer; but it must have been at an early age. It was related to the writer by an eminent bookseller of Hamburg, that about thirty years ago, a bashful awkward boy was accustomed to come to his shop, and spend hours and days in the perusal of books which were lying about, in total abstraction and regardless of every thing which was passing around him. This circumstance soon excited attention; and on inquiry, the bookseller was so much interested in the situation of the poor youth, and in the extraordinary mental powers exhibited by him, as freely to furnish him with the books he wanted, and also ultimately to unite with a few friends to afford to him the means of obtaining a liberal education. Such was the commencement of Neander's career; and nobly has he repaid the sympathy and care of his early friends. His earliest patron is now the publisher of his works; and the relation between them, though changed in its external form, has yet lost nothing of the mutual respect and confidence in which it was originally founded.

Neander pursued his studies at the University of Göttingen, where he was afterwards *Repetent*.* In 1812 he was called as Professor Extraordinary to Heidelberg, where he remained three or four years.† About the year 1815, he was transferred

* This is the name of an office peculiar to Göttingen. It was probably intended at first, that the incumbent should *repeat* to his pupils the lectures of the professors, with explanations, etc. At present it is a small appointment of about \$150 per annum, given to young men among the *privatim docentes*, for which they are required to read a few public lectures. There are usually two *Repetenten*. The station has been held by many distinguished scholars, as Gesenius, H. Planck, Neander, Ewald, etc. See Vol. I. p. 9 sq.

† The University of Heidelberg has been the nursery, from which many distinguished professors have been transplanted to other stations. To mention only a few of the more prominent,—De Wette,

to the University of Berlin, of which he has ever since been one of the ornaments; and his lectures and influence have contributed not less than those of any other person, to elevate that university to the pre-eminence of rank, which it now holds among the schools of Germany.

The department of theology to which Neander has principally devoted his attention, is Ecclesiastical History. But the course which he has taken, and the point of view which he has adopted, are new, peculiar, and striking. Instead of dwelling on the external history of the church, and merely arranging and recapitulating the facts preserved in ancient authors, he has endeavoured rather to take a comprehensive historical survey of the effects produced by Christianity on the human race, in all the relations in which it has been presented to them. He would view the christian religion in its relations to the mind and soul of man; the manner in which it has affected these in different ages, countries, and individuals; the hindrances which have existed to counteract its benign effects; and then also the external manifestations of these influences and these hindrances, both in private and public life and in doctrine, as they are exhibited in the history of the visible church. It will be apparent, that this is a far loftier eminence, from which to survey the field of ecclesiastical history, than has commonly been gained; and that viewed from this elevated point, the field expands into prospects of unlimited extent and overwhelming interest to the christian student. No ordinary training or qualifications would enable the historian to do justice to his subject, regarded in this light. This Neander felt; and he has, therefore, shaped the studies of his life accordingly. His first step was to make himself acquainted with the facts and the spirit of Christianity, from the original sources; and with these, as developed in the New Testament, no man is probably more familiar. The next point was to become in like manner acquainted with the views and character of those to whom Christianity was presented; in order to be able to estimate in what manner it would probably be received, the modifications which it would undergo from the influence of preconceived opinions and former feelings, and the nature of the objections and hindrances which it would have to encounter. The sources of all this information may be classed

Neander, and Hegel were called from Heidelberg to Berlin; Augusti to Bonn; Ullmann to Halle, etc.

under three heads,—the national views and philosophy of the Jews at the time of our Saviour's appearance, a knowledge of which is to be drawn chiefly from the Bible and the Jewish writers; the philosophical views and moral state of the heathen world, which, so far as they stand in relation to the history of the christian religion, are to be found in the lives and writings of those who embraced, or rejected, or modified Christianity, viz. the early teachers and fathers of the church, the schools of philosophy, and the ancient heretics; and lastly, at a later age, the various speculative and practical systems, both orthodox and heterodox, which sprung up in the bosom of the church itself, and which are recorded in the numerous decrees and interminable discussions of friends and foes in the middle ages. None of these sources has been overlooked by Neander. Endued with great sagacity and a memory of prodigious power, and trained to habits of iron diligence, he has studied, to a greater extent and with larger results than any man now living, all the works of the fathers and other ancient writers, as also all the writings of the middle ages, which have any bearing upon either the external or internal history of the christian religion. He has entered into their very spirit, and made himself master of all their stores. These are points on which there is no question among the scholars of Germany, of any sect or name. What Neander affirms upon any subject connected with such studies, comes with the weight of the highest authority; because it is understood and known to be the result of minute personal investigation, united with entire candour and a perfect love of truth.

The character of his writings corresponds to such a course of preparation. They are not a mere narrative of the actions of persons and the progress of events; but they bring before the reader the very persons themselves, as thinking, speaking, acting, in all their living power and energy; their thoughts become visible to us, their very words are repeated to us, their actions take place as it were before our eyes. It is the same graphic power of vivid representation, applied to the true delineations of real character and history, which gives to the half historic pages of Scott their magic charm. His successive writings all serve to mark the progress of his studies; while at the same time they have laid open many new views and treasures of ancient things. In a special manner, he was the first to introduce light and order into the chaos of the Gnostic systems. All his previous works have also served directly, if not intentionally, as

preparatory to the great work on which he is now labouring, his General History of the Christian Religion and the Church. Besides all this, he has now been for twenty years constantly lecturing upon these subjects, usually two hours, at least, in every day.*

This is not the place to give a review, or even an analysis of this great work. In his plan, the author has adopted the division of periods, now usual in Germany; each period comprehending the interval between some two important epochs. The first volume covers the first period, from the time of the apostles until about the accession of Constantine, when Christianity became the religion of the state. In like manner, the second volume includes the second period, from the accession of Constantine to Gregory the Great, when the possessor of the papal throne became first firmly established in his preeminence over the patriarch of the East. Each of these volumes is subdivided into three parts or volumes; the *first* of which contains the external history of the church in each of these periods; the *second* is devoted to the consideration of Christianity as affecting public and private life, the manners and customs of its professors, as also the antiquities of the church, the forms and ceremonies of worship and religious rites, etc.; while the *third* part in each volume comprehends the history of the development of Christian doctrine; embracing of course an account and critical estimate of the various systems, whether right or wrong, and of the discussions and disputes by which they were accompanied; and including also

* The following is a list of his principal works, if not of all :

1. *Der Kaiser Julian und sein Zeitalter*, 1812.
2. *Der heilige Bernard und sein Zeitalter*, 1813.
3. *Genetische Entwicklung der vornehmsten Gnostischen Systeme*, 1818.
4. *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des Christenthums*, etc. 2 vols. Ed. 2. 1823—27.
5. *Der heilige J. Chrysostomus und die Kirche in seinem Zeitalter*, 2 vols. 1821—2.
6. *Antignosticus, oder Geist des Tertullians*, 1826.
7. *Kleine Gelegenheitschriften*, Ed. 3, 1829.
8. *Allgemeine Geschichte der Christliche Religion und Kirche*, 2 vols. in 6 Parts, 1827—32.

Another work, entitled 'Geschichte der Apostolischen Zeit,' and introductory to his great work, was announced to be published in the course of the year 1832.

biographical sketches of the distinguished teachers and others, who exerted an influence upon the form and fashion of the doctrinal systems, in which the truths of Christianity were embodied.

It were much to be desired, that a good translation of this work could be laid before our christian public. Five years ago the Editor examined the work with special reference to such an undertaking ; but was then deterred from it by two considerations. One was, that at that time only the first part of the first volume was published ; and therefore a correct estimate of the general character of the whole work could not be formed ; and besides, the uncertainty of human affairs left no security that it could ever be in any respect completed. The other consideration was, that in that first part, which treats only of the external history, the author has taken his stand greatly in advance of the present state of historical knowledge in our country ; he assumes, as already known, very many things which to German students are elementary, but which with us are not yet thus generally known ; so that to use his work with profit, a course of preparatory reading, or of collateral study, would be absolutely necessary. Still, at the present time, both these considerations have less weight. The first is in a great measure removed by the circumstance, that each volume, or the history of each period, constitutes of itself a *whole*. The second is also weakened ; inasmuch as those parts relating to life and manners, antiquities, etc. and the history of doctrines, are in themselves complete, and are portions of ecclesiastical history, which, as such, are yet comparatively unknown in the English language.

But in thus expressing his desire to see Neander's great work in an English dress, the Editor cannot forbear also to say, that it is not every person who has a smattering of German that is qualified to undertake such a translation. The style of Neander, though lucid, is yet exceedingly idiomatic, and full of condensed thought ; and is therefore one of the most difficult to transfuse into good English. The translator of such a work too, a work which contains the results of the labours of a life, should be able to comprehend and appropriate to himself the lofty spirit in which it is written ; he should be able, like the author, to rise above the trammels of local circumstances and feelings ; and to regard, not the shell, but the kernel ; not the form, but the essence ; not the letter, but the spirit. It is therefore matter of deep regret, that a professed translation of Neander's work has begun to

appear in England, from the pen of one who would appear to possess none of these essential qualifications. He has neither fully understood the language of the original, nor expressed what he did understand in intelligible English; still less has he comprehended the spirit of the author; for while Neander has elevated his views above all external forms, and regarded Christianity only in its all pervading and life-giving power, it is the great object of the translator to bring down his work into the trammels of the ultra high-church theories of a portion of the English hierarchy. The publication of such a translation cannot but be fatal to the reputation of Neander in England; and must necessarily, though most falsely and unjustly, cause him to be ranked among those obscure and cumbrous writers, of whom it is the unfortunate reputation of Germany to have so many examples.

Neander has published nothing, except in the historical department of theology; but as a lecturer, his hearers are yet more numerous in his courses of systematic and exegetical theology, than in his historical course. His exegetical lectures are confined to the New Testament, and are most frequented. In these he brings the results of all his researches and of his vast reading, to bear upon the illustration both of the letter and the spirit of the text; and with very great effect. Indeed the lectures of Neander upon the New Testament, so far as the writer has had any personal or other means of forming an estimate, are superior to those of any living lecturer in Germany; inasmuch as they unfold to the hearer the ideas of the original in the very form and spirit in which they would appear to have existed in the minds of the sacred writers themselves. His lectures are less philological than those of many others; indeed he has little of the parade of philology; while the fact that he possesses the thing itself is obvious, both from the results which he presents, and also from the circumstance, that on proper occasions he can and does enter into all the minute philological details, in which German scholars are supposed to be peculiarly at home. On the other hand, he is distinguished for his attention to the *logical* part of exegesis, and is full of illustrations drawn from the connexion, the train and progress of the thoughts, as well as from the scope of the writer, the character of his mind, his spirit, his conceptions of Christianity, and the external relations and circumstances in which he was placed. It was to the writer of these lines a striking trait in the character of Neander's mind,

and was often a topic of remark among the Americans then in Berlin, that he was accustomed to take profound and expanded views of every subject, while at the same time he was capable of surveying it in its minutest details; two qualities which are rarely found united in the same mind.

In his private character and deportment, Neander is kind and amiable, emphatically 'doing good to all as he has opportunity.' His friends relate, that the writings of John are his favourite books of Scripture; and they ascribe this to a similarity between his tastes and feelings and spirit, and those of the beloved apostle. In his personal appearance and manners there is nothing remarkable or pleasing; they are those of a recluse student. In the afternoon of a sunny day, he may sometimes be seen loitering in the walk *Unter den Linden*, or wandering in the alleys of the *Thiergarten*; but he is never found in any mixed or general society. In conversation he does not possess that flow of interesting and striking remark, for which Tholuck is so much distinguished; his thoughts come out with more abruptness, and sententiousness; but are not perhaps on that account less impressive. Neander was almost the only theologian in Germany, known to the writer, whose views of the divine and native power of Christianity were such, as to lead him to wish every where to trust religion itself with its own support. In the minds of most, it seemed to be regarded as necessary, that religion should be established as a matter of state policy, and receive support as such from the state. These latter reasoned from the existing state of things in Germany and the adjacent countries; Neander drew his conclusions from the nature and spirit of Christianity itself, and was accustomed to appeal to the present aspect of the American churches in proof of the soundness of his views.

In selecting the following article for publication, the Editor has been influenced by two motives; first, a desire to make the American public acquainted with one of the most distinguished writers, and one of the most remarkable theological works, of modern times; and secondly, to spread before the public Neander's views of a controversy which once shook the church to the centre, and the consequences of which have not passed away even to the present time. Neander must be considered, in every respect, as an IMPARTIAL historian of these transactions. The Lutheran church, to which he belongs, sides as a church with neither of the great opponents; nor was there any thing in the

state of public opinion or feeling when he wrote, which could impart any local preference or authority to either side of the controversy in question, except as an important topic of historical interest. As such, the views which Neander has given are now presented to the readers of this work, in the hope and confidence that they will be found, if not satisfactory, yet at least impartial and deeply interesting.—My young friend who has executed the translation, is admirably fitted by his previous studies and experience to do it well; and he has succeeded accordingly.

EDITOR.

AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS.

PELAGIUS was a monk of Great Britain; and both of these circumstances, his education in Great Britain and in the monastic life, exerted an important influence upon his development as a theologian. As the British Church was derived from the Oriental, it is probable that a connexion was in various ways still kept up between them. Pelagius was very conversant with the teachers of the Eastern Church; and he found the manner in which they exhibited Christian Anthropology peculiarly accordant with his own personal experience.¹ He had from the first

¹ [An outline of the leading views of Neander respecting the history of Christian Anthropology during the whole period preceding the Pelagian controversies, will illustrate this remark and others occurring in the following sketch.

Anthropology receives its peculiar Christian import from the doctrine of redemption, the great central doctrine of revealed religion. By announcing this doctrine, Christianity furnished a new point of view for contemplating human nature, and came out in implied opposition to the conceptions previously entertained respecting it. So far as the doctrine of redemption proposes to renovate and restore a corrupt nature, to impart to it a new divine life, raising it to an elevation above the reach of its own powers, it appeals to a *sense of imperfection and need* in man, and stands opposed to the Stoical doctrine of self-sufficiency. So far as it proffers *parlon*, it presupposes a *sense of guilt*; and consequently the existence of free agency by which alone guilt is possible; and thus it stands opposed to the idea prevailing throughout the heathen world, that man acts according to mechanical laws, or a blind destiny, and that evil is the result of his natural organization. Thus are the two points of man's weakness and inability,

lived a life of earnest moral effort ; and had proceeded tranquilly in the course of improvement. It was not by some great crisis in his inward life, nor through any violent conflict, that he had

in opposition to his being sufficient of himself to attain his high destination, and of his freedom and power, in opposition to his being bound by a natural necessity, clearly seen in the light reflected from the doctrine of redemption. And a sense both of weakness and of power, of the kind here described, is implied in the full and unperturbed Christian consciousness of human nature. But from various causes, either of these points may become prominent for a time, to the entire exclusion, or at least the comparative shading and obscuring of the other.

In the Oriental church, and especially in the school at Alexandria, the opposition of the early teachers to the Gnostic doctrines deriving evil from a necessity of nature, led them to insist upon the free, self-determining power of man. And although they did not exclude the doctrine of man's depravity and dependence on grace, they gave it a subordinate place. This tendency was principally represented by Clement and Origen. And it is in general found more congenial to those persons who have grown up under Christian instruction, and upon whom its influence has been more gradual, mingling insensibly with their own voluntary exertions in the business of moral culture.

In the Western church, on the other hand, and especially in that of North Africa, man's depravity, and his need of redemption thence resulting, and his dependence on grace to renovate and restore his corrupt nature, were made prominent. It was the case however here, as in the Eastern Church, that the predominant conception was not at first exclusive of the other. From many passages in the writings of Tertullian, by whom this tendency was principally represented in this period, it is plain, that he did not infringe upon the free, moral power of man, as has been since done by those who have carried this tendency to an extreme. This view of human nature would be likely to accord with the experience of persons who had passed more suddenly, and through a violent crisis of being, from unbelief to faith, and from a depraved to a holy life.

Such briefly are the views of Neander respecting the history of this doctrine before the Pelagian controversies. Comp. his *Church Hist.* Bd. I. Abth. iii. p. 1041—1060 ; and Bd. II. Abth. iii. p. 1185 sq. He finds the germ of these controversies in the diverging tendencies above pointed out between the East and West ; though these divergencies were so slight, as to produce no clashing of sentiment, until farther unfolded by Augustine and Pelagius.

The Translator has retained the word *Anthropology*, which constantly occurs in the original of this sketch, and in all the German theological writers, to denote *the doctrine respecting man*. It is hardly

attained to faith, and been brought to decide upon leading a life consecrated to God. But, without his being conscious of any resistance to its influence, Christianity had acted upon the development of his moral powers and character.² He had not to contend against a wild and ardent natural temperament, nor against desires and passions which were peculiarly inordinate.³ Nor had he been thrown into those storms of active life, which summon one to a more resolute conflict with himself; for he led a tranquil life in study, and in the ascetic discipline adopted by the monks.

The effort which the discipline of the monks excited among them, to bring their own internal life into conformity with the ideal moral excellence set up before them, produced different effects upon different characters. Some it led to deeper self-examination and self-knowledge. And struck with the sense of the contrast between their own actual state, and those ideal models by which they were inspired, they looked to the God revealed in Christ, to remove this contrast and to satisfy their deep-felt need. Others, on the contrary, by contemplating these ideal models, which seemed to them to set forth the essential excellencies of their own moral nature, by the success attending their ascetic endeavours, and by the consciousness of a power in the will to overcome the allurements of sense, came to a feeling of their own moral strength, and imbibed a spirit of self-confidence. It naturally became a prominent thought with them, how far man could advance by actively unfolding the germs of good lying in his own moral nature, by the energetic power of the will, and by self-discipline. It was natural, too, in the monastic life, that the outward asceticism, and the subduing of the lower

sanctioned by good English authority; but it is so convenient a designation of this doctrine, as to lead us to wish for its adoption, while there can be no objection to it either on the ground of euphony or analogy.—Ta.

² Augustine, the zealous, but candid opponent of Pelagius, is certainly the most credible witness for the fact, that the latter, by his strict monastic life, had acquired universal veneration. He thus speaks respecting him in his work *De peccat. merit. et remis.* III. 3, "Istum, sicut eum qui noverunt loquuntur, bonum ac prædicandum virum.—Ille tam egregie Christianus." Again he writes respecting him, Ep. 186, "Non solum dileximus, verum etiam diligimus eum."

³ We cannot indeed bring any historical vouchers for the truth of this description, since so little is known respecting the life of Pelagius; but we derive this picture of him, from his doctrines and his writings.

propensities, should have led to a forgetfulness of the true nature of inward holiness, as a disposition having its root in love. It was natural, that in doing so much to repress the particular visible outbreakings of evil, they should have neglected to search out its secret springs; thus disregarding the word of the Lord contained in Matt. 12: 29. In this way, they might come to believe, that by the exertion of human powers, great results had been produced; while yet, for all this, the radical evil may have been any thing but cured.

As to Pelagius, this latter effect cannot be said to have been produced upon him, certainly not in all its extent. On the contrary, he exhibited, in this respect, the better moral spirit of monasticism. His letter to Demetrias,⁴ a virgin who had consecrated herself as a nun, shows how important he felt it, to warn others against the aberrations of an ascetic spirit which might become infected, even unconsciously, with hypocrisy, concealing spiritual pride under the mask of humility; and how dangerous he thought that disposition to be, which should suppose that after resisting one particular evil, it might abandon itself the more unreservedly to another.⁵ He well knew how to distinguish that false humility, which only conceals spiritual pride, from the true humility recommended by Christ. And in this respect he says with truth of his contemporaries, "Many follow after the shadow of this virtue, few after its true substance;" and he then undertakes a description, drawn doubtless from the very life, of that pretended holiness, which makes a show of humility: "It is very easy to wear a poor garment, to salute another in lowly guise;—with the head bowed down, and the eyes demiss, to put on the appearance of humility and gentleness; it is easy to speak one's words but half out, with a low and scarcely audible voice, often to sigh, and with every word to

⁴ Written A. D. 415, while he was in Palestine, and with reference to the disputed questions, which were then agitated there; although they are not expressly mentioned.

⁵ See, e. g. p. 67. ed. Semler. "Nos (proh pudor!) quadam dilectione peccati cum in quibusdam ostendimus quandam vim naturae nostrae, in aliis omnino torpescimus." On p. 69, he says, that with many, *abstinentia* and *jejunium* were nothing else than *umbracula vitiorum*. On p. 74, he says respecting humility, "Praecipue tamen fictam humilitatem fugiens, illam sectare quae vera est, quam Christus docuit humilitatem, in qua non sit superbia inclusa."

call one's self a sinner and a wretch."⁶ In such an hypocritical form, and in this false caricature, did the sense of sin, which is an essential element of Christian consciousness, often probably pass under the notice of Pelagius. And it is easy to see, how his disgust at the hypocritical form in which this Christian sense of guilt frequently appeared, might have led him to overlook the deep truth lying at its basis.

Still Pelagius was not free from those perversions of the monastic Ethics, by which their moral doctrine was severed from its internal connexion with the doctrines of faith. He was ensnared by that idea, so common among the monastic orders, that man can advance farther in Christian perfection than the law requires, by the practice of the so called *consilia evangelica*;—that theory by which a false contrast between laity and clergy was introduced; by which the obligation universally binding upon men during their whole life, and in all their relations, to attain to a holy Christian standard, was obscured and let down; and by which, on the contrary, human power, considered merely as human, was set very much too high.⁷ The great thing with Pelagius was *sincere moral effort*,—a practical Christianity, exemplifying the ideal moral standard contained in the commands and counsels of Christ; but not taken in connexion with the fundamental nature of the whole doctrine of the Gospel.

Connected with this serious, conscientious cast of character, Pelagius had, so far as we can judge from his writings, that turn of mind,⁸ which led him to take clear and intelligible views on every subject before him. He was not one of those who feel themselves impelled to dive into the depths of the soul and spirit, and to bring their secret things to light. Where others found myste-

⁶ "Perfacile est enim, aliquam vestem habere contemptam, salutare submissius, inclinato in terram capite oculisque dijectis humilitatem ac mansuetudinem polliceri, lenta voce tenuique sermones infringere, suspirare crebrius, et ad omne verbum peccatorem et miserum se clamare."

⁷ Ep. ad Demetriad. c. XI. "Supra legem facere, amore perfectionis supra mandata conscindere."

⁸ [*Klare verständige Richtung*,—a phrase depending upon the distinction made in German philosophy between *Verstand* (understanding) and *Vernunft* (reason), and incapable of being rendered into English, except by a somewhat copious paraphrase. The immediate succeeding context will show the correctness of the paraphrase which is here given.—Tr.

ries, he could easily regard every thing as susceptible of explanation.

We must here notice, also, the external opposition, which cooperated with the above-named tendency of mind, to unfold the theological system of Pelagius. He had not enough of a dogmatizing or systematizing spirit to be led, from his own internal impulse, to form an original and peculiar system; and he would never have done this, had he not been supplied with a motive from without, by the prevalence of a spirit which seemed to him injurious to morality. Nothing but the belief, that the moral interest predominant with him, was endangered by a particular doctrinal tendency, and his desire to establish and vindicate this interest, could have induced him to enter upon theological investigations and distinctions. It happened also now, that he came into contact with some of those men, who entertained the false notion of faith so prevalent at that time, regarding it as a mere speculative belief in certain dogmas which they had been taught, without any influence upon the heart. There were those who supposed, that if they possessed such a faith, and stood in external communion with the Church, they were sure of salvation, although they might be far from holiness of life.⁹ There were others, who thought they had done enough, if they merely refrained from the grosser outbreakings of the passions and desires, and who excused themselves for the rest by the corruption and weakness of human nature, now no longer able to obey the divine commandments in all their strictness.¹⁰ In

⁹ Though they might previously have to expiate their sins in the *ignis purgatorius*, they supposed that even this was an advantage which they enjoyed above all who were not Christians. See Bd. II. p. 213, of the author's *Kirchengeschichte*. Hence the zeal with which Pelagius endeavours to take away the support which such persons thought they derived from the text 1 Cor. 3: 13; comp. his Comm. on this text. "Non hic, ut quidam putant, in igne flammæ arsura sunt opera; sed homines qui ita operati sunt, ut increantur incendio deputari." He understands this text to relate to teachers alone; and then adds the following language, in which we discover the moral ardor for which he was distinguished: "Quod si ille non nisi per ignem salvus erit, qui justus de proprio est, quia negligenter aedificavit discipulos, quid de illis fiet, qui et sermone non aedificant, et insuper scandalizant exemplo."

¹⁰ Ep. ad Demetriad. c. 3. "Qui vitam suam emendare nolunt, videntur emendare velle naturam." C. 19. "Dicimus: Durum est, arduum est, non possumus, homines sumus, fragili carne circumdati."

opposition to the dead faith of such persons, Pelagius urged the claims of the moral law revealed in the conscience, and the still higher claims of that moral law revealed in the Gospel. With conscientious fidelity, he adopted into his Christian Ethics all the moral precepts which he could find in the discourses of Christ, interpreted, too, according to the very letter.¹¹ And yet, his ethical code was no longer a properly Christian system of morals; since the latter gives a law of life, not merely coordinate with faith, but proceeding from it, and grounded in it. Pelagius, on the contrary, set up in opposition to a dead theology, which knew no other idea of faith, than that opposed by the apostle James, a preceptive, dead, ethical system, about which the same is true, which Paul has said respecting the law.

The conflict between these opposing tendencies was not indeed wholly new, but had existed long before,¹² especially in the Oriental church; and in general, the true Pauline notion of faith, and consequently the true Pauline notion of the relation between faith and the life, had been for a long time obscured.¹³ It was now the object of Pelagius to arouse men from their moral stupidity, and to excite them to the fulfilment of those commands which were held up before them. And he knew of no better way for attaining this object, than to point out the falsity of all excuses drawn from the natural weakness and corruption of human nature; to show what power for goodness lies in human nature itself, how all evil flows only from the free will of man,—that he can never plead, for his justification, that he is borne along to evil by an irresistible power; but that it always depends equally upon himself to do either good or evil. To confirm his declarations, Pelagius appealed to what had been accomplished even by the heathen, in their efforts for moral improvement. How much more, he asked, ought now to be accomplished by human nature, redeemed, renewed, and furnished by Christianity with many new aids for goodness! But then, it was not so much what man has become by grace, which he wished here to exhibit. His favourite theme,—the one on which he spoke oftenest, and most impressively, was the moral powers with which human nature has been endued by the Creator. We

¹¹ As in the prohibition of swearing. See Ep. ad Demetriad. c. 22. Ep. Hilar. ad August. 156.

¹² See Bd. II. Abth. II. p. 742, of the original work.

¹³ See Bd. I. Abth. III. p. 1079, of the original work.

would not by any means affirm, that he was not in earnest in respect to the doctrine of grace, or that it was hypocrisy in him to profess to receive the doctrines current in the church on this subject; for he was doubtless conscientious in receiving into his faith every thing which he found in the Scriptures and in the established system of doctrine. But all this was foreign to those religious and moral ideas which had grown up within himself, and could not naturally become incorporated with his own system.

And now, besides the conflict in which he thus stood with a dead and unfruitful faith, he was on this side also urged to a further contest. He saw the doctrines of grace and predestination brought forward in such a form, as seemed to him absolutely to overthrow the doctrine of free-will, and so to furnish a new excuse to moral inactivity.

The representative of the second doctrinal tendency,¹⁴ who stood forth in conflict with Pelagius, was AUGUSTINE. And he was distinguished from Pelagius in every respect,—by the history both of his internal and external life; by the course of his education and the development of his theological views; as well as by the whole peculiar character of his mind. Augustine had been able to attain to inward peace only after a long and violent contest with an ardent and vehement natural temperament, which, in the wild consciousness of strength, resisted every thing divine.¹⁵ Hurried hither and thither during many years of his life, between the ideal

¹⁴ [See a statement of the two diverging tendencies here alluded to in Note 1.—TRANS.]

¹⁵ [*Dem Göttlichen*, literally *the Divine*,—language which, as applied to man, though it may appear objectionable to some, yet when it is explained according to the views of those by whom it is used, implies nothing inconsistent with the commonly received doctrine respecting human character. It will be seen in the sequel that Augustine considered the higher principles of reason and conscience, as being absolutely dependent upon God for their exercise, and as being the organ by which his influences are received, and the medium of a living communion between the soul of man and its Author. This view of the relation of the higher faculties of man to the Spirit of God, is very prominent in the religious systems of Neander, Tholuck, and others; and this seems to be the ground of their frequent use of the language here remarked upon.—TRANS.]

standard which attracted the longing of his spirit, and the desires and passions which still held him captive to the lusts of the world; he experienced in himself what the contest of the flesh and spirit is. From his own internal experience, he learnt how to understand the fundamental ideas of christian anthropology, and especially of the Pauline doctrine of man; and indeed he occupied himself especially with the study of Paul's writings at the very time, when that great crisis in his character took place. As he found in his own life two great divisions,—on the one hand, a nature powerless notwithstanding all its efforts, and striving in vain after holiness; and on the other, a nature subordinate to faith, and, by the power of redemption, triumphant over evil;—he saw again the same great divisions in the historical development of human nature in general. The contrast between that which proceeds from nature left to itself and estranged from God, and that which proceeds from the new and divine principle of life imparted to humanity through redemption and regeneration,—this contrast, which he had learned so well from his own experience, was thenceforth adopted by him, as the central point of his theology.

As now the opposition between good and evil in human nature arrested the attention of Augustine from the first, it could not but occur to him as the most difficult of all questions, *Whence is evil in this nature*, which feels itself attracted towards what is good, and is even conscious of it, as belonging to its original being?—This question employed him, as soon as he began to think upon higher objects. It was by contemplating this question, that he was led to Manichaeism; and it was by prosecuting his inquiries farther that he was brought to abandon this system. To Pelagius, on the contrary, this question could not be a difficult one. Evil appeared to him to result naturally from the preponderance of sense over reason, and to be necessarily attendant upon that moral freedom, without which virtue could not exist. Pelagius always proceeded from the experience of the *phenomenal*,—Augustine, from the contemplation of the *ideal*.¹⁶ The depth of feeling, of thought, of speculation,

¹⁶ [The sentiment here, when divested of its Platonic dress, is what one might express by saying, that Pelagius, in his speculations, considered things *as they are*; Augustine considered them *as they should be*; i. e. the former was a realist,—the latter, an idealist. Pelagius seeing man, as a matter of fact, imperfect, erring, and sinning, and not considering what man was designed to be, would find nothing strange, or

which distinguished Augustine, was altogether wanting in Pelagius; and this was another cause of the entirely different direction which was taken by their contemplations on christian doctrine.

The system of Pelagius was formed of heterogeneous elements. It consisted partly of certain general moral notions, some of which he adopted from classical antiquity, and others from Christianity; which were all brought together, without any very distinct perception on his part of the peculiarities of the two kinds; partly of the results of a narrow intellectual philosophy, such as are easily derived from a superficial observation of the world by men of a less speculative spirit; and partly of the disjointed elements of theology, which he had borrowed both from the Bible and from the established ecclesiastical belief, and which did not always correspond exactly with the other materials of his system. The less there was of the speculative, systematic, and dogmatic element in Pelagius, the less was he likely to see clearly what consequences would result from carrying through consistently the principles on which he proceeded, and which he in fact carried no farther, than his practical need required. With Augustine, on the contrary, in consequence of his peculiar mental constitution, the effort after systematic unity and consistency was as predominant in his mode of thinking, as in his life. He could leave no difficulty unsolved; and he felt himself impelled to develop still more and more fully the results of every principle which he had once embraced, nor did he shrink from any consequences which it necessarily involved.

We must however notice different epochs or periods in the developement of Augustine's theological character, through which he passed before he attained to the last consistent scheme, resulting from those principles which he had learnt from his own experience, in the great crisis of his being.

The first period embraces the works which he wrote from the time of his baptism, until the first years of his exercising the office of presbyter, somewhere about the year 394. These works are, *De moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae et Manichaeorum*, *De vera religione*, and *De libero arbitrio*. At this period of his life the christian sense of the need of aid and redemption, which

hard to be accounted for, in sin. Augustine, considering what man was designed to be, and the ideal of excellence to be attained by him, would naturally see much in his present state of sin, seemingly inconsistent, and of difficult solution.—Tr.

is felt by one when convinced of moral evil, and the consciousness that the fellowship between man and God which is restored by redemption, or in other words GRACE, is the source of every thing which is truly good ;—both of these were united in him with an idea which he had taken from Platonism about the relation between all good to the original Good, and of all being to the supreme and absolute Being. The principle of grace, and resignation to God as the original source of all good,—these were the points common to this period, and to all the following periods of his theological developement; and they constituted the ground on which he built every thing, and from which, with a consistency becoming constantly more decisive, he formed his system. But in connexion with this tendency, there were also at that time other tendencies of his mind, which were afterwards repressed, through the undue and entire predominance of this fundamental bias.

The conceptions which Augustine entertained of human nature, have been unjustly supposed to be derived from the influence of Manichaeism. His doctrine respecting the moral corruption of man, was something entirely different from the Dualism of Mani, which was drawn from the philosophy of nature. It did not, like that of Mani, arise from confounding the *natural* and the *moral*, but from a pure fact of moral consciousness. It may be said with more truth, that while the desire to explain in a speculative way, the irreconcilable contrast between GOOD and EVIL, of which he had become early conscious in his inmost soul, had led him to embrace Manichaeism, he had been compelled again to abandon this system, by coming to apprehend this contrast more and more in a moral light. Farther; it was in direct opposition to Manichaeism, that he framed the theory, derived by him originally from Platonism, that evil has not, as Mani taught, a self-subsisting existence; but that, as all real existence, all true being, flows from the Supreme and Absolute Being, and has its foundation in the same; so evil is nothing else, than the *subjective* deviation of created being from the law of the supreme and only true Being, and is in itself a mere nibility, a non-existence, a μη ὄν; which, however, as soon as it comes forward into action, must submit itself to the law of the Supreme Being.¹⁷ To this point, Au-

¹⁷ A *defectus ab ordine*, which however must yield to the *summus ordo*; see especially his books *De ordine*.

gustine held fast, through all his changes. And it was not difficult to reconcile this theory with his later doctrine of Absolute Predestination. But during the period now under consideration, he connected with this another principle, by which this earlier period is essentially distinguished from that which followed.

In this period, it was an important principle with him, that this subjective deviation from the Supreme Good, could not be explained from any necessity of nature, and could be derived only from the free Will. He held, that this free, self-determining Will is always the sole ground of this deviation; and that we are to look for no other cause of the different relations of men to the Supreme Good, than the different directions of the Will, which cannot themselves be accounted for by any thing farther back. To assert the freedom of the Will, in opposition to the necessity of nature, he felt to be especially important, during this first period. And even afterwards, he still held fast this principle *in theory*; but it was only through a dialectical self-delusion that he could unite it *in practice* with the results of his later system.

The principles of Augustine, as they appear from this point of view, were the following. In the state in which man now finds himself, it is no longer in his power to be good; because he either does not know what, in conformity with his destination, he ought to be; or else, if he knows this, he is unable to live conformably to his known destination. Ignorance of what is good, and the difficulty attending the practice of it,—these are the moral evil of human nature; and this would be inconsistent with the justice of God, were it not to be regarded as a righteous punishment. Sin is its own punishment; so that man having had the knowledge of good, and not rightly employing it, consequently lost this knowledge; and having had ability for good, and yet not doing good, he lost the ability itself. If the question was presented to him, How this hindrance to the practice of goodness, which is found cleaving to the moral nature of all mankind, can be reconciled with the righteous judgment of God? he replied,—that we might justly complain, if no one had ever been able to triumph over the power of error and passion; but that in fact we are furnished with means sufficient to enable us to obtain the victory. God is every where present, and, in various ways, through the instrumentality of the creatures subservient to him, calls after revolted man, instructs those who

believe, and strengthens those who exert all their own powers. That ignorance of man, for which he is not himself to blame, will not be imputed to him as guilt, but only the fact, that he does not strive after knowledge; his moral imperfections will not be charged against him; but his neglect of those means of recovery placed within his reach. Here, therefore, Augustine makes the operations of grace, without which man cannot be freed from moral evil, to be uniformly conditioned by the subjective direction of the free Will.

In a work composed about the year 394, entitled *Explicatio propositionum quarundam de Epistola ad Romanos*, he was led, in his explanation of the difficult texts in c. 9 of this Epistle, (to which he afterwards particularly appealed in behalf of his doctrine of absolute Predestination,) to develop more in connexion his ideas on these points. He proceeds on the principle, that all men find themselves in a state of alienation from God, in which they are unable to accomplish any thing truly good. Love to God is the only source of true goodness; and this can be attained by us only through the communication of the Holy Spirit. Since now man is unable, before this renewal of his inward life by the Holy Ghost, to perform any thing good; he cannot, by any kind of good works, deserve that grace, by which he must be healed of his moral maladies; in other words, grace goes before all desert. Still, there is nothing arbitrary on the part of God, when to one he gives, and from another withholds, his saving grace. Men obtain this grace through faith, and faith is wholly the work of man.¹⁸ In the passage relating to the election of Jacob and the rejection of Esau, he supposed, therefore, that nothing more was meant, than to deny that election is on condition of good works, but not that it is on condition of faith.¹⁹ The Apostle Paul says, God *works* all in all; but not, God *believes* all in all. He explains the hardening of Pharaoh's heart as owing to his own guilt; the punishment of his preceding unbelief, and through which his wickedness punished itself.

In this scheme of doctrine, there was much, which such a

¹⁸ "Quod credimus, nostrum est. Quod autem bonum operamur, illius, qui credentibus in se dat Spiritum Sanctum." § 60.

¹⁹ "Non quidem Deus elegit opera, quæ ipse largitur, cum dat Spiritum Sanctum, ut per caritatem bona operemur; sed tamen elegit fidem."

mind as Augustine's, striving so earnestly after consistency and unity, would be led, after a farther examination of its own christian consciousness, and a longer study of the Holy Scriptures, to abandon as untenable. For in proportion as the nature and the worth of faith came to be more highly esteemed by him, and that partial view which he at first entertained of it,²⁰ as a mere belief in authority, became ennobled into the idea of a living faith; just in this proportion must it have become evident to his mind, that even faith itself presupposes an entrance of the divine life into the human soul; that even here the divine and human mingle together; and that the limits of both, in relation to each other, cannot be so definitely determined. But perceiving this, he might naturally fall into the other extreme, and refer faith, like every thing else, to the divine agency alone, and wholly exclude the self-directing agency of man. Besides this, the vindication of God in respect to the calling of nations and the election of individuals, which he had formerly attempted on the ground of a predestination conditioned on the divine prescience,²¹ and his solution of the difficulties in the Epistle to the Romans founded on the same principle, could not be satisfactory to his penetrating mind. To one of his character it would seem preferable, at once to cut the knot, which no human explanation could untie.

Thus does it appear, that within a period of between three and four years from the time above mentioned, Augustine had changed his views on these points; since he now acknowledged that the divine and human elements could not be separated in the way he had formerly supposed, and that even in faith a divine element is contained. In a book which he directed to

²⁰ See the author's Kirchengesch. Bd. II. Abth. I. p. 434, 435.

²¹ He supposed the election of individuals and the calling of nations, to be conditioned on the foreknowledge of God as to the manner in which they would have received the Gospel, had it been made known to them. See Ep. 102, to *Deo gratias: quibus omnino annuntiata non est (salus), non credituri præsciebantur*. Yet when Augustine wrote this, in the year 408, he had had his doctrine of predestination for some time fully developed, and therefore this answer could no longer satisfy him; and he had, from the 'stand-point' of that doctrine, another reply in the back-ground, at which he hinted: *excepta illa altitudine sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei, ubi fortassis aliud divinum consilium longe secretius latet*.

Simplician, bishop of Milan, written in the year 397, and designed to answer various questions respecting the Epistle to the Romans,²² he first developed this turning point in the tendency of his theological opinions.²³ He here opposed the theory which he himself had formerly advocated; and from the manner in which he endeavoured to show its falsity, it is easy to see, that he had not been long in possession of his new views, and was then under the influence of his first zeal in behalf of the discoveries, which he supposed himself to have made.

In this work, Augustine again undertakes the explanation of the difficult texts in the ninth chapter of Romans;²⁴ but the explanation which he had formerly given, is no longer satisfactory to him. Yet how came it to pass, that he now explained these texts in that sense, which indeed first offers itself, when no regard is paid to the object and connexion of the Epistle, and made them, thus interpreted, the basis of his system; although he had formerly interpreted them according to the system which he supposed himself to have drawn from the whole doctrine of Scripture? The reason why these texts now made so different an impression on him, is doubtless to be found in the fact, that under the influence of his inward experience, his whole manner of thinking had become changed. It is now clear to him, that Paul teaches a divine election which is conditioned on neither a foreknowledge of faith, nor of good works proceeding from faith; for Paul lays the stress of the argument upon the fact, that the election of God made the difference between the children before they were born, and of course before they could believe, before they could do either good or evil.²⁵ Not even does the merit of *faith* go before the mercy of God, but on the contrary presupposes this mercy, and is itself one of the gifts of divine grace. In Rom. 9: 11, Paul does not oppose faith to good works, as the ground on which men are called by God, but he opposes the *calling* itself to works. The calling of God

²² De diversis quæstionibus ad Simplicianum libri duo.

²³ In speaking of *Predestinatione Sanctorum*, c. 20, he himself says, with reference to the work above mentioned, *Plinius sapere capi in mei episcopatus exordio, quando et INITIUM FIDEI DONUM DEI ESSE COGNOVI et asserui.*

²⁴ Lib. I. Quæst. II.

²⁵ "Si non de operibus, quæ non erant in nondum natis, nec de fide, quid nec ipsa erat."

is here therefore the first cause ; and the existence of faith presupposes this calling. But how comes it to pass that the calling of God, through the preaching of the Gospel, and through the external circumstances which prepare the way for this, reaches to one, and not to another ; and that the same influences from without make a different impression upon different persons, and indeed upon the same persons at different times? The Almighty and All-wise God could find means, adapted to all the different states of men, which would with an innate necessity make an impression upon them ; so that they, being awakened, drawn, moved, and enlightened, must follow, without yet being conscious of any resistance of their will to the divine grace acting upon it.²⁶ It must indeed be said, that the willing of man is nothing without the mercy of God ; but it can by no means be said, on the other side, that the mercy and grace of God are nothing without the will of man ; for God could find means to mould every human will, in a way exactly suited to each individual. On whomsoever God has mercy, and whom he actually elects, such an one he calls in the most appropriate manner ; so that he is both drawn irresistibly towards him that calls, and at the same time follows freely after him.²⁷ Nor is it any longer satisfactory to Augustine, to explain the hardening of one person, and his consequent rejection, in opposition to the election of another, as a punishment deserved particularly by the individual ; since, according to his view, the omnipotence of God could find means to act upon every degree of obduracy, and there exists in all the same want of susceptibility, until God by his grace affects the heart.

Thus Augustine comes to the following result. All men are found in the same state of condemnation. The reason why some,—*not* are plunged into destruction, which would be contrary to the holiness and to the love of God,—but are not rescued from the ruin into which all, according to the righteous judgment of God, are fallen through the guilt of the first transgression ; while to others he shows mercy according to his free love, and calls them by his grace to eternal life ;—the reason of this lies in the secret and to us unsearchable decree of God.

²⁶ " Posset ita vocare, quomodo illis aptum esset, ut et moverentur et intelligerent et sequerentur."

²⁷ " Cujus autem miseretur, sic eum vocat, quomodo scit ei congerere, ut vocantem non respuat."

This, however, we must always hold fast, that the justice of God cannot be impeached, although its proceeding may surpass the measure of our knowledge. Yet even according to the analogy of human relations, one cannot be accused of injustice, who, agreeably to his own will, remits the debt of one person, while from another he requires payment.

It appears from what has now been said, that Augustine had carried through his doctrinal system on this point to all its results, at least ten years before the opinions of Pelagius had awakened any public controversy. It cannot, then, be true, that he was influenced in forming his system by opposition to Pelagianism.²⁸ It may be said with more truth, that Pelagius was

²⁸ [This remark deserves particular attention ; since the representation has been made times without number, in writings hostile to Augustine, that he was driven by the pressure of controversy to adopt his extravagant doctrines ; and that, had it not been for the contradiction of Pelagius, he would never have thought of his "Decretum Absolutum." Thus Priestley represents, in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, (Vol. I. Part III. Sec. I.) that "*before Augustine engaged in his controversy with Pelagius, he held the same opinion concerning free will with the rest of the Fathers.*" And he quotes Augustine's retraction of his earlier opinions about faith, as having taken place in consequence of the Pelagian controversies ; whereas it now appears to have been made several years before these controversies commenced. This is only one instance of many, in which those who have preferred the more youthful to the more mature opinions of Augustine, have ascribed the change to his being "unhappily perverted by controversy." Few will deny that Augustine carried his principles on some points to an extreme ; but in justice to him it should be remembered, that he did this from his own internal impulse, from a love of consistency fearless of consequences, and not from any external cause ; least of all under the impulse of the heat and blindness resulting from controversy.

This false representation has not, till now, been directly controverted by any of the numerous admirers and apologists of Augustine. But Schleiermacher, whose system of congenial depth and consistency enables him to appreciate that of Augustine, expressed his opinion a few years since, that the new critical investigations of this controversy then going forward, would make it appear, that this oft-repeated charge is unfounded. We refer to the remarks made by him in his article on the doctrine of Election in the "*Theologische Zeitschrift*," Art. I. p. 3 sq. Berlin, 1819. He there advocates the distinguishing points of the Augustinian and Calvinistic creed, in opposition to the Lutherans ; and says it seems to him that these points, so far from

excited and led on to bring out his doctrine, by opposition to the Augustinian principles of the natural depravity of man, and of a grace and predestination not conditioned on the self-determination of the free will. These principles coming into collision with his own, first stirred him up to resistance. While he was sojourning at Rome near the beginning of the fifth century, he heard a bishop cite the following words from the Confessions of Augustine :²⁹ "*My God, bestow upon me what thou commandest, and command from me what thou wilt,*" implying that all good comes from God. At this Pelagius took great offence, supposing that such a sentiment necessarily excluded free will ; although in fact, nothing more than this is implied in it, viz. that the ideal conception of holiness and the power to realize it, flow both from the same divine source,—an opinion which may be adopted independently of the Augustinian theory of predestination.

[Neander now proceeds with the external history of this controversy, until Pelagianism was condemned ; the emperor Honorius and the Roman bishop Zosimus having been brought to declare against it. We shall here cite only the result of this external controversy, and then proceed with the internal history.]

If now we cast an eye back upon the result of these controversies in the Western Church, it cannot be denied, that here, as well as in the doctrinal controversies in the Oriental Church, no free developement of the points of difference took place, by which the result should have been effected ; but that Pelagianism was put under the pressure of an external power, which prevented it from speaking out freely. Still there appears to be a great difference between the course of these controversies and those in the East. Here, the result was not brought about by the intrigues of a theological party which, confounding secular and spiritual interests, succeeded in connecting itself with the court ; but through the transcendent spirit of one man, animated by zeal for a truth which to him was sacred, and who, controlling those by whom he was surrounded, knew how by their means to gain over the civil power to be subservient to his own views. And although a few men of independent minds were

occurring to Augustine in the heat of the debate, belonged essentially to those original convictions which drew him into this controversy, and animated him while prosecuting it.—TRANS.

²⁹ Lib. X. c. 29.

compelled to submit to number and authority, yet the doctrine which here gained the victory was not, as was often the case in the East, forcibly engrafted by the civil power upon the natural development of the church; thereby occasioning afterwards a violent reaction. But a doctrine here prevailed, which had in its favour the voice of universal christian consciousness, which pronounced distinctly against the Pelagian tendency;—a doctrine which stood in entire accordance and harmony with the whole life and experience of the church, as expressed in the litanies and all the services of worship. And therefore, although Pelagianism was overcome rather by being suppressed, than in consequence of any free course of discussion and development; still there was not, so far as this doctrine was concerned, any violent reaction. But in respect to another point, the system of Augustine comes itself into collision with a higher inward power, with a conviction hitherto predominant in most minds, and planted in the very depths of christian experience and consciousness. And this part of his system could not, for this very reason, so easily win its way to a general acknowledgement and reception in the church.

In order to make what has now been said the more obvious, we shall proceed, before going farther in the external history of these controversies, to examine more closely the relation in which these two conflicting modes of thinking stand to each other, and the manner in which the conflict between them was carried on.

A few words, in the first place, respecting the importance to Christian Theology, of the questions which here come under discussion. Pelagius and especially Cœlestius³⁰ endeavoured to diminish the impression of the importance of these questions, as if all existing differences could be resolved into merely speculative varieties of sentiment, which had nothing to do with faith. They were led to this, however, by the relation in which they stood to the prevailing party in the church; since it was at first their chief concern, to be allowed to propagate freely their own peculiar sentiments in connexion with those to which they were opposed. Quite different was the declaration of the violent and

³⁰ See the account of his trial at Carthage, and his letter to the bishop of Rome, as given pp. 1219, 1234 of Neander's Church Hist. Bd. II. Abth. III.

reckless Julian, bishop of Eclanum, who had been excommunicated from the catholic church, and had therefore no longer any occasion to seek for a peaceable adjustment of differences. He speaks³¹ very emphatically against those of his party who, for reasons of worldly policy, submitted to the reigning power, and then comforted themselves by saying,³² that this controversy did not concern the essentials of faith, but turned upon obscure questions, which had little to do with the vital points of Christianity. He affirms, on the contrary, that the highest object of christian faith, the doctrine respecting God, is essentially affected by the questions in dispute; for the *Traduciani*³³ did not agree with other Christians even with regard to this doctrine. The God of the Traduciani, he says, is not the God of the Gospel. For while they teach that human nature is tainted with evil, even in generation,—while they represent the natural appetites and desires themselves (*concupiscentia*) as sinful; they must either deny that God is the creator of human nature, and make Satan its author, thus falling into Manichæism; or they must make God himself the author of sin. And while they exhibit God as punishing men on account of evil, for which they are not themselves to blame, and as distributing death and life arbitrarily, they infringe upon the doctrine of the divine holiness and justice.

Nor, on the other side, did Augustine concede to Cœlestius, that this controversy was so unimportant in its bearings on Christian Theology. Believing that the doctrine of a Redeemer and a redemption, in which the essence of Christianity consists, presupposes a recognition of the need of redemption; he held that the doctrine of redemption is therefore closely connected with that of the depravity of human nature, and consequently with the doctrine respecting the first sin, and its consequences; and that the former fundamental doctrine loses all its significance, unless the latter doctrines are presupposed. In

³¹ *Opus Imperfectum Augustini contra Julianum*, L. V. c. 2 et sq. and L. VI. c. 1.

³² "Ejusmodi opinionem hactenus super nostro fuisse certamine, ut ad quæstionem involutam magis quam ad summam spectare fidei crederetur."

³³ So he called the advocates of the doctrine of original sin, accusing them of holding to a propagation of sin in the way of ordinary generation, *propagatio peccati per traducem*.

the contrast between Adam and Christ, therefore, consists the very essence of Christianity.³⁴

Thus it appears, that the prevailing interest of the Pelagians in this controversy, was an interest in behalf of the *general religious and moral consciousness of man*, as it exists, however, under the influence of Christianity, without which it could never have been so far developed; while Augustine was animated by an interest for what constitutes the more peculiar nature of *christian consciousness*.

Since now many connected topics of Christian Theology came under discussion during this controversy, the question first arises, Whether all the particular differences here brought to view, may not be referred back to some one fundamental difference of religious sentiment? and if so, What is this highest fundamental principle from which these differences proceeded? If we confine ourselves to the points which were stated by the two parties themselves, and of which they had formed distinct conceptions, it must appear that this controversy arose from the *different modes of considering human nature in its present state*; or rather, from the *different views entertained respecting the relation of the present moral condition of mankind to the sin of Adam*. For every thing else which came into discussion,—the different views entertained as to man's need of assistance, as to the nature of redemption, as to the work which Christ performed, and the influence of Christianity, as to the object and efficacy of baptism, in short every point debated between the two parties, was intimately connected with this fundamental difference. Augustine always came back at last to this, that man is in a state of corruption; and this on the other hand was always the point, to which the disavowal of the Pelagians especially referred.

We find, however, that many of the disputed points cannot be derived from this one radical difference. And even more; we find some differences between these two systems, from which this very point of contest, which was held up by the contending parties themselves as the most general, may be itself deduced. Indeed, it is not at all necessary to suppose, that what in reality

³⁴ "In causa duorum hominum, quorum per unum venundati sumus sub peccato, per alterum redimimur a peccatis, proprie fides Christiana consistit." Aug. de pec. orig. § 28.

constituted the most general and essential difference between the two parties, was clearly and definitely stated or apprehended by themselves. It frequently happened at this period, when theological science advanced only through opposition at each particular point, as we have already seen by many examples; that the existing differences of doctrine were not seen in their proper root, but only in the particular branches of theological sentiment which had grown from this root, while their real origin had not been observed.

We find, accordingly, in the first place, that there was a difference in the mode of apprehending a very important idea, both for religion and morals, viz. that of the *Freedom of the human Will*,—a difference which cannot be deduced from that respecting the present condition of human nature, but which is rather itself the foundation of the latter difference. In the Pelagian system, moral freedom was apprehended as a freedom of choice,—as a power to determine at each moment with equal liberty between good and bad, and to choose which of the two it would adopt. This is the fruitful root which produces good or evil, according to the different direction of the will.³⁵

Augustine, on the contrary, maintained that such an indifference or equipoise between good and evil, from which one can determine himself at any moment equally for one or the other, is wholly inconceivable.³⁶ Man is already inwardly determined in his disposition, before he comes to action. Evil and good cannot proceed from the same root. The good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor the bad tree good fruit. The root from which every thing good proceeds is the love of God; the root of all evil is the love of self. And accordingly as a man is

³⁵ The following are the words of Pelagius, in the first book of his work, *De libero arbitrio*: “Habemus possibilitatem utriusque partis a Deo insitam, velut quandam, ut ita dicam, radicem fructiferam, quae ex voluntate hominis diversa gignat, et quae possit ad proprii cultoris arbitrium vel nitere flore virtutum, vel sentibus horrere vitiorum.” August. *De gratia Christi contra Pelag. et Coelest.* § 19. With this sentiment Julian agrees in many passages cited by Augustine in his “*Opus Imperfectum*,” L. V. and VI.

³⁶ As Augustine well expresses it in opposition to Julian: “*Libra tua, quam coararis ex utraque parte per aequalia momenta suspendere, ut voluntas quantum est ad malum, tantum etiam sit ad bonum libera.*” *Opus Imperf. c. Julianum*, L. III. c. 117.

predominantly governed either by the love of God, or the love of self, he performs good or evil.³⁷ The definition above given of freedom, is not applicable to God, or to the blessed in Heaven;³⁸ it even presupposes and implies a corruption of the moral faculties; and it becomes less and less applicable to man, just in proportion as he advances in moral improvement, and the nearer he approaches to true freedom. On the highest point of moral elevation, freedom and necessity coincide.³⁹ A rational being acts freely, when he determines himself according to the inward law of his moral nature. As evil is something repugnant to the original constitution of rational beings,—something not founded in nature, but contradictory to it; it follows, that what is regarded in the Pelagian definition as the sign of moral freedom, presupposes a corruption of the moral nature; since evil exerts upon it a power of attraction which it ought not to exert.⁴⁰

In connexion with this difference, there were also other important differences. Proceeding from his more ideal and essential notion of freedom,⁴¹ Augustine would necessarily suppose, that he saw in human nature, as it now appears, a contrast to freedom thus understood; since this true idea of freedom is nowhere applicable to man, who is in a state directly opposed to it,—a state of slavery to sin. Thus this definite idea of freedom led Augustine to assume, that a corruption had taken place in human nature, and that man previously existed in a state of

³⁷ Comp. August. l. c. de gratia Christi: "Aliud est caritas radix bonorum, aliud cupiditas, radix malorum; tantumque inter se differunt, quantum virtus et vitium."

³⁸ Contra Julian. Opus imperf. L. VI. c. 10.

³⁹ The *beata necessitas boni* opposed to the *misera necessitas mali*.

⁴⁰ [The following paragraph from Jeremy Taylor's "Deus Justificatus," Works, Vol. IX. p. 326, Heber's Ed. may be appropriately cited here, not only on account of its striking coincidence in sentiment with this view of Augustine, but on account of the exquisite beauty and aptness of the comparison contained in it. "In moral things, liberty is a direct imperfection,—a state of weakness, and supposes weakness of reason and weakness of love, the imperfection of the agent or the unworthiness of the object. Liberty of the will is like the motion of the magnetic needle towards the north, full of trepidation, till it be fixed where it would fain dwell forever."—TRANS.

⁴¹ See the next note.

moral freedom. This suggested the thought, that after this original freedom had been disturbed by the first voluntary deviation from the law of original nature, a state of slavery followed upon the state of freedom. As human nature, unfolding itself in a state accordant to nature, and yielding itself to what is good, and to the divine impulses, becomes constantly more confirmed in true freedom; so, on the other hand, by yielding itself to evil, it comes continually more and more under the bondage of evil; a state to which Augustine frequently applied the words of Christ, "Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin." Evil punishes itself, as good rewards itself.

Pelagius, on the contrary, and his followers, entertaining that more formal and empirical⁴² idea of freedom, saw no reason to suppose that human nature had been corrupted, or that there had been an original state in which it differed from its present condition. The very essence of freedom seemed to them to imply the possibility of evil, as well as of good; indeed, this seemed to them to belong to the essence of human nature itself, and therefore to be something inalienable. And so the question, *Whence is evil*, appeared to them wholly inadmissible. The fact that man, who at every moment can choose either good or evil, does at any time choose evil, has no other ground, than his immediate self-determination; otherwise his choice could not be free. Although the Pelagians, therefore, were induced by external authority, to admit that Adam was originally created holy, and also the original transgression, as a fact; it is yet plain, that this admission could stand in no real connexion with the whole of their anthropological system. They rather remained indifferent with regard to this point; for understand-

⁴² [The idea of freedom which was held by Augustine, is called by Neander, in the preceding paragraph, *ideal and material, or essential*, in opposition to the idea of Pelagius, which he here calls *formal and empirical*. The meaning intended to be conveyed by these epithets seems to be, that the idea of Augustine belongs more to the essential nature of freedom (its *materia*), and is derived from contemplating man as he once was, or as he should be, i. e. the *ideal* of man. For if evil had never entered the world, man would have enjoyed freedom in the sense of Augustine; and so he will again, when evil shall be entirely suppressed. On the other hand, the idea of Pelagius is *formal* (in the Platonic sense) and *empiric*, because it answers to freedom in its present *form*, or as it now *appears*, and is found by *experience* to exist in the present state of man.—TRANS.

ing moral freedom as they did, the moral condition of human nature could not, in their view, sustain any essential alteration; the same freedom of choice between good and evil still ever remained.

There is still another doctrinal consequence in connexion with this. Pelagius places human nature, endued by God the Creator with moral power, in the midst between evil and good. But Augustine places it, as being still in its original state, either in fellowship with the ultimate fountain of good, freely yielding obedience to the same, and the natural organ of its influences; or else estranged from the higher power of good, whose organ human nature was designed to be, and subjugated by the opposite power of evil. The moral power of man points, according to Augustine, to the ultimate source of good, from which alone all goodness can flow, to God himself, communion with whom is the highest good of beings endued with reason; and apart from which communion there is only evil. Hence there results the following contrast; on one side, life in communion with God, the divine life, the predominance of the good, nature subordinate to grace; and on the other side, estrangement from God through the direction of the will revolted from the supreme good,—self-love and sin. The Pelagian idea of freedom, on the contrary, allows of no such divine principle of life, renewing and transforming nature, and of no contrast, systematically drawn out, between *nature* and *grace*. God has endued human nature with all the constitutional faculties requisite for the attainment of its destination; and consequently with moral power for the practice of all goodness. This immutable power is the work of God alone. It depends entirely upon man, to apply, in the exercise of his own will, this power granted him by the Creator, and thus become what God designed him to be. The *posse* comes from God; the *velle* and *esse* from man.⁴³

But Augustine does not, like Pelagius, suppose that man, after he is once endued by the Creator with reason and free-will, with capacities for the knowledge and practice of truth and goodness, is left entirely to himself in the application of them. On the contrary, he supposes that man, even in this respect,

⁴³ Pelagius as quoted by Augustine (de gratia Christi, c. IV.) says: "Primum illud, id est *posse*, ad Deum proprie pertinet, qui illud creaturæ suæ contulit; duo vero reliqua, hoc est *velle* et *esse*, ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt."

stands in an absolute and constant dependence upon God, as the only source of all being, and of all truth and goodness. The powers and faculties of rational creatures are not complete and perfect within themselves, and self-sufficient for the purposes for which they were given; but only organs to receive, appropriate, and again give out, what is communicated to them through their fellowship with that absolute source of truth and good. The same relation which the eye sustains to the sun, does the reason sustain to God.⁴⁴ According to this principle, he could not but be led to maintain the dependence of *all* rational beings, and not of man only, upon *grace*, considered as the internal revelation and communication of God to the soul,—as participation in the divine life; and to hold, that without this, they could not attain to their destination. And from this it follows, that according to the view of Augustine, *this dependence did not begin with the disorder of the moral nature of man, and did not arise from it; but belonged originally to the nature of man, as well as to that of all the rational creatures of God.*

We thus come to a difference of opinion between these two parties, which cannot be derived from their different views respecting the present state of human nature, but is antecedent to these. This difference, however, was made more prominent by the speculative and systematic Augustine, than by the Pelagians, who did not lay so deep the foundations of their theory. It is a difference of views respecting the relation to God in the original state itself; since man, according to Augustine, even in this state was dependent upon the grace of God, which he might secure to himself by the exercise of his free will, and by which alone he could perform any good thing.⁴⁵ This difference was rather the ground of the other, respecting the present condition of human nature; for it followed from this principle, according

⁴⁴ According to the words of Augustine: "Sicut corporis oculus non adjuvatur a luce, ut ab eadem luce clausus aversusve discedat, ut autem videat adjuvatur ab ea, neque hoc omnino, nisi illa adjuverit, potest; ita Deus, qui lux est hominis interioris, adjuvat nostrae mentis obtutum, ut non secundum nostram, sed secundum ejus justitiam, boni aliquid operemur." De peccator. meritis et remissione, L. II. § 5.

⁴⁵ Augustine, De correptione et gratia, § 31. "Habit primus homo gratiam, in qua, si permanere vellet, nunquam malus esset; et sine qua, etiam cum libero arbitrio bonus esse non posset. Liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit; ad bonum autem parum est, nisi adjuvetur ab omnipotenti bono."

to Augustine's course of thought, that after man had alienated himself by his free will from God, as the source of all good, his will, now left to itself, was capable only of evil; and that man stood in need of a new superadded grace, in order that he might be led back again to goodness. So that it was at this point that the questions arose, which came most prominently into discussion in the contest between the two systems.

But we can still carry this difference a step farther back, to a diversity of sentiment respecting the relation of the creation to the Creator; although this diversity did not come into discussion in the controversy itself between these two parties. It is a sentiment which lies at the basis of Pelagianism, that after God had once made the world, and furnished it with all the powers necessary for its preservation and action, he left it to go on, with its inherent powers, according to the laws imposed upon it; so that the continued agency of God is mainly concerned in the preservation of these powers and faculties; but does not operate in the way of *concurrence* (*concursum*),⁴⁶ for their developement and exercise. Augustine on the contrary, makes preservation by God to be a continued creation; and regards the life and activity of the creature, both generally and in particular, as resting upon and conditioned by the almighty and omnipresent agency of God, and as subsisting in an absolute dependence upon the same every moment.⁴⁷

Although this difference was not, in general, elsewhere made farther prominent in the controversy, yet Jerome perceived,

⁴⁶ [*Concursum* is the technical name of the theory, which supposes God to exert a constant agency in connexion with the powers which he has implanted in his creatures. It is well explained by Hollaz, Exam. Theol. I. p. 647, "*Concursum sive coöperatio Dei est actus providentiæ divinæ, quo Deus cum causis secundis in ipsarum actiones et effectus influxu generali et immediato juxta cujuslibet creaturæ exigentiam et indolam suaviter coinfluit.*" "*Concursum* or the *coöperation of God*, is that act of divine providence, by which God, by a universal and immediate influence, sweetly conspires with second causes in their actions and effects, according to the need and nature of each one of his creatures."—TRANS.]

⁴⁷ E. g. the words of Augustine: "*Deus cujus occulta potentia cuncta penetrans incontaminabili præsentia facit esse quicquid aliquo modo est, in quantumcunque est, quia nisi faciente illo non tale vel tale esset; sed prorsus esse non posset.*" De civitate Dei, L. XIII. c. 26.

that every thing depended upon it; and he objected to the Pelagians, that they denied the absolute dependence of the creature upon the Creator, and that they made man, by the independence which they ascribed to him in regard to his actions, equal to God. He appealed, in opposition to them, to the words of Christ, John 5: 17, implying that the agency of God in the creation never ceases, but is perpetually active.⁴⁸

This diversity about these fundamental ideas must have led, if it had been distinctly expressed and applied, to a very important difference of opinion respecting the whole course of human development, and respecting the nature of revelation and of redemption. But Pelagius, Coelestius, and Julian, were very far from apprehending clearly and distinctly the principles lying at the basis of their own assertions, and the consequences flowing from them. They did not come to their principles by reflecting impartially and with a purely scientific interest, upon the doctrines of theology; but through a polemical interest in practical Christianity; and they applied these principles, as the sequel will

⁴⁸ Jerome, in his Epist. ad Ctesiphontem: "Istiusmodi homines per liberum arbitrium non homines propriae voluntatis; sed Dei potentiae factos se esse jactant, qui nullius ope indigent. Scimus nos nihil esse, nisi quod donavit, in nobis ipse servaverit. Joh. 5: 17, non mihi sufficit quod semel donavit, nisi semper donaverit. Audite quaeso, audite sacrilegium: *Si voluero curvare digitum, movere manum, sedere, stare, etc. semper mihi auxilium Dei necessarium erit?*" If now these words were really used by the Pelagians, it would follow, that even they distinctly apprehended this point of difference.

This opposition of sentiment was also brought forward by Orosius; "Non in solo naturali bono generaliter universis unam gratiam tributam; sed speciatim quotidie per tempora, per dies, per momenta, per *ἀτόμας*, et cunctis et singulis ministrari. Dicit enim Scriptura, 'qui facit solem suum oriri super bonos et malos.' At tu forte respondes: *ordinem suum composita bene natura custodit, ac per hoc Deus, elementaris semel cursibus constitutis, facit inde quae facit.* Quid ergo de illa sententiae parte, quae sequitur, opinaris? 'Dat pluviam super justos et injustos.' Utique qui dat cum vult dat, et ubi vult, dat, vel dispensando dispositam constitutionem, vel effundendo propriam largitatem." See Orosii Apologia de arbitrii libertate, ed. Havercamp, p. 607. Comp. also the words of the Roman bishop Innocent, Epist. ad Concil. Carthag. § 3. "Ergo eris tibi in providendo praestantior, quam potest in eo esse, qui te ut esses effecit? Ei cui putas debere, quod vivis, quomodo non putas illi debere quod quotidianam ejus consequendo gratiam taliter vivis?"

more fully show, only so far as they were led to do so by this interest.

From what has now been said, it appears, that the opinions of Augustine and of the Pelagians respecting the condition of the first man, and respecting the nature of the first sin and its consequences, must have been very different, and also in what respects they must have differed. Still both the parties professed to draw their views from the same source,—the narrative in Genesis; and both agreed, also, in their hermeneutical maxims, and in the application of them, especially in adopting the literal method of interpretation. Such a contrast as that supposed in the Augustinian system, between the original nature of the first man, while as yet disturbed by no inward conflict, and the nature of his posterity now distracted by this conflict, could find no place in the Pelagian system; for according to this latter system, human nature, in its intellectual and moral faculties, has continued always the same. All men, until they themselves commit sin, are found in the same innocence in which Adam existed before the first transgression. The Pelagians, in imitation of many of the older fathers, especially those of the Oriental church, with whose views they more particularly coincided, often compared the state of the first man, with that of an innocent, inexperienced child; with only this difference, that the intellectual and bodily powers of Adam were in some degree already developed; as was indeed requisite for his preservation. From this view of the state of Adam, the Pelagian Julian endeavours to explain the first sin. And in order to show, as the interest of his system would of course incline him to do, that the supposition of any such ruinous consequences following from it is altogether untenable, he endeavours to represent it as a very trifling offence,—the disobedience of an unwary child, exposed to yield readily to the allurements of sense. God gave the first man a command, in order to lead him to the consciousness of his moral powers and of his freedom. This command was simple, as the youthful powers of man required that it should be. God required of him only a proof of child-like obedience.⁴⁹ But inexperienced and unwary, having never learned to distrust himself, and having never witnessed an example of virtue,⁵⁰

⁴⁹ "Interdictu unius pomuli testimonium devotionis expetitur."

⁵⁰ "Rudis, imperitus, incautus, sine experimento timoris, sine exemplo justitiæ."

man allowed himself to be enticed by the agreeableness of the forbidden fruit, and to be persuaded by the solicitation of the woman. This enticement of appetite was in itself nothing bad ; it belongs to that lower nature which man has in common with the brute, and is derived therefore from the Creator himself.⁵¹ That he allowed his will to be misled, and yielded to the solicitation of sense to transgress the divine command,—this only can be denominated *sin*.

Augustine, on the contrary, makes the great distinction between the first man and all his posterity, to consist in this, (which is indeed the ground of all the rest,) that Adam stood in that undisturbed communion with God for which he was made ; that by this communion all the powers of his nature were elevated, and the higher and lower faculties brought to act in perfect harmony. The human body did not, indeed, then resemble that glorified body, which we shall receive after the resurrection ; still, since there was as yet no conflict in human nature, it was the willing and obedient organ of the soul, which itself was governed by the Spirit of God. And had man remained faithful to the will of God, he would have passed over to the higher, unchanging, and imperishable life which awaited him, without the intervention of the violent struggle of death.

Hence the magnitude of the first sin, did not rest, according to the view of Augustine, in the external character of the act in itself considered, nor in the kind of object to which it related. Augustine had in general, as we have remarked on other occasions, the great merit as a moralist, of opposing the estimation of actions by their external *quantity* so to speak,—a method contrary to the true criterion of the moral character of actions,—and of directing attention more to the nature of the inward disposition. The greatness of Adam's guilt consisted, in his view, in this, that while he was as yet exempt from that moral bondage under which his posterity suffer, he transgressed the law of God with free will. The endeavour to account for this sin by a temptation addressed from without to his appetites, could not be allowed by Augustine to be successful. Such a temptation already presupposes an inward corruption ; and a contest like this between the flesh and the spirit, could have no place in that abode of peace. The will of man, subordinate to the divine will, received also the animal nature, as an organ sub-

⁵¹ *Contra Julian. Opus Imperf. IV. 38.*

servient to its purposes, and obedient to the soul. It was not until man had fallen away from the divine will by an inward act, by the opposition of self-love or of his own will to the will of God, and thus the foundation had been laid for every kind of conflict, that the allurements of a bodily appetite could have led him to transgress the divine law.⁵² Hence ensued disunion and conflict in all parts of human nature; hence, too, all physical and moral evils, and death itself as the punishment of sin. And all this passed over from the first man to all his posterity. As in the first man the love of self, which stood forth in opposition to the divine will, was the source and principle of all sin; so is it with the whole race. From this source proceeded the inordinate desires of sense, *concupiscentia*, in contradiction and resistance to the law of reason; and with reference to this resistance, which the Pelagians considered as something inseparable from the human organization, and therefore in itself innocent, Augustine regarded this inordinateness of passion and appetite as sinful. It was not the propensities of sense in themselves considered, but rather the power which carnal appetite of any kind exercises over the spirit of man, destined as it was for a higher life,—the warring between the flesh and the spirit,—it was this which he considered as the consequence of that original disorder and as something sinful; and it was this which he understood by *concupiscentia*.⁵³ But his lofty mind, which itself longed after a free spiritual life, was also disposed to regard every desire of sense by which man is affected, so far as it has an influence to disturb and hamper the soul in its purely spiritual life, as a trace of this self-inflicted bondage.⁵⁴

Since now Augustine regarded the perfect or ideal conception of man as a state in which reason is predominant over sense; and since he saw in all that opposes this natural predominance of reason, only the evidence and result of an internal derangement; it was an unfounded reproach of the Pelagians, that he

⁵² "In Paradiso ab animo coepit elatio, et ad praeceptum transgrediendum inde consensio." August. con. Jul. L. V. § 17.

⁵³ It is not the *sentiendi vivacitas*, but the *libido sentiendi*, "quae nos ad sentiendum sive consentientes mente sive repugnantes appetitu carnalis voluptatis impellit." Con. Julian. L. IV. § 66.

⁵⁴ "Quis autem mente sobrius non mallet, si fieri posset, sine ulla mordaci voluptate carnali vel arida sumere alimenta, vel humida, sicut sumimus haec aëria?"

held, with the Manichaeans, that the flesh and its affections are in themselves evil, and derived from an evil principle. To Julian, who derived the power of the bodily appetites from that nature, which man has in common with the brute, Augustine replied, that man could not, in this respect, be compared with the brute; in the latter, there can be no contest between the flesh and the spirit; but it was the duty of man to control his animal nature by the spirit. The fact that man has come to resemble the brute, through the power of animal desires not subject to the rational will, is a consequence of the original breach between the human and the divine will.⁵⁵

But Augustine not only assumed, that this bondage to the principle of sin, by which sin punishes itself, is transmitted from the progenitor of our race to all his posterity; but also that the first sin is to be regarded as the act of the whole human race, and that there is a propagation of guilt and punishment from one to all.⁵⁶ This participation of all in the sin of Adam, Augustine made clear to his own mind by supposing that Adam was the representative of the whole race; and that he already carried within himself, in its first germ, the entire nature and race of man, as they were afterwards developed from him.⁵⁷ And this supposition might harmonize very well with Augustine's speculative system, since he had adopted a Platonico-Aristotelian realism in the doctrine about *general notions*, and regarded these as the archetypes, which were realized in particular things of the same kind. Besides, his slight acquaintance with the Greek language, and his habit of reading the Scriptures only in the Latin Version, led him to find a confirmation of his theory in the text, Rom. 5: 12, where $\epsilon\phi' \alpha\delta\alpha\mu$ is incorrectly rendered *in quo*, which he referred to Adam. It may indeed be a question, whether his theological prepossessions would not have prevented his seeing the simple meaning

⁵⁵ "Fatere secundum Christianam fidem, etiam istam esse hominis poenam, quod comparatus est pecoribus insensatis, et similis factus est iis. Carnis concupiscentia homini est poena, non bestiae, in qua nunquam caro adversus spiritum concupiscit." Opus Imperf. contr. Jul. IV. 38.

⁵⁶ "Propagatio reatus et poenae."

⁵⁷ E. g. De peccatorum meritis at remissione, L. III. c. 7. "In Adam tunc omnes peccaverunt, quando in ejus natura illa insita vi, qua eos gignere poterat, adhuc omnes ille unus fuerunt."

of this passage, even if the New Testament in the original had been more accessible to him. We must be cautious, however, of ascribing too much influence upon the formation of this doctrine of Augustine, either to his peculiar philosophical system, or to his imperfect exegetical knowledge; for it had a deeper ground in his christian consciousness.

Pelagius and his followers, on the other hand, denied all these physical and moral consequences of the sin of the first man, which were supposed by Augustine to extend to the whole race. An imputation of the sin of another is inconsistent with the justice of God, and a propagation of sin is inconsistent with the very idea of sin and of free will. Sin is not the affair of nature, but of the self-determining free will, and cannot therefore be transmitted from one to another. The individual himself who sins, says Julian, cannot be changed in his moral nature by one sin; and he still retains the same freedom of will. The sin which Adam committed did not injure even him, after he had repented of it. How is it possible, then, that the whole race and nature of man should have been corrupted by it? The principle of Augustine, that sin punishes itself by moral bondage, and that sinfulness is at the same time the source of other sins, and the punishment of sin,—this principle Julian was so little able to understand, that he saw in it even something blasphemous, as if God punished man for sin by plunging him into more sins.⁵⁸ The Pelagians would admit of nothing more, than that Adam had injured his posterity *by his example*; and to this influence they referred all those texts of the New Testament, which speak of the connexion between the first sin, and the sin of the whole

⁵⁸ See Con. Julian. Op. Imperf. IV. § 5.—That profound passage in Rom. 1: 28, 32, respecting the reciprocal influence of moral and intellectual blindness, which had been cited by Augustine in proof of his principle, was so obscure to Julian, that he did not hesitate to empty it of its deep meaning, by supposing that the apostle here used a hyperbolical metonymy. According to Julian, Paul meant here to say, in order to express his abhorrence of such sins, *non tam reos quam damnatos sibi tales videri*. Augustine, however, was able to show Julian, from his own words, that he himself had expressed a sentiment at least resembling that by which he was so shocked, when it appeared in another form. For Julian had said, "*Justissime enim sibi bonus homo et malus committitur, ut et bonus se fruatur, et malus se ipse patiatur.*" Contra Julian. L. V. § 35. [Comp. Bibl. Repos. Vol. II. p. 86, 87.]

race.⁵⁹ But as to physical evils and death,—Pelagius and his followers, particularly Julian, endeavoured to show, that they were all inherent in the very nature of our corporeal organization, as it proceeded originally from the hands of the Creator, and that this could not be otherwise, according to the destination of human nature, and the manner of its development.

The question respecting the propagation of sinful propensity (*Sündhaftigkeit*), would naturally become connected with the question, which had been much agitated since the time of Tertullian and Origen, about the origin and propagation of souls. We have before remarked how Cælestius employed the connexion of these inquiries, in order to remove them both from the circle of truths affecting faith and orthodoxy, and to class them both among those points about which a difference of opinion, may exist without impairing unity of faith. On the other hand, Augustine sought here to separate a point important in theology, clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures, and founded in the analogy of christian doctrines, from one which was rather a matter of speculation, and respecting which the Holy Scriptures had decided nothing definitely. In his mind the conviction was immoveably fixed, that sin and guilt had been diffused from Adam over all mankind; and it was equally certain to him, that any view conflicting with this supposition, could not be otherwise than false. But respecting the other question, viz. Whether the doctrine that souls are created (*Creatianismus*), or are propagated (*Traducianismus*), is to be believed, he did not venture to speak so decidedly; although he well knew what advantages the latter theory offered his system, and although it had been connected with the doctrine respecting the propagation of depravity, by many in the Western church, ever after the time of Tertullian. He was probably hindered, however, by the fear of falling, with Tertullian, into material conceptions respecting the

⁵⁹ Julian could easily refute Augustine's explanation of ἐφ' ᾧ in Rom. 5: 12, and show that it is properly rendered by *propter quod*; but Augustine could also easily expose the weakness of the whole interpretation, which supposes that the effect of Adam's example is the only thing here referred to. Con. Julian. L. IV. § 75.—According to Julian, the apostle mentioned Adam only, and not Adam and Eve, though both sinned, in order to make it evident that the only effect is that of the example here given, and to prevent the supposition of there being a propagation of sin by generation. Con. Julian. Opus Imperfect. II. 56.

nature of the soul, from declaring himself in favour of a theory which otherwise was so much to his purpose. On the other hand, he saw clearly the difficulties in which the theory that souls are created, involved his theological system. The argument urged by Jerome in behalf of this view,⁶⁰ drawn from the incessant and ever active creative energy of God, according to John 5: 17, appeared to him unsatisfactory; since, as he remarked, the incessant, creative energy of God is also presupposed in natural propagation of every kind.⁶¹ The Holy Scriptures appeared to him to give no decisive testimony in favour of either theory; and thus he came to the confession of ignorance, which, to a man of his speculative spirit, must certainly have been a self-denying sacrifice. "Where the Bible gives no decisive testimony," he concluded, "human presumption must beware of determining either for one view or another. Had the knowledge of such things been essential to salvation, the Scriptures would have contained more respecting them."⁶²

Although the Pelagians denied an hereditary corruption of human nature, they yet agreed with Augustine in admitting the truth of the position drawn from experience, that evil has ever maintained a greater and greater predominance among men. They held to a progressive deterioration of mankind; and this, in their view, is the foundation of the necessity of the different divine revelations, and the different means of grace employed by God, to counteract the downward tendency. This deterioration

⁶⁰ See Jerome *Contra errores Joannis Hierosolomytani*, Vol. IV. ed. Martinay, f. 310.

⁶¹ *De anima et ejus origine*, L. I. § 26. "Ipse quippe Deus dat, etiamsi de propagine dat."

⁶² *De peccat. remiss.* L. II. § 59. This confession of ignorance from so distinguished a teacher as Augustine, was quite displeasing to a certain young man, Vincentius Victor by name, of Mauretania Cæsariensis. He wrote a book against Augustine, in which, wishing with his narrow understanding to comprehend every thing, he made many confused and absurd statements; and among other things, even ventured to apply to Augustine the words in Ps. 48: 13, according to the Vulgate, *Homo in honore positus non intellexit; comparatus est pecoribus insensatis, et similis factus est illis.* Augustine replied to him as follows, in his work *De anima et ejus origine*, L. I. § 26. "Istum autem non ego vicissim, quasi rependens maledictum pro maledicto, pecoribus comparo; sed tanquam filium moneo, ut quod nescit, se nescire fateatur, neque id, quod nondum didicit, docere moliatur."

in mankind at large, as well as in particular individuals, they explained from the force of evil habit; through the influence of which evil becomes, as it were, a second nature.⁶³ Still, however, as human nature comes into the world in its original purity, and has no foreign principle inherent in it, this fact of its deterioration, to which experience testifies, is only something contingent. There may be exceptions to this general rule,—persons who by cultivating and unfolding the powers of their moral nature, in the exercise of their free will, have lived in perfect holiness to the last. In the public exposition of his opinions, indeed, Pelagius would never express himself decidedly on this point. But in his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, he says, in remarking on the passage ch. 5: 12, that the word *all* is to be understood to include those only who had sinned like Adam, and not persons like Abel, Isaac, and Jacob; the apostle says *all*, because the few righteous are as nothing in comparison with the multitude of sinners. In his book respecting free will, he cited many examples of men and women from the Bible; and, taking advantage of the superstitious veneration for the Virgin Mary, which already began to prevail, he closed the list with the example of her, whom it was essential to piety to call *sinless*.⁶⁴

The fundamental principle of Pelagianism, as now described, might indeed have led on to the belief of a developement of humanity within the sphere and according to the laws of nature, which should be complete within itself, and should exclude all divine interposition. But Pelagius and his friends were far from carrying this principle to such an extent. Although the doctrine of supernatural communications from God had indeed no such place in the Pelagian system as in that of Augustine, in consequence of the systematic and complete views of the latter

⁶³ E. g. Epist. ad Demetriadem, c. 8. "Longa consuetudo vitiorum, quæ nos infecit a parvo paulatimque per multos corruptit annos, et ita postea obligatos sibi et addictos tenet, ut vim quodammodo videatur habere naturæ." They understood the passage Rom. c. 7, respecting the law in the members, to relate to this power of evil habit. See Pelagius as cited by Augustine, *De gratia Christi*, § 43, and Julian as quoted by the same in his *Opus Imp. L. I. c. 67*.

⁶⁴ August. *De nat. et gratia contra Pelagium*, § 42. "Quam dicit sine peccato confiteri necesse esse pietati." But as Pelagius could not show from a single word of Scripture, that those whom he named were to be regarded as holy, he used the following singular argument: "De illis quorum justitia meminit (Scriptura sacra), et peccatorum sine dubio meminisset, si qua eos peccasse sensisset."

respecting the relation of the creature to the Creator, and the depravity of man; still, this doctrine could yet find a point of union in the Pelagian system, in the acknowledgement of the moral degeneracy of human nature as a whole, and in the idea that human nature, considered as created, might and would be raised by the free displays of divine love, to a point of perfection far exceeding the measure of the powers with which it was originally endued by the Creator. The Pelagians, to be sure, made no such distinction and contrast between nature and grace as Augustine did; and as to the term *grace*, they used it, without hesitation, to denote *all* communications of the divine love; they even sometimes comprehended all the moral and intellectual powers with which human nature is endued by God, under the general idea of *gratia*. But, at the same time, they by no means denied *supernatural* communications of the love of God, by which something is imparted to human nature, which it would never have been able to obtain by means of the powers implanted at its creation. And both these classes of derived gifts—those contained in the common course of nature, and those transcending it—were alike included by the Pelagians under the general name *gratia*. Thus they applied the idea of *grace* to all the divine revelations both in the Old and the New Testament, in the Law and in the Gospel. Sometimes they referred it solely to what Christ has conferred upon man; as when Pelagius said, that the power of free will belongs alike to all, Christians, Jews, and Gentiles; but that in Christians alone it is assisted by grace.⁶⁵

In reference to the influence of these divine institutions in counteracting the moral degeneracy of man, the Pelagians held to different degrees of righteousness. *First*, the knowledge of God derived from reason and the law of life, written, not in letters, but on the heart; this stage is the *justitia ex natura*. *Secondly*, the revelation of the positive law, in order to kindle again the light of nature, obscured by depravity, *justitia sub lege*. But, *thirdly*, when the habit of sinning had become predominant, and the law was insufficient to restore holiness, then Christ came, that he himself directly, and not through his disciples only, might effect the cure of this now desperate malady; and so henceforward *justitia sub gratia*.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ "In omnibus est liberum arbitrium æqualiter per naturam; sed in solis Christianis juvatur a gratia." August. De gratia Christi, § 33.

⁶⁶ De peccato originali, § 30.

The Pelagian Julian, in defending himself against the charge, that according to their doctrine free will is sufficient for the duties we owe to God, says, that although God might have been recognized as the Creator of the world, by natural reason alone, yet unaided reason is by no means adequate to discover the mysteries of faith,—the doctrine of the trinity, of the resurrection, and many other similar doctrines.⁶⁷

Julian contended only, that between the revelation of God in the Scriptures, and the eternal truths which he has implanted in reason, there can be no contradiction; and that the Holy Scriptures can contain nothing inconsistent with those ideas of a holy and just God, which are inseparable from our consciousness of God. Nothing opposed to these universal and eternal truths of reason can therefore be proved, even from the Scriptures; and on the contrary, every thing hard and dark in particular passages of the Bible, must be so explained, as to accord with those ideas which we obtain of God from the great body of scriptural representations, and also with the ideas of reason.⁶⁸ But in this

⁶⁷ *Opus Imperf. con. Julian. L. III. c. 106.* It is worthy of remark here, how indistinct the conceptions of Julian are respecting the *cultus Dei*. He brings together the *ethical* and the *doctrinal*, moral action and theoretic knowledge of some particular doctrines, without once pointing to any internal connexion between the two, a central point in the inward life, from which they both proceed. As the Augustinian idea of *gratia* was foreign to his system, it was a matter of course, that he should also have had no conception of any such higher unity, imparting a divine principle of life, and renovating the entire religious and moral consciousness. The words of Julian are: “Cum enim cultus Dei multis intelligatur modis, et in custodia mandatorum, et in execratione vitiorum, et in ordine mysteriorum, et in profunditate dogmatum, qua de Trinitate vel de resurrectione, multisque aliis similibus fides Christiana, consequitur.”

⁶⁸ In the first book of the “*Opus Imperfectum*.” Julian says, “nihil per legem Dei agi potest contra Deum, legis auctorem.” By this *unum compendium* he supposed that every declaration infringing upon the holiness or justice of God, might be repelled. Right interpretation must tend to reconcile any apparent inconsistencies between reason and revelation; and should any thing really inconsistent with reason be found in the Bible, it must be rejected as not belonging to divine revelation. “Ambigua quæque legis verba secundum hoc esse intelligenda, quod absolutissimis Scripturæ S. auctoritatibus, et insuperabili ratione firmatur.” In another place: “Secundum id, quod et ratio perspicua et aliorum locorum, in quibus non est ambiguitas, splendor

principle, there was no essential difference between Julian and Augustine; since even the latter would allow of no real contradiction between *fides* and *ratio*. The Pelagians, however, would not have agreed with the maxim of Augustine respecting the manner in which *fides* goes before *ratio*, and in which the latter should develop itself from the former.

Pelagius and his followers, in their views of the doctrine of grace, were strenuous only in maintaining the *opposite* of a theory *infringing upon free-will*; they regarded all the influences of grace as conditioned by the free will, all the means of grace as efficacious or otherwise, according to the different directions of the will; and they denied any controlling influence of grace over the free will. Augustine, on the contrary, regarded it as essential to the idea of grace, that it should exclude all *meritum*; and for grace to be conditioned in any way by the various degrees of susceptibility on the part of man, was, in his view, of the nature of merit. Provided every thing be not referred to the agency of God only, and any thing depends upon the different ways in which men stand related to the agency of God, the idea of grace is given up; for what is granted according to desert, is no more grace.

The point of opposition just mentioned, (*viz.* opposition to a theory infringing upon free will,) is the only one which the Pelagians insisted upon in this part of the controversy. But this opposition led them in reality much farther. Although they sometimes used the term *grace* to denote something supernatural, they were still inclined even then to understand by it nothing more than *external revelations*, or the communication of certain kinds of knowledge, which surpass the powers of natural reason. The idea of *an internal communication of a divine life, of an influence of God upon the will and consciousness of men*, was foreign to their system. Although among their multiform and indistinct representations about grace, they said many things which bordered upon this last named characteristic of the Augustinian

aperuit." In still another passage, L. II. c. 144, he places his recognition of the divinity of the Scriptures, not upon external tradition, but upon their agreement with reason, and with the nature of christian faith, and also upon the morality of their contents: "Sanctas apostoli esse paginas confitemur, non ob aliud, nisi quia rationi, pietati, fidei congruentes, erudiunt nos, et Deum credere inviolabilis æquitatis, et præceptis ejus moderationem, prudentiam, justitiam, vindicare."

system, and although they never came out in a decided and well-understood opposition to it; still the thought seemed to float before their minds, that by the admission of any such internal influence of God, the free will would be endangered. Had they supposed that they could agree with Augustine in this characteristic of his system, without abandoning their disagreement with him on the doctrine of free will, it was certainly for their interest distinctly to avow this; since Augustine had often pressed them on this very point, and charged them with denying *this special internal influence*, although they admitted a supernatural revelation, and a communication of knowledge beyond the powers of reason. But they always drew back from the avowal of agreement on this point, and then brought forward a great number of indefinite bearings of the means of grace, by which the free will is supported, in order to show, by the multitude of their expressions, how far they were far from denying *grace*. "God assists us," says Pelagius,⁶⁹ by the instruction which he gives us, and by the revelation he has made; by opening the eyes of our hearts, by disclosing to us what will take place in the future world, that we may not be engrossed by present things; by discovering to us the devices of Satan; and by enlightening us with manifold and unspeakable gifts of heavenly grace."⁷⁰ The passage, Phil. 2:13, "God worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure," which is specially important in behalf of this distinctive feature of the Augustinian system, is explained by Pelagius as follows:⁷¹ "God works in us, to will what is good and holy, by kindling our minds, devoted to earthly desires, with the greatness of the future glory, and the promise of rewards; by leading the adoring will, through the revelation of his wisdom, to long for God; and by counselling us to all good." Thus too Julian says, that God assists us, by giving laws, by bestowing blessings, by sanctifying, restraining, exciting, and enlightening.⁷²

Augustine, on the contrary, gives a special prominence, in all cases, to this single characteristic of his system, upon which every thing else depends. The revelation of the law could of itself be of no use to man, since he is destitute of power to fulfil

⁶⁹ As quoted by Augustine, "De gratia Christi," c. VII.

⁷⁰ "Dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiæ cœlestis illuminat."

⁷¹ c. 10.

⁷² Opus imperf. III. 114. "Præcipiendo, benedicendo, sanctificando, coërcendo, provocando, illuminando."

it. The revelation of the law could answer no other purpose, than to awaken in man the feeling of his need of grace, by which alone he can obtain power to obey the law. Love is the fulfilling of the law; but love to God is not shed abroad in our hearts by the law, but by the Holy Ghost.⁷³ Augustine could apply his own idea of grace, which he regarded as appropriately the christian idea, to all which the Pelagians said respecting revelation and divine instruction, only so far as they understood by these terms, not merely an *external revelation*, and an external instruction by the letter, but an *internal revelation through the inward working of God upon the internal life and consciousness of man*,—that living knowledge and perception of what is revealed, which results from a new divine life.⁷⁴

With this difference in the doctrine of grace, was also closely connected the difference in the doctrine respecting Christ, as the Redeemer of men, and in the doctrine respecting redemption. The *negative* relation of the work of redemption⁷⁵ must, indeed, be limited, according to the Pelagian system; since it admitted of no such corruption of man's entire nature, as resulted, according to Augustine's doctrine, from the sin of Adam. Still

⁷³ "Proinde per legem gratia demonstratur, ut lex per gratiam compleatur."

⁷⁴ "Haec gratia, si doctrina dicenda est, certe sic dicatur, ut altius et interius eam Deus cum ineffabili suavitate credatur infundere per se ipsum." De gratia Christi, c. 14.

⁷⁵ [In his history of the doctrine of redemption, Neander regards this work as having two aspects or sides, the one *negative*, and the other *positive*,—the former having relation to the state in which man is by nature, from which it is the design of redemption to deliver him; the latter having relation to the new state into which he is to be placed by redemption. So far as Christ took upon himself human nature, with all the consequences of the sin hitherto reigning in it, and with the burden of guilt resting upon it, his work is denominated *negative*; so far as he fulfilled the ideal of holiness in this nature, before infected by sin, imparted to it a divine life, and raised it to glory, his work is called *positive*. Hence it will be obvious, that the negative aspect of the work of redemption could have little or no place in the Pelagian system; while still it might hold to redemption, as a work designed to elevate and ennoble our nature, without reference to the state of guilt and helplessness in which this nature is found. This positive side of the work of redemption was prominent in the view of the Oriental teachers, though not, as in the system of Pelagius, exclusive of the other.—TRANS.

the doctrine of redemption could be held, even in the Pelagian system, as opposed to the deterioration of man, and the force of bad habit. And so the Pelagians would need, here again, to attach themselves more to the way of thinking on this subject common in the Oriental church. There redemption was regarded not alone as the sanctification and deliverance of *corrupted* human nature, but still more as the *exalting, ennobling, and glorifying* of the imperfect, limited moral nature of man, above the point on which he was placed at the original creation, and above the powers then granted him. And so the Pelagians did in fact admit, that human nature, made good by God originally, is made better by Christ; raised to a higher degree of advancement, which consists in our sonship to God; endued with new powers, and assured of a blessedness, resulting from citizenship in the kingdom of God, to the attainment of which the powers of nature are inadequate.⁷⁶ Even this idea, however, of an exaltation and renewal of human nature by Christ, could not be apprehended in all its depth in the Pelagian system; since, as has been already remarked, the idea of a communication of a divine principle of life through Christ, found no place in this system.

In the Pelagian system, Christ appears as a divine teacher, who reveals those truths, the knowledge of which human reason is not able of itself to attain. In his life and doctrine he exhibited the most perfect moral rule, and gave to all the most perfect example of holiness.⁷⁷ As the Pelagians affirmed, that Adam injured his posterity by setting the first example of sin; they now opposed to this the perfect example of virtue given by Christ.⁷⁸ In this respect, however, the merit of Christ could not be shown, according to the Pelagian system, to be altogether peculiar and exclusive; for according to this system, there were some before Christ, who had perfectly kept the moral law.⁷⁹ From this difficulty, the Pelagian Julian could extricate himself in no other way, than by supposing a difference of degree, mak-

⁷⁶ The words of Julian: "Christus, qui est sui operis redemptor, auget circa imaginem suam continua largitate beneficia, et quos fecerat condendo bonos, facit innovando adoptandoque meliores." Aug. con. Julian. L. III. § 8.

⁷⁷ "Exacta in Christo justitiæ norma resplenduit." Opus Imperf. L. II. § 188.

⁷⁸ "Sicut ille peccati, ita hic justitiæ forma."

⁷⁹ See p. 109 above.

ing it out that Christ, though he did not give the first, did yet furnish the greatest example of righteousness,⁸⁰—a mode of representing this subject, which none but such undialectical thinkers as the Pelagians were, could have tolerated. This cannot be understood at all, without supposing, that according to the Pelagian system, there is something more perfect than the mere fulfilling of the law,—some works of moral perfection, which, more than common human virtue, transcend the letter of the law,—such as they supposed Christ alluded to in the *consilia evangelica*. Further, Christ procured and made known to those who believe in him, an eternal blessedness, respecting which they could know nothing from their natural reason, and to which man can attain only by the new means of grace afforded by Christ. In addition to this positive agency of Christ, as the Redeemer of man, he procured also for the great body of men, with, indeed, but very few exceptions in the whole race, the forgiveness of their sins.

By all these means, Christ has imparted many new springs to moral effort, and given man new power to overcome his lower propensities and the allurements of sin. These new springs are, the hope of eternal blessedness, on condition of obeying the laws of Christ; the example of Christ, enkindling a zeal for imitation; gratitude for the forgiveness of sin, and especially for the work of the Son of God, his becoming man, and giving his life for men. It would be doing the Pelagians injustice to say, as one might be led to say from some of their declarations, that they made the fear of future punishment and the hope of future reward, the only motives to goodness. Julian expressly mentions gratitude and love to God, enkindled by the revelation of the love of God to us, as new motives to moral effort. He speaks of a state resulting from these principles, in which Christians practise virtue from pure love to God, and for its own sake, and not for the sake of external reward,—a state in which they feel happy in doing right, even in the midst of suffering. "The fulness of divine love which gave all things their existence," says Julian, "is manifest in this, that the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us. As God desired the returns of love from those he made in his own image, he showed how he had

⁸⁰ "Justitiæ forma non prima, sed maxima, quia et ante quam Verbum caro fieret, ex ea fide quæ in Deum erat, et in prophetis et in multis aliis sanctis, fulsere virtutes."

done every thing for us from unspeakable love, in order that we might in return love him, who spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us, and who promised, that if we would henceforth obey his will, he would make us joint-heirs with his own, only-begotten Son."⁸¹ "This love to God enkindled in our hearts is so powerful,"—as Julian (who himself suffered for what he supposed the cause of Christ) said,⁸² explaining well and applying the passage, Rom. 5: 3, "that we can rejoice not only in the prospect of future good, but in the possession of virtue can be cheerful in the midst of suffering, can regard the rage of our persecutors, rather as a trial of our patience, than as a disturbance of our joy, and can abstain from sin, not merely for the sake of reward, but considering this very not sinning, as itself a reward."

It appears from what has now been said, that the Pelagians believed in justification understood in the *objective* and *judicial* sense,⁸³ and also in the sanctifying influence which faith in the forgiveness obtained by Christ must exercise upon the heart of man, and so upon the whole course of his life, by exciting confidence in God, and grateful love to him.⁸⁴

But although the Pelagians gave prominence to the external connexion between Christ and believers, founded upon what he had done for mankind, the blessings he had procured for them, and also promised to bestow in future; they placed more in the back ground the *internal relation between Christ and believers*; and indeed, they could not do otherwise, in consistency with the fundamental principles of their system. Augustine reiterated against them the reproach, that they made the grace of Christ to consist merely in the gift of pardon, and that they left man, after he had obtained this, to his own free will; not acknowledging, that his whole internal righteousness or holiness is still the work of Christ alone, and that the new divine principle of life, which is the source of all good in believers, flows only from communion with

⁸¹ Opus imperfectum, I. 94.

⁸² L. c. L. II. c. 166.

⁸³ As Julian says, Opus Imperf. II. 165, "Justificatio per peccatorum veniam."

⁸⁴ Julian says, Opus Imperf. II. 227, rightly explaining the apostle: "Eo debetis servire Deo fidelius quo liberalius. Peccatum quippe dominabatur vobis, cum reatum impendebat ultio; postea autem quam gratia Dei beneficia consecuti estis, et depositis reatum ponderibus respirastis, ingenuo pudore communiti, debetis gratiam referre medicanti."

Christ by faith. This internal communion between Christ and the believer, and the justification or sanctification of man⁸⁵ grounded in Christ and flowing from this union;—this it was which Augustine particularly insisted upon, in opposition to the Pelagians. It was with regard to justification in this Augustinian sense only, that there was any discussion during this controversy; and this strife accordingly ran into the same as that respecting grace.⁸⁶

Augustine makes the following statement of the process by which the moral and religious life is developed. He distinguishes, according to Paul, the letter of the law, which kills, and its spirit, which makes alive.⁸⁷ By the mere knowledge of the law, as external precept, the nurturing grace of God, from which the first excitements to goodness proceed, leads man to the knowledge of his sin, and to the consciousness, that by his own powers he cannot obey the law; and hence springs the feeling of his need of a Redeemer and then faith in him. By faith he not only obtains the forgiveness of sin, but enters also into joint participation with the Redeemer in a divine life, and obtains grace by which his soul is healed of sin. With the returning health of the soul, the free will is also restored, in place of the will before enslaved to sin. The will now yields itself anew to be obedient to righteousness, with free love. The divine life, which acquires in man a specific form, reveals itself in works of love. This is the spirit of the law, which makes alive,—it is the love shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost.

From hence resulted another difference between these two modes of thinking. Pelagius, it has been already said, gave preference to the theological views of the Oriental teachers; and as they, with their more free, historic view, were accustomed to make more distinction between the different stages through which men were led by the nurturing care of God, and the different periods of divine revelation; he, too, in accordance with his doctrine, which has been explained above, of the gradual deterioration of human nature, and of a gradual counteraction of the same, distinguished the three following periods, viz.

⁸⁵ This is what Augustine understood by the word *justificatio*, which he did not use in the same sense with the Pelagians.

⁸⁶ August. de gratia Christi, § 52. "Eam esse gratiam Dei per Jesum Christum in qua nos sua, non nostra justitia justos facit."

⁸⁷ Especially in his fine work, *De spiritu et littera*.

(1) Righteousness in the state of nature ; (2) Righteousness under the law ; (3) Righteousness under grace. Augustine, on the contrary, insisted always, that through all these stages there is the same need of redemption, and the same source of true holiness, that is *grace*, obtained by faith ; not indeed at first by faith in a Saviour already manifested, but still in one then promised. " Even during the dispensation of the law," he says, " there were those who did not stand under the law, terrifying, convincing of sin, and punishing,—but under grace, filling the heart with joy in goodness, healing and delivering it."⁸⁸

As Augustine recognized but one principle of true goodness, in the nature of the religious and moral disposition, which results from faith in the Redeemer ; he applied this to the estimation of the moral acts performed before the knowledge of Christ. This led to a controversy between Julian and Augustine, which had an important influence upon the development of Christian Ethics. Augustine laid down a just proposition ; but he erred in the application of it, in consequence of overlooking the connexion which still continues between God and that portion of our nature which is related to him, and in consequence too of not discerning the conflicting elements from which human actions can result. In this controversy, as elsewhere, Augustine had the merit of opposing the principle of judging actions by any external standard, or according to the external QUANTITY of the action performed, and of placing in a clear light the internal, necessary connexion between religion and morality, showing how the latter is founded on the former, and consequently how ethics is founded on theology.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ De peccato originis, § 29. " Non sub lege terrente, convincente, puniente ; sed sub gratia delectante, sanante, liberante."

⁸⁹ Although Augustine wrote no work on Christian Ethics in general, but only on some particular ethical topics ; he yet contributed more to the advancement of the science of Christian Morals, than Ambrose of Milan did, who has acquired celebrity in the history of this science by his work *De Officiis*, in three books. This work, however, is rather a collection of general rules of life for the clergy, (hence its original title, *De officiis ministrorum*,) drawn from some general maxims, than a systematic development of Christian Ethics. The merit of Augustine in this respect, consists particularly in this, that he pointed out the essential, internal connexion between Christian Theology and Christian Ethics, brought to light the peculiar *principles* of Christian Ethics flowing from this connexion, made the nature of the christian disposition prominent, in opposition to mere legality and the

But at the same time he contributed in a great degree to promote in the Western church the partial and limited manner of judging respecting the ancient heathen times, in opposition to the more free views of this subject held by the earlier Alexandrine theologians, traces of which are found even in many of the Oriental writers contemporary with him, and to which Augustine himself, as a Platonist, had at first been disposed. In his later writings, he sometimes gives still indications of that earlier and higher sentiment, in searching out and recognizing whatever of Truth and Good there is scattered throughout heathen literature, and which he every where derives from the revelation to created minds of that Divine Spirit which is the source of all truth and goodness; though this last is inconsistent with his theory respecting the entire corruption of human nature, and with the exclusiveness of his doctrine of predestination.⁹⁰

The Pelagians appealed particularly to the shining examples of heathen virtue, as evidences of what human nature, even when left to itself, can do, in opposition to the assertion of the moral depravity of man. To this Augustine replied as follows: There is nothing intermediate between good and evil; love to God is the principle of all true goodness, and love of self is the principle of sin. This victorious principle of goodness, which overcomes the opposing selfishness, can spring only from faith. Hence every thing which does not have its root in faith, is sin. In support of this sentiment he appealed to the declaration of the apostle, which had been already misunderstood in this respect, and which after Augustine's day became, in this false application, a classical text in behalf of this sentiment, viz. Rom. 14: 23, "Whatever is not of faith is sin."⁹¹ From hence Augustine

opus operatum, and asserted the unconditioned obligation of the moral law, in opposition to the looser principles which came in from the Greek church; such e. g. as the principle, that the end sanctifies the means. The merit of Augustine in the last particular, appears especially from his opposition to the doctrine respecting an *officiosum mendacium* in his works *de mendacio*, from his correspondence with Jerome respecting the controversy between Peter and Paul at Antioch, and from his unconditional condemnation of suicide, in his work against Gaudentius, p. 432.

⁹⁰ [Compare with this the enlarged and truly liberal view of this subject expressed by Calvin, Bib. Repos. Vol. II. p. 558.—TR.]

⁹¹ The Pelagian Julian appears to have seen, from the connexion in which these words stand, that they bear an entirely different sense,

concluded, that all the showy virtues of the heathen are only apparent virtues. But as to Julian, inasmuch as he overlooked⁹² the principle on which morality rests, its internal unity, and its being grounded in religion ; this statement of Augustine appeared to him so revolting, that he could not sufficiently express his surprise at it. He deduced from it the following strange consequences: "If the chastity of the heathen is no chastity, one might as well say, that the body of unbelievers is no body, that the eyes of the heathen could not see, that the grain which grows on the fields of the heathen is no grain."⁹³ Augustine replied to this, that moral goodness could not be contemplated as so isolated, but that, in forming judgments respecting moral actions, every thing must depend upon the entire unity of the internal life, from which the activity of man proceeds. He referred his opponent to Matt. 6 : 23, and said, the eye of the soul is the whole direction of the internal man.⁹⁴ One who appears to do what is good, but in doing it, does not propose to himself the end which true wisdom prescribes for all human action, sins by having the direction of his soul alienated from that which is the supreme good of man.⁹⁵ If every thing is not judged according to this principle of the disposition, then what proceeds from a sinful disposition may indeed appear to be virtue, and sins may seem to be conquered by sins, but true virtue can never be thus realized.⁹⁶

and relate only to actions performed against one's own convictions. See August. con. Julian. IV. 24.

⁹² At other times, Julian knew well, that right and wrong must be determined, not according to the external action, but according to the direction of the will. "Hoc operatur foris jam ipsa justitia, quam intus voluntas sancta concepit et peperit," Opus Imperf. I. 79. Still it may be, that although he regarded the virtues as internal directions and attributes of mind ; he did not yet discern their higher internal unity, their deepest root in the one essential nature of that which is a right disposition.

⁹³ L. c. 27.

⁹⁴ "Oculus intentio, qua facit quisque quod facit." l. c. 28.

⁹⁵ "Quidquid boni fit ab homine, et non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere, vera sapientia præcipit, etsi officio (*opificium, the external action*) videatur bonum, ipso non recto fine peccatum est." l. c. 21.

⁹⁶ Julian was so little able to understand this principle, that he deduced from it the conclusion, in opposition to Augustine, that if sin

But although Julian acknowledged no internal distinction in what is called virtue, from different points of view; yet, by following the doctrine commonly received, which assigns the eternal blessedness promised in the New Testament, the blessedness of the kingdom of heaven, exclusively to Christians, he fell into the inconsistency of instituting an external distinction between christian and heathen virtues and good works, determined according to the results by which they are followed. He called christian virtues, on account of the reward connected with them, good *fruitfully*; the others, from not having this reward annexed, good *unfruitfully*.⁹⁷ His view of this point depends upon his conceiving of the relation between religion and morality as only an external one, and his supposing something arbitrary and external in the relation of reward or blessedness to the life and actions of men. Augustine justly placed this inconsistency in a strong light; and said in opposition to it, that what is truly good cannot be unfruitful, and that the final result must correspond with the *internal* nature of human agency.

Corresponding with the various degrees through which, according to the Augustinian system, the nurturing grace of God carries the divine life in the process of its developement in human nature, this grace must receive many appropriate designations. So far as grace, anticipating all desert on the part of man, first draws with internal, irresistible necessity, the depraved will of one who is in the same alienation from God with all others, produces in him the first motions of goodness, awakens him to the feeling of his need of redemption, and thus leads him to faith, it is called *gratia præveniens* or *præparans*. It now creates in him, through faith, a free will to good, *gratia operans*. This, however, is not a transformation in which human nature is at once wholly renovated, and raised above all conflict with evil. There still remain in man two principles conflicting with each other. So far as he is born of God, and lives in fellowship with Christ, he sins no more; but so far as he bears within himself

could be conquered by sin, it must then be far easier to subdue vice by virtue; and that it could not therefore be so difficult for human nature, by its moral power, to triumph over evil. He did not consider, and this in consequence of the defect above mentioned, that it is wholly a different kind of victory which is here spoken of. Compare what Schleiermacher says respecting this superficial view, in his Remarks on the Idea of Virtue, p. 21.

⁹⁷ *Fructuose* and *steriliter bona*.

the old nature inherited from the first fallen man, sin still cleaves to him.⁹⁸ He therefore still needs grace, to assist and cooperate with his renewed will (*gratia cooperans*), that he may be enabled to accomplish what is good, and to come off victorious in his continued conflict with evil.⁹⁹ Although Augustine referred the explanation of the fact, why grace did not, as it might do, bring any one during this earthly life, into a perfect freedom from sin, to the unsearchable decree of God; he yet suggested the following mode of explanation, which to him seemed not improbable: So long as man has not yet attained, as he will in the future life, to the vision of the supreme good, so as to regard himself as nothing in comparison with God, and so long as he is not so entirely filled with his Spirit, as to prefer God to himself, not merely from rational conviction, but also from unceasing love;¹⁰⁰—so long as this is not the case, man is always exposed to the danger of pride, which is the more likely to spring from the self-contemplation of a rational spirit, since this spirit is in fact greater than all besides in the earthly creation. Hence to guard him against this danger, man must be kept in constant conflict with himself.—In reply to this, Julian could make the not unfounded objection, that Augustine reasoned in a circle; for since pride itself is sin, it follows of course, that grace, in freeing man wholly from sin, would also free him from pride. Still this argument of Augustine's had its origin in a true christian experience, which could not be reasoned away.¹⁰¹ Since now, while man continues in this life, he is continually exposed by reason of this unremitted contest, to the danger of falling; he needs, in order to salvation, that grace which will enable him to

⁹⁸ See e. g. *De perfectione justitiae hominis*, § 39.

⁹⁹ "Cooperando perficit, quod operando incipit. Ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens." *De gratia et lib. arbit.* § 33.

¹⁰⁰ "Quamdiu non videt, sic ut videbit in fine, summum illud et immutabile bonum, in cujus comparatione se spernat, sibi que illius caritate vilescat, tantoque spiritu ejus impleatur, ut id sibi non ratione sola, sed æterno quoque amore præponat." *Con. Julian.* IV. 28.

¹⁰¹ Julian: "Absurdissimum et stultissimum, peccatum fuisse, ne peccatum esset, quoniam et ipsa superbia utique peccatum est." Augustine: "Hoc si experti non essemus, et in aliquibus terris, ubi ista nunquam contigerant, viveremus, audiremus, sine dubio utique derideremus." *De natura et gratia, con. Pelag.* § 30.

hold on victoriously, through this conflict to the last. Grace in this respect was called by Augustine *donum perseverantiae*; and this is the only sure mark of the predestinated.

This doctrine of grace, as now unfolded with all its distinctions, stood necessarily connected with the doctrine of absolute Predestination. And when this doctrine was so taught, it was justly exposed to the following objections, which were often repeated by the Pelagians; viz. that under the name of grace, Augustine here introduced a real *fate*, that he denied outright the free will belonging essentially to the constitution of human nature, and that he set aside all the conditions of a righteous judgment on the part of God. In relation to the free will, Augustine always affirmed, that as the law is not annulled, but fulfilled, by faith; so by grace, the free will is not set aside, but made first truly free, which it never is before; and he referred to the declaration of Christ, that he only is truly free, whom the Son makes free. Here, however, he was led by the ambiguity of the term *freedom*, to confound two distinct ideas,¹⁰² viz. the idea of freedom as a certain state and stage of moral improvement, and of freedom as a particular faculty belonging to every rational mind. With regard to freedom in the former sense, Augustine gave a deeper view of it, in connexion with his idea of a divine principle of life imparted by grace, than could consist with the Pelagian system. But it was otherwise as to freedom in the second sense, which was the particular point at issue in the present controversy. This freedom Augustine denied to all the descendants of fallen Adam, since he did not allow all men to have *ability* to attain to that higher moral freedom. This ability he regarded, not as in the inalienable possession of the rational mind, but as a gift imparted to a particular number of men by a special divine in-working. With regard to those who belong to this number, it cannot be said, that they have a *free self-determination* in appropriating to themselves what is offered them by grace, since their will is determined by an internal necessity, through the almighty will of God. And as these follow an irresistible agency from above, the great mass of mankind, in bondage to sin, follow also an irresistible agency of a worse sort. But here Augustine contended, that free self-determination is not infringed upon by the inward operations of grace; since he

¹⁰² A fact which the Pelagians well knew how to animadvert upon. Con. Julian. Opus Imperf. I. 176.

was satisfied with the notion of a freedom in appearance, or that show of freedom which is necessarily formed in the consciousness of the creature, viz. in so far as grace operates according to the form of human nature, or of rational human consciousness,—the form of that self-determination, which we are conscious of in our experience. Hence, although man is really determined by a higher principle, renovating his will with an irresistible power, to which he yields after the manner of nature, he is yet conscious of no violence done to his will. It was in this sense, that Augustine said, that the operation of grace presupposes that free will, which belongs essentially to the nature of reason; that if man were not made in the image of God, he could not be susceptible of grace; and that grace acts on men, and could not act on stones.¹⁰³

It was an inconsistency in the system of Augustine, that while he derived the first sin from the free self-determination of man, he made every thing else to depend upon an unconditional divine predetermination. He would have been more dialectically consistent, if in following the principle which had led him to this whole mode of conception, he had derived the acting of Adam, as well as that of all others, from an unconditioned predestination. This inconsistency was prominently taken notice of by Julian.¹⁰⁴ But it was a noble inconsistency,—one which resulted from the victory of his religious feeling over his speculative tendency. Thus he could in one point hold fast the holiness and justice of God, and the free guilt of man; and transfer from God the cause of evil, and place it in that truly free self-determination which originally belonged to man. In the mind of Augustine this inconsistency was obviated, by the supposition of the necessary and incomprehensible connexion between the first man and the whole human race; for as the act of the first man can be regarded as the personal act of each individual, the loss of original freedom is in every one the result of his own guilt.

¹⁰³ "Neque enim gratia Dei lapidibus aut lignis pecoribusve preestatur, sed quia imago Dei est, meretur hanc gratiam." *Con. Julian. IV. 15.* "Non sicut in lapidibus insensatis, aut sicut in iis, in quorum natura rationem voluntatemque non condidit, salutem nostram Deus operatur in nobis." *De peccat. meritis et remissione, Lib. II. § 6.*

¹⁰⁴ *Opus Imperf. VI. 22.* "Unde tu nosti illud tantummodo justum fuisse, ut in Adam nisi voluntarium crimen non possit ulcisci, si injustum esse non nosti, imputari cuiquam in crimen, quod fatearis sine voluntate susceptum?"

From this Augustinian system, composed with so much dialectical art, there might be drawn some hurtful practical consequences; though when it was stated with the caution, wisdom, and dialectical skill of Augustine, these could be avoided. Those who, like Augustine, had come into this system through the whole developement of their own internal life, and with whom it had become incorporated with the fundamental experiences of their christian consciousness; those who had already attained to inward rest and firmness in the christian life; such persons could find repose in this system. The life of faith which they led, their consciousness of a divine life, raised them above the doubts which might have arisen from reflection on the point, whether they belonged to the number of the elect. But it was otherwise, where this system was taught in a less guarded and skilful manner, or where it was inculcated upon persons, who were still involved in many an internal conflict, and who could be easily disturbed by reflection upon their own state. Augustine himself lived to see some of these effects, and it is worthy of notice, how he proceeded with reference to them. From what he observed, he took occasion still farther to develope his system, in regard to its practical bearings.

The effects to which we allude took place between the years 426—27, and were as follows. One of Augustine's polemic treatises relating to these controverted points in theology,—a letter of his to the presbyter (afterwards bishop) Sixtus of Rome,¹⁰⁵ was circulated among the monks belonging to a cloister in Adrumetum of the province Byzacene in North Africa. It produced among them violent excitement of feeling. There came forward among them persons who deduced hurtful practical consequences from the Augustinian doctrines respecting grace and predestination. "Of what use," said they, "to teach others, and exhort them to goodness, since human efforts are of no avail, and God works within us both to will and to do. Moreover, it is unjust to reproach or punish men who commit sin, since they are not to blame for doing it. Without grace they cannot do otherwise; nor can they do any thing to deserve grace. Consequently we can do nothing, but pray for them."

When Augustine received information of these disturbances by messengers sent from the cloister, and by a letter from the abbot Valentinus, he addressed two books to these monks; in

¹⁰⁵ Epistolæ August. 194.

one of which, (*De gratia et libero arbitrio.*) he unfolded more fully his doctrine respecting the relation of grace to the free will, in opposition to Pelagianism; and in the other, (his book *De correptione et gratia.*) he examined it in its practical bearings with reference to the consequences which had been deduced from it. According to the teaching of Augustine, this unconditional predestination is not an arbitrary act of God, conferring eternal salvation upon man while he is loaded with every sin; but a necessary intermediate link is the communication of grace. This, in all who possess it, is the source of a divine life, and must, according to an internal impulse, manifest itself in works of goodness. But here, too, no limits can be established where the divine agency in man begins and ceases, and where human agency commences and ends; the two go inseparably together. The human will, when appropriated by divine grace, being renewed and sanctified, performs with freedom what is good; and grace can act only through the will, serving as its organ. Hence Augustine says, that "one who is a child of God must feel himself impelled by the Spirit of God to do what is right, and when he has done it, must thank God, who gave him power for this purpose, and pleasure in goodness. But one who does not do what is right, or does it without the proper motive of love, should pray God to grant him the grace which he has not yet received."

On account of the internal connexion which Augustine supposed to exist between the first sin and the sin of all mankind, as has been already shown, he maintained, that no person could exculpate himself by reason of the general sinfulness, and that his sin must be imputed to him as the result of his own guiltiness; and farther, that God might indeed act by his grace upon the hearts of men, without our warning, counselling, or punishing them, and equally, too, without our praying for them. In fact, none of these second causes could have the designed effect upon men, except on the supposition of divine grace, which acts by human instrumentality, and without which all human instrumentality would be of no avail; and also on the supposition, that those whom we desire to lead to salvation, belong to the number of the elect. Considering, however, that God often employs such instruments as we are in imparting his grace to men; considering that there are no infallible signs by which we can in this life distinguish the elect from the non-elect, and that we must desire in the spirit of love, that all should attain to happiness; it

is our duty, in the same spirit of love, to proceed on the supposition, that God will make use of us as instruments, through his grace, of converting and bringing to salvation, this or that particular person, now living in sin, and so to employ for this end all the means within our power, leaving the event with Him.

[The history goes on from this point, with the developement of semi-Pelagianism. We will here cite, in conclusion, a passage taken from page 1322 of the original work, which is closely connected with the outline above given.]

Augustine had set apart the last years of his long and active life for completing his theological works, which were in part connected with these controversies which he regarded as so important. As the numerous duties belonging to his episcopal office left him no leisure for this, he procured the presbyter Eraclius, who had been formed under his eye, to be united with him as an assistant, with the consent of the church. He now employed himself in preparing a *Critique* of all his writings,—his *Retractiones*. What particularly induced him to do this, was his seeing that many passages from his earlier works were brought against him by the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians, to the great embarrassment of his enthusiastic admirers, who would not allow any error in a man whose authority with them was *too great*. Augustine, however, was far from claiming any such authority for his works; an authority which in his view belonged to the Bible alone. He said to these extravagant admirers of his, that they gave themselves needless trouble, they had not undertaken a good cause, and must lose the process, even by his own decision.¹⁰⁶ He rejoiced in the acknowledgement, that he had made advances in the knowledge of the truth, and that he had found out many of his early errors to be such; and he was not now ashamed to point them out publicly in his works. It may indeed have also been, as might be inferred from what has been already said above, that as his mind was in many respects more limited by system in the latter part of his life, he regarded many of the more unshackled opinions of his earlier years as erroneous; or that he himself may have unconsciously carried back his altered system into the expressions of his earlier views.

¹⁰⁶ "Frustra laboratis, non bonam causam suscepistis, facile in ea, me ipso iudice, superamini." Ep. 143, ad Marcellinum.

Augustine next employed himself about his last work in the Pelagian controversies, in opposition to Julian, which he was never able to complete. He wrote on this work in the midst of violent political storms, which brought desolation and ruin over the flourishing portion of the world in which he lived. He had the pain to see accomplished the downfall of a man, who had once been very dear to him. The leader (Comes) Boniface, one of the most distinguished and successful commanders of the declining Roman empire, had been induced by the advice of Augustine himself, to abandon his intention of withdrawing into monastic life, and to devote his powers to the defence of oppressed Romish Christendom against the raging incursions of the barbarous nations. But he was afterwards prevailed upon, in consequence of the intrigues of the commandant Aëtius, his rival in military renown, to rebel against the imperial government. In order to sustain himself in this contest, he called in the Vandals from Spain to his aid. Augustine employed a favourable moment to speak to the conscience of Boniface, in a letter written with genuine christian dignity and great wisdom,—a true model for such complicated relations. Boniface had to learn by bitter experience, the truth of what his old friend had predicted to him. He was led on farther than he himself first intended, and when he wished to retrace his steps, it was too late. The Vandals looked upon those flourishing regions as their own, and from being the allies of Boniface, became his enemies. Augustine's episcopal residence, the city Hippo, was besieged by them. In the midst of these sufferings, and in the prospect of new dangers impending, it was Augustine's common prayer, that God would deliver the town from the enemy; or that he would grant his servants power to endure every thing which his will should impose upon them; or that God would take him out of the world. The latter event took place. On the third month of the siege, which lasted fourteen months, Augustine died, 76 years old, A. D. 429.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ Of the latter years of Pelagius nothing is known with certainty. He is generally said to have passed them in the seclusion of monastic life, at Jerusalem; and one account relates that he died there A. D. 420, at the age of 90 years.—Ed.

ART. IV.—HINTS RESPECTING COMMENTARIES UPON THE SCRIPTURES.

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. at Andover.

It is impossible for any one who reads and venerates the Scriptures, not take an interest in the present signs of the times respecting them. The period now past is not very remote, when the whole world called Christian, with the exception of priests, monks, and a few literati, were entirely, or almost entirely, excluded from the reading or consultation of the word of God. To us who live in a land where every kind of publication has the most free and wide range that is possible, and where no authority of man can prevent the reading of any book which one chooses to read, it seems scarcely credible that such a state of things should ever have existed. And were we not most forcibly reminded of it by facts that are continually occurring in the midst of us, even at the present time, among some called Christians, and who regard as a crime the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures among the people at large, we should almost be tempted to suppose, that the history of the past had received some touches from the hand of exaggeration. In some particulars this may have been so; but that the facts on record, with regard to the prohibition of the Holy Scriptures as a book for use among the common people, are substantially true, is beyond all contradiction. Indeed, no attempt is made by those who are principally concerned in such prohibitory measures to conceal this fact.

The Lord Jesus told the unbelieving Jews to "search the Scriptures," John 5: 39. The sacred historian of early christian times says, that the Bereans "were more noble than those of Thessalonica, inasmuch as they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so," Acts 17: 11. Paul gives special charge to the Thessalonians, that "his epistle be read to ALL the holy brethren," 1 Thess. 5: 7; and the same apostle exhorts the Ephesian church, without distinction or exception, "to take to themselves the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," Eph. 6: 17. The ancient legislator of the Jews, in times of great ignorance among the community over which he presided, gave express direction, that "the words which he commanded should

be in their heart ; that they should teach them diligently to their children, and talk of them when they should sit in the house, or walk by the way, or lie down, or rise up ; that they should bind them for a sign upon the hand, and they should be as frontlets between their eyes ; that they should write them upon the posts of their house, and upon their gates," Deut. 6: 6—9 ; the holy Psalmist describes the pious man, as being one whose "delight is in the law of the Lord [the Scriptures], and in his law doth he meditate day and night ;" and a great multitude of passages, of the like tenor, might easily be added to these. Yet the church of Rome, even after the light of the Reformation had burst upon the world, and the subject of disseminating the Scriptures had been amply discussed, did *prohibit* the reading of Scripture by the common people, in the famous council of Trent, and make it penal for booksellers to deal in Bibles.* The only exception to a general prohibition with regard to the common people is, that upon the recommendation of a priest or confessor, the bishop may give license to particular individuals, to read the Bible as translated into their own vernacular language, when such translation is made by catholic authors ; a privilege, as we know from the history of the past, rarely asked for, and still more rarely granted, because the odium of suspected heresy was attached to making such a request. Inquiry implied doubt, as these directors of the consciences of men supposed ; and doubt, with the reading of the Bible, might easily lead men to think and act for themselves in matters of religion, instead of submitting implicitly to the dictates of the See at Rome.

That the zeal and the infatuation which dictated such measures at Rome, in regard to the dissemination of the Scriptures, have nothing abated in recent times, is sufficiently evident, if we consult documents which lie before the public. In the Circular Letter of the Pope, in A. D. 1824, which respects the recent efforts of Bible Societies, and is addressed to all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the catholic church, he exhorts them diligently to occupy themselves, by all means, to turn away their flocks from these *deadly pastures (lethiferis hinc pascuis)*, meaning the Scriptures circulated by Bible Societies, which, in another passage of the same Epistle, he styles the *gospel of the Devil (evangelium Diaboli)*. And in conformity to these requisitions, the poor catholics of our great cities are

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 4. Decret. de Canone Script.

obliged by their priests, on pain of excommunication, to give up Bibles or any other religious books, which they may have received from protestants, and the reading of which might shake their faith in the decretals of the Council of Trent.

How different the general spirit which pervades our country and that land from which we came ! Bibles without limitation, and almost without number, are printed and circulated ; and instead of any prohibition being laid upon the dissemination of them, it is regarded as an imperious duty of societies and of individuals, to circulate them to the greatest possible extent. Already, in a great part of our country, has every family been supplied with a copy of the Holy Scriptures, who was willing to receive one.

The spirit of inquiry respecting the contents of the Scriptures, is one that we should naturally expect to follow on, in the train of events like these. Accordingly it has made its appearance, and is becoming diffused rapidly, and in a manner surpassing all expectation. It would hardly be possible to calculate, without great pains and much expense of time, how many commentaries on the Bible have been printed and circulated in the protestant religious community, since the operations of the British and Foreign Bible Society first commenced. In the interesting accounts of these operations, and those of other kindred societies in this country and elsewhere, but little notice has yet been bestowed on this unexpected result of their efforts. It is an honour due to them, to point out this important fruit of their labours ; and to shew, that while they are diffusing the Scriptures themselves among the people at large, they are of course waking up the spirit of inquiry, not only among the mass of men, but in a particular manner among those whose business it is to be the teachers of religion.

Comparing the state of things not many years since, in this country and in Great Britain, one can scarcely give credit to facts respecting the circulation of large and expensive commentaries on the Scriptures among the mass of the community. That such voluminous works as those of Scott and Henry, for example, should not only meet with a ready sale in one or two extensive editions, but that these editions should be frequently repeated, and the sale become still more and more extensive, is a palpable evidence that new times have come upon the church, and that new developments are about to be made, in regard to the subject of religion and of the Bible, which must be looked

for with the deepest interest by all who are concerned in things of this nature.

It is not to my purpose further to pursue historical notices relative to this great subject. I have said thus much in order to show that there never was a time, when information respecting the Holy Scriptures was so extensively sought after as at present ; and consequently there never was a time, in which all good men had so deep an interest in the character of books, whose object it is to explain the contents of the Bible. The activity of the enemies of this blessed book has been greater, I believe, during the last fifty or sixty years, than ever before, in lands called christian. The enemy have indeed "come in like a flood ;" but "the Spirit of the Lord has raised up a standard against them." Infidelity, after a while, begins to grow weary of its toil ; and this very naturally ; for what is the reward which it can hope for, on account of the labours which it bestows upon the objects that it has in view ? A few men attain, perhaps, to wealth and notoriety, by their efforts and their writings. But the mass of their fellow labourers sink down into insignificance, the victims of selfish passions and carnal appetites. But not so with Christians. They have a great and glorious object before them ; no less than the diffusion of the light of salvation over the world, and the regeneration of our degraded and unhappy race. Their immediate reward is the pleasure of doing good ; and their ultimate and highest one, is the final approbation of God, and the glories of the heavenly world.

All things considered, it would seem quite probable, that the circulation of the Scriptures, and of books which may serve to explain them, will become more and more extensive. I do hope and trust that Christians, who have begun thus to scatter light over this benighted world, will feel such pleasure in doing this, and cherish so deep a sense of the duty of thus doing, that the work will not stop, but go on and increase, until "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters fill the sea."

The highly interesting nature of this undertaking, renders every step of its means and its process an object worthy of the most attentive and serious examination. No one individual can even hope to do the principal part of such a task. The united and the successive efforts of many minds will be required, in order to complete what is to be done in the way of canvassing and settling the question : What are the means best adapted to promote

a true knowledge of the Scriptures? In its full extent, this question would embrace, in the first place, the considerations suggested by the inquiry, What kind of helps are best adapted to promote a right understanding of the Scriptures? And in the second place, it would be requisite to show, how these helps could be most profitably and successfully diffused and employed.

I shall limit myself, on the present occasion, to one point only, which would naturally be arranged under the first of these two questions. In other words, my design is, to make some remarks on the subject of *commentaries* on the Scriptures, and particularly on such as are best adapted to popular use. It will be conceded, on all hands, that, at a time like this, the subject is opportune; and if it should be treated in any manner as it deserves to be, I trust it will secure a patient hearing. It cannot be otherwise than of high importance, that the public sentiment should be enlightened in relation to this topic; and for the generations to come, leaving the effects on the present one out of view, it is in every respect a matter of deep interest, how the efforts and taste of the present generation may be excited, and formed, and directed. It would savour both of vanity and arrogance for any one individual to believe that his efforts can accomplish all this. But such an one can contribute his *mite*; and this is all which I expect to do, at the most, and all that I set out to do, on the present occasion.

In the prosecution of the subject thus introduced, I design to inquire, I. What is meant by a proper commentary on the Scriptures? II. To shew the grounds or reasons why such commentary is needed. III. To make some remarks on the different kinds of commentary that are necessary in order to meet the wants of the public, and on the appropriate characteristics of each kind. IV. To suggest some considerations in relation to the means of furnishing such commentaries.

I. What then is meant by a proper commentary on the Scriptures?

The word *commentary* or *comment* means, agreeably to its etymology or derivation, *that which accompanies*, i. e. occupies itself with, the *mind* or *meaning* of a writer. The Latin words *commentarius*, *commentarium*, or *commentatio*, mean, as we say in English, *notes upon an author*, a descant or discourse concerning him; also an abstract, memorial, description, or narration of any thing, i. e. something which so presents it to view as to explain it and make it intelligible. The verb *com-*

mentor, to which all these nouns stand related, means not only to discourse, to argue, to dispute, to discuss, but also to write commentary, i. e. explanation or discussion, to muse, to study, to think upon, etc. If *commentary* should be explained as meaning *the result of such a process*, i. e. the result of studying and discussing any treatise, or the giving of one's thoughts upon what he had studied and discussed, such an explanation would well describe this species of writing.

Thus much for the etymology of the word. The simple meaning of *commentary*, as now employed in the current language of the day, is an *explanation, exposition, or interpretation*, consisting of notes philological, critical, and exegetical, upon the text of any author, either in a foreign or a vernacular language. A proper commentary does not of itself proceed beyond this. When the author is explained, the appropriate work of the interpreter or commentator is finished. But to complete his explanation, something more than merely grammatical or philological remarks will be needed. The consistency of an author with himself, and his agreement with other writers of the like character, come fairly under the head of explanation, i. e. commentary. For how can the mind or meaning of any writer be fully explained, until all the modifications of particular forms of expression are pointed out, and all the qualifications of particular assertions are made plain and palpable?

In regard to the sacred writers, moreover, there is a peculiar reason why their works should be viewed in a relative, as well as in an absolute light. The Bible claims to be an inspired book. If now we examine into the nature of its claims, and satisfy our minds that they are valid, and that we are bound in candour, as moral and accountable beings, fully to admit them, then of course we come to the position, that all which the Bible contains must be consistent; and consequently, that one sacred writer does not contradict another. If this be so, then, in order fully to develop the sentiment of any one particular writer, we must compare him, whenever he treats of subjects that have been handled by any of the others, with those other writers, and see what modification of his language will result from this comparison.

I am aware that I shall be disputed and opposed in this position. It has been said, and is still very confidently said, that this is arguing in a circle; for we first admit the divine authority of the sacred writings, (which we should do only after the con-

tents of these writings are fully and entirely understood,) and then we construe each particular writer, not as he is merely in himself, but in a manner that his relation to others demands, on the *à priori* ground that each and all of them are inspired. This, it is alleged, is both unphilosophical and unjust; for the laws of exegesis demand that each writer should stand upon his own basis, and that his defaults or errors should not be covered over, or in any way diminished, by what others have said or written. All attempts of this nature belong, therefore, it is said, not to the office of an interpreter or commentator, but to the part of a partial friend and an apologist.

It is not for the sake of vindicating the remark I have made above, in respect to what properly belongs to commentary, that I enter upon the discussion of these objections. This would be a comparatively unimportant end. It is because there are involved, in the subjects now suggested, some principles which are fundamentally concerned with the proper and legitimate interpretation of the Scriptures, that I venture to introduce the discussion.

It is said in the first place, that we have no right to conclude that the Bible is a divine book, until *all* its contents are well understood; and that to do so, is a kind of *ὑστέρων πρότερον*, because we must argue from the contents of the Bible, at least in a good degree, that it is a divine book; and how can we do so, while any part of its contents are obscure or uncertain?

I acknowledge that there is something specious in this argument; and this arises from the fact, that to a certain extent it is really founded in truth. It is true, that if the matter of the Scriptures were trifling, romantic, mythological, tending to no serious moral end, and promotive of no spiritual good; if it were full of contradictions and absurdities; we could not, with the views which as rational beings we now have of God and of duty, receive the Bible as a divine book. No external testimony would be adequate to remove our scruples or fears, in relation to this subject.

But this does not settle the principle in question. It is a fact, after all, that a great proportion of the Bible is intelligible to all readers of any tolerable illumination. The general drift and scope of all its contents, is plain and palpable. It is equally plain that this is, to honour God, our Maker and Redeemer, and to promote those virtues among men, which tend above all things to make them happy in this world, as well as in that which is to come.

Can such a book, or rather, such books, be fraudulent or superstitious? Every probability is against it. Can the external testimony in favour of their extraordinary nature and origin, be set aside? Not so, unless we bid adieu to all the established principles of receiving testimony, and launch into boundless skepticism. Then why may we not admit, that the Bible is a revelation from God, even while some individual expressions and some subordinate parts of it are still obscure or doubtful to us?

How is it when we read the book of nature—a book so highly applauded by many an author, who doubts and cavils on the subject of revelation? I join with the naturalist in all his applause of the works of God in the natural world; but not in the intention with which he bestows it. When I acknowledge with heart-felt joy, that “the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth forth the work of his hand;” that “the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made;” that all men “shew the work of the law written in their hearts,” and that those “who have not a law [a revelation], are a law unto themselves;” I do not, in cheerfully and gratefully acknowledging all this, detract from the truth, that “the gospel has brought life and immortality to light;” that we ought to “give heed to it, as a light shining in a dark place;” and that “the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimonies of the Lord sure, making wise the simple.” If, when the objector to the views I am defending, looks to the sun, he acknowledges the hand of God in making it the source of light and heat; if, when he sees its light and exults in it, and feels its warmth and is cheered by it, he feels also, and is justly persuaded, that he ought fully to believe that all is of God, and is the result of his benevolence; why should he entertain or justify doubts on this subject, because he does not know whether light actually proceeds from the sun, or is a fluid distributed through the universe, and merely called into action by his presence. In like manner he does not know, in respect to warmth or heat, whether it is merely latent in all the objects around us, and is called forth by the presence of the sun, or proceeds directly from the sun itself. But is he to wait until these doubts and difficulties are all settled, before he can believe that God in his goodness has provided light and heat to cheer and comfort the creatures of his power? If you answer in the negative, then I may be permit-

ted to say, that there may be some unexplained passages of the Bible, not understood by me ; and yet I may reasonably and properly believe, that the Bible, as a whole, is of divine origin. The book of nature will surely be admitted to claim such an origin ; and yet this has a thousand obscure passages, where the Bible has one.

If I am correct in these positions, the main prop of all the objections I am canvassing, is taken away. Admit that the Scriptures are a divine book, and you admit, that, at least as they originally were, they must have been essentially consistent and harmonious. Nature is so ; although there are not wanting very many *seeming* contradictions. But these are removed, just in proportion as our knowledge increases. Knowing this, we come to the conclusion that all these apparent discrepancies would be removed, if our knowledge was commensurate with the true nature of things.

Why is not the same thing true, or at least, why ought it not to be admitted, in respect to revelation ? And when admitted, then we may meet with some *apparent* discrepancies in the Bible, without being obliged at once to conclude that they are real ones. In case of apparent contradictions on the pages of the book of nature, we are slow to believe that they are real ; in fact we absolutely reject the idea, and ascribe their appearance to our limited knowledge. And how do we proceed in order to remove apparent difficulties ? We enlarge our knowledge of the powers and the operations of nature ; we compare different parts of her great book together ; we feel an assurance that if we do read and rightly construe the whole, that we should find entire harmony and concord. We are so far from thinking it to be just, to maintain that we ought to believe in real contradictions, that we should feel it to be an act of haste and imprudence and folly, to decide against the principle of universal harmony, so long as our attainments in knowledge are any thing short of an absolute acquaintance with the contents of the whole book.

Now why should we treat the second and more perfect book of God in a different way ? It comes to us couched in human language—a medium necessarily imperfect, because language itself is principally the result of human effort, which is always imperfect. We know, from experience, that we often have feelings and conceptions which no human language is adequate in any good degree to express. Can it be, then, that the in-

finite and eternal God can express all of his feelings and views, (if I may thus speak,) through such a medium? The thing is in itself impossible. If difficulty, then arises at times, in respect to the meaning of some things in the Scriptures, would it not betray great want of consideration and candour, to think this strange? And when we are unable to explain, at once, particular parts of the Bible, why, I ask again, should we conclude, off hand, that these are contradictory of some other parts? Why may we not follow the example of the natural philosopher, and insist, that if the whole book were to be read and understood, we should not then find it to contain discrepancies and contradictions?

Thus much we may say, on the ground of analogical reasoning—arguing from that which all admit to be just and proper. I have now to add, that the principle assumed by those whom I am controverting, is in itself, at least in the extent to which they admit or apply it, radically and essentially at variance with the proper principles of interpretation. How shall we correctly interpret Horace, or Cicero, or Juvenal, or Plato, or any other writer ancient or modern? Shall we not compare him, not only with all his cotemporaries, but with all those of the same nation, and even of other nations of like views, who have preceded or followed him, in the same species of writing? Most certainly we shall do so, if we skillfully and thoroughly perform the office of an interpreter. To say that we must compare the same author with himself, in order to elucidate his meaning, would seem to be almost superfluous; so obvious and universally admitted is this principle. If now, in interpreting Horace, we may be permitted, or rather, if we are absolutely bound in duty, to compare one piece with another, and to explain what appears to be obscure or difficult in one passage, on account of its connexion or the form of expression, by what is of the like tenor in another passage, but plain from the connexion in which it stands; then we may be admitted to practise the same thing, in commenting upon John, or Paul, or any other sacred writer. If, moreover, we must consult the cotemporaries of Horace, and his predecessors and successors in writing lyric poems and satires, in order to draw from them such information as may cast light upon his works; and if we may lawfully apply such information in order to modify and elucidate the meaning of the Roman poet; then why may we not consult all the sacred writers in order that we may obtain aid in the explanation of any

one? We may; nay, we must do so, if we would comply with the imperious demands of the laws of exegesis.

But I shall be told, perhaps, that "those who admit the Bible, as a whole, to be of divine origin, push their attempts for conciliation beyond the bounds of justice and propriety, and thus sacrifice the great principles of interpreting language, to their prejudices on the subject of an inspired book."

In some cases this may be true; in some, no doubt, it has been a matter of fact. But because this principle may be abused, it makes nothing against the use of it. If I find, in Cicero or in Horace, an expression that seems to me incongruous, I may compare it with other parts of these authors, and with other writers of the Roman nation, or of the Greeks from whom the Romans derived most of their literature, and if I meet with any thing which affords ground to believe, that the doubtful or difficult sentence is to be taken in a *modified* sense; if, when thus taken, it makes a probable, an appropriate, and altogether a significant sense; and if I have reason to believe that Horace or Cicero did write what was congruous and appropriate and significant; then I can have no hesitation in using the means just described, in order to interpret Horace or Cicero. Is it a novelty in the matter of interpretation, that we must modify particular expressions, at times, *pro exigentia loci*? I trust not. Why should such a liberty, then, when applied to the Bible, be called in question or denied? Are not the Scriptures to have the like rules of interpretation extended to them, as are applied to other books? This will not, I trust be denied. And if so, then why should we not resort to *all* the biblical writers, in order to obtain light to aid us, in construing any of them? That we should do violence to language or sentiment, in order to produce concord, I certainly do not contend for. Indeed we may say, in one sense, that this is impossible. The mind which is free in any good degree from prejudice, and which is earnestly desirous of seeking and knowing the truth, cannot be satisfied with any sort of violence, and can in no way be convinced by it. Real conviction must be as free and spontaneous, as the mind itself from which it proceeds. All strained or unnatural interpretation, then, will sooner or later come to be rejected by sober and reflecting persons. It may have a temporary currency given it, by the learning and weight of some individuals; but it never can stand the test of time.

If, after all proper allowances made for the imperfections of

human language, and all due comparison of an author in any particular passage with himself and with others, we do still find an apparent meaning that allows of no modification which will bring it into unison with other writers; then we must either set the passage down as one beyond our present ability to construe, or else we must admit contradiction or discrepancy. The former of these two courses cautious and modest inquirers will be prone to take; the latter is generally chosen by those who are accustomed to decide summarily, on all subjects which pertain to matters of revelation.

I have explained sufficiently, and I would hope in some degree vindicated, the meaning of the assertion, that a commentary should embrace and exhibit the results of comparing any particular sacred writer with others in the same department. It would seem to be lawful and proper to make such a comparison; or rather, it is plainly a duty to do it, in all cases where it is practicable. We may admit, it appears, that the Bible is a divine book, without being necessitated, as a previous condition, fully to understand every particular expression in it. The meaning of expressions difficult or obscure to us, we may inquire after, by bringing all the light we can obtain to bear upon them; and we must do this, as a matter of conscience, when we admit that the sacred writers were inspired. In doing it we have only to guard against violating the proper principles of philosophy, or of doing violence to the nature of language. Such violence can never satisfy the candid mind; it can be employed only by the unenlightened or the prejudiced one.

I acknowledge that I have been induced to protract these remarks, not only on account of the important principle of hermeneutics connected with them, but because I have seen the matter in question so often treated in a manner that seems unjust, by a certain class of recent commentators. They appear not only to assume, for example, that Paul and Peter may differ from and contradict each other, but that this is a thing so very probable, that the contrary can scarcely be supposed with any good degree of verisimilitude. And why? Because men at the present time differ in their opinions and views—even sincere and enlightened men—and therefore they may have always done so, and probably did so.

Now this, in the first place, is setting aside all the evidences of inspiration; and in the second, it is reasoning from analogy to an extent greater than fact demands. It is not always true,

that good and enlightened men differ from each other on all, or on most, or even on any, of the important doctrines of religion. They may differ in their modes of illustrating and defending them; they may differ in philosophizing about them. But in respect to the facts or truths themselves, it would be quite too much to say that there is no real concord; especially among the immediate disciples of a great and enlightened teacher.

I cannot in any way, then, see how it is to be assumed *à priori*, that Paul and Peter did differ from each other, in their belief as to facts or doctrines. Had they philosophized on these, it would be easy to suppose, unless they were inspired in their philosophizing, that they might have differed. But as they do not appear to have done so, we are not bound to suppose that there is of course a discrepancy between them of any importance.

Yet we are admonished, by one class of commentators and theologians, and very often reminded, that there is a *Pauline* gospel, and a *Petrine* gospel, and a gospel peculiar to John; and so of the others. In the Old Testament, also, there is a *Mosaismus*, and a *Davidismus*; one view of religion by Solomon, and another by Isaiah, etc. Representations of this kind are not only current and common among some writers, but the truth of them is actually made the basis of some of the most important parts of their critical and religious opinions.

In all this, so far as I am able to see, there is some truth, and a great deal of substantial error. There is some truth, when it is said that there are discrepancies (not contradictions) among the different writers of Scripture. In style and manner of representation, they differ widely. I know of scarcely any thing in the whole range of Greek, Latin, or English literature, more discrepant or diverse in manner, than Isaiah and Malachi, Habakkuk and Ezekiel, David and Coheleth or Ecclesiastes; or than Paul and John, Luke and James. If, however, this striking discrepancy of style and manner constitutes a difference in religious views, and is a good ground for attributing to each a different system of religion, then we must go on to draw the conclusion, on like grounds, that no two writers ever held the same religious faith; for surely no two ever made representations in all respects alike. Nay we cannot stop here. We must go on to conclude, that because the voice, the looks, the manner, the style, in a word the whole person, and the whole developement of Paul as a preacher, were different from those of Peter and John, therefore Paul did not preach the same gospel as these

other apostles. John oftentimes, and Peter once, speaks of regeneration as a "being born again," "being born of God;" but Paul conveys the same idea by calling it a "new creation," a "resurrection from the dead," a "being renewed." And so of nearly all the prominent doctrines of religion, as represented in the Old Testament or the New, different writers clothe their representations with costume of a different hue, as we may say, or even of different material. I admit this, almost to any extent that you please. I know of no writers who exhibit so little of mannerism, as the sacred ones. They are altogether free, unconstrained, and independent. Each once chooses for himself his own elements for painting the scenes which he portrays. No one is a slavish imitator of others. So far as I know, there is not, in the whole bounds of human composition, more diversity of style, manner, modes of expression and representation, than is to be found in the Scriptures.

But what then? This only shews that the Bible is a book not mechanically, slavishly, superstitiously made. It is no patch-work, composed of shreds taken from other and different garments. Each writer thinks, speaks, represents, for himself. If this were not so, those who charge so many different systems of religion upon the sacred writers, would at once rise up and say, that the whole mass bears upon its very face the indubitable evidence of fiction, for it is but a tissue of patch-work imitation.

Why should I maintain that Paul preached a different gospel from that of Peter, merely because his tones, gestures, looks, demeanour, and style were different? And if I am not, on this account, justly entitled to maintain such ground, then how am I entitled to assert that the gospel, or the religious system of different writers in the Bible was discrepant, as to principles, merely because the style and modes of representation are so diverse?

We have now before us, what will enable one to see how much and how little truth is contained in the suggestions, so often repeated, of a Pauline and Petrine gospel, of Mosaism, etc. in the Scriptures. The discrepancy out of which all this is made, is one of costume, not of person. Is not a man the same person, whether he is clothed in white linen, in scarlet silk, or in sombre sackcloth? I wot this cannot be well denied. Let those then who are attempting, not to harmonize, but to disharmonize the Scriptures, first shew that the discrepancies of which they speak so loudly, are essential and doctrinal, and not discrepancies of

manner, of style, or of objects in view, and then it will be time to look at this matter with sober and thorough reconsideration.

It is undoubtedly true, that even in the historical books of the Old Testament and the New, there is a great variety, not only in the modes of narration, but as to the insertion or omission of particular facts. One writer, with a particular object in view, has dwelt largely upon facts of a certain description; another, without such a particular object in view, has given an account which differs greatly from the first, as to the insertion or omission of many things. All this is very natural; and is, indeed, what takes place every day. Hume's history of England, and those of Rapin, Henry, Lingard, and others, differ widely not only as to manner, but in a great variety of respects, as to matter; and this even where the matter is authentic. But omission is not contradiction; and insertion by one writer, is not convicting another of falsehood, who omits what it is not for his particular purpose to insert. In describing the same mountain, one writer may give us the view which he had of it on the east; another, on the west; a third, on the north; a fourth, on the south. These views of course are each discrepant from the other. Yet each may be true, and is so, provided the representation be faithful. But supposing, now, on reading these descriptions, I should say: "They cannot be true, for they are discrepant from each other." Would this be sound reasoning? And if not, why are we obliged to credit those, who, from discrepancies of a similar character in the gospels and elsewhere, aver that the Bible contains many different systems of religion?

But the interest of the subject is drawing me quite beyond where I intended to go, when I turned aside from my more immediate purpose, in order to consider it. I return to that purpose.

A commentary on any book of Scripture, we may now say, ought to contain the results of a comparison of that book with what other sacred writers have said. In case of a harmony or concord of views, this should be pointed out; for it greatly strengthens the confidence of an intelligent reader of the Scriptures, in any particular interpretation, when he sees that other inspired writers speak in accordance with the sentiment thus given. This is "comparing spiritual things with spiritual;" which accords not merely with the advice of Paul, but with what all good interpreters of other books do, in respect to principle, habitually practise.

I cannot help adding here, that a commentary on the Scriptures throughout, conducted on a plan of widely extended and discriminating comparison, would be worth more to the church and the world, than all the commentaries now extant. We have, it is true, a great abundance of reference Bibles; and not a few, whose margins are filled with an ample and most elaborate collection of references. But who, that has had any considerable experience, and is capable of judging, does not know, that among these abundant references to parallel passages, there are multitudes which entirely mislead and disappoint the reader; many where the parallelisms are merely verbal, and have no reality; and comparatively few which will stand the test of enlightened and critical examination? Every student of the Bible must have often had his hopes mocked in this way, and have "been sent to April," as the Germans express it, to his great disappointment and vexation, where he placed reliance on such incompetent aid. One of the most important of all the things yet to be done for the Bible, for theology, for sacred interpretation, and for the church of God, is a reference Bible, constructed on a plan that will not disappoint the hopes of inquirers or of critics. But this must be the work of many lives; and nothing short of consummate skill in exegesis, and of the highest attainments in the knowledge of the Scriptures, can ever accomplish it. May the great Head of the Church prepare the way for the speedy accomplishment of such a work! But this can be brought about only by some ten or twelve men, who will unitedly devote their whole lives to preparation for their work, and the accomplishment of the work itself. The churches, the government, or the society, which shall make ample provision for this, and carry it into full execution, will do more, as I verily believe, to promote the effectual and solid knowledge of the Scriptures, than all that commentary or lexicography has ever yet done.

In discussing the question, What belongs to an appropriate commentary on the Scriptures? we have seen, that an explanation of words, phrases, idioms, etc. is its first and immediate object; and secondly, that a commentator should compare the book which he has undertaken to illustrate, with other parts of the Scriptures, and give the result of such a comparison, in order to cast light upon and confirm the interpretation which he gives. In defending this position, I have been led to the discussion of several important topics connected with it, which has

retarded our progress in respect to the subject immediately before us. But before I dismiss the present head, in which it was proposed to consider what appropriately belongs to a commentary, I cannot refrain from saying a few words, on what may be called the *logical* or ratiocinative part of such a work.

It certainly must be a matter of surprise and of deep regret, that so little attention has been paid, by most commentators, to this branch of commentary, which is truly the most interesting and important of all. The importance of accurate grammatical and philological knowledge in a commentator, is indeed so plain, and this knowledge is so indispensable, (as I have on a former occasion endeavoured to show,*) that I need not here insist upon it. Enough, that all commentators who have not such a knowledge, must ever be unable to see the original of Scripture with their own eyes; or must always be dependent on the assertions of others. But are there no cases, in which it appears, that the acquisition of such knowledge has been carried very high, and yet that the possessor of it remains, in a most important respect, unqualified to discharge with success the proper duty of a commentator? Unquestionably there is an abundance of such examples. Germany, the most prolific of all countries in commentators and lexicographers; whose schools and universities are better adapted to thorough philological education than those of any other country; seems to me, by the very prominence which she gives to grammatical and philological knowledge, to prepare young men to dive deep into the letter, rather than the spirit of authors; to fit them admirably indeed to select the best means of stripping off the hull of fruit with dexterity, but not so well to taste and estimate the kernel. There are, indeed, and especially of late, some striking exceptions to this remark. But the great majority of biblical commentators in that country, I must think to be of the other class; very useful, i. e. many of them are so, in helping to get out the grammatical shape and sense of a particular passage; but not affording any important aid in telling one to what part of a building, great or small, the particular piece which he is surveying belongs, or how it would fit in with the symmetry of such a building. I have often, while poring over the pages of these laborious, and in some respects very useful writers, been led to compare them, in my own mind, to a curious and enthusiastic

* In the Essay on the Study of the Greek Language, No. 6. Vol. II. p. 290 sq. of this work.

antiquary, who, in searching out the ruins of some ancient temple, finds fragments of a building on which he descants with great ardour and accuracy of description, while he can tell neither the magnitude nor form of the edifice to which it belonged, nor the use of the discovered fragment, nor the place which it occupied in the magnificent structure. I have sometimes been even tempted to say, "the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive;" to think that the commentary I was reading, afforded a striking example of an appropriate case, in which the sentiment of this passage might, in an accommodated manner, be with great propriety applied.

Among all the *old* commentators with whom I have any acquaintance, I should say that none stands so preeminent for *logical* commentary as Calvin. His merits, at last, are beginning to be more generally acknowledged than they have been since the times in which he lived. The unhappy disputes of the Lutheran church with his followers, for a long time have kept them from paying him any deference. But time and circumstances have mitigated the passion for dispute with Calvinists; and the gigantic theologian and commentator is again beginning to take his proper place. The members of the Lutheran church themselves, and one of their most distinguished and successful commentators, has lately republished Calvin on the Epistles of Paul; and such is the approbation and success which have attended his work, that a loud call is made in Germany, to proceed in this good undertaking to other books of the Scriptures.

Whoever reads Calvin's Commentaries, and has extensively compared them with those of other interpreters, will be able at once to perceive, that what I call the *logic* of commentary, i. e. the reasoning, drift, scope, object, of the writer's discourse, is every where his main point. He has little of philology displayed on his pages; he had much in his head. That he was a fine Greek and Hebrew scholar for the times in which he lived, no one will doubt who considers well the results to which he has come, in commenting on difficult passages of the Bible. Beyond all doubt, the value of his works would be greatly augmented, if the detail of philology were often, indeed habitually, given; for it always must be true, that the logic of commentary should be justified and supported by philology, else we cannot put confidence in it. The logic may of itself be good; but the question always arises: Is it the logic of the writer? This can be determined only by a just interpretation of his language.

The union of these two qualities, then, the *philological* and the *logical*, seems absolutely essential, in order to reach the highest ground of a proper commentary. A man may tell me every thing about words, grammar, phrases, idioms, etc. and yet leave me in the dark as to why or wherefore this or that thing is said; or how it contributes, in any degree, to the writer's purpose; or even, in fact, what the purpose is. How easy to lay my hand, how often have I been obliged to do it, on many a writer, who is justly characterized by the remarks that I have now made!

I am often led to compare many a writer of commentary to a mineralogist, who is searching after what is imbedded in the earth in some particular spot only; or to a botanist, who is examining merely the plants and flowers which spring from the surface here and there; neither of them surveying the whole face of the country, the general features of the landscape, the nature of the soil, climate, rivers, mountains, etc. or the adapt-*edness* of the country for pasture, agriculture, or the production of timber. Now such a mineralogist or botanist, who makes investigation merely of localities, may be exceedingly accurate and scientific in his details, and worthy of all credit, so far as he goes. But if a colony, about to emigrate, should inquire of either respecting all these great questions in which they would have a most important interest, they could obtain scarcely any thing of the desired information.

So it is with many a commentator. He handles a locality wonderfully well; with great skill in grammar, etymology, and *usus loquendi*. He investigates with great patience, and with much thoroughness and accuracy. But he is like an anatomist, who will dissect the brain, or a limb, with abundant skill, but who can make out no consistent and satisfactory account of the relation in which the parts of the human body stand to each other, or of their mutual and respective influence, or of the perfection and beauty of the *tout ensemble*. Such men are merely the collectors of materials for those of an order of mind like that of Calvin, whose constant effort it was to obtain a 'stand-point,' at the outset, from which he might look out and survey his whole ground, and see the distances and bearings of all the respective parts of it. When he had obtained this, he could direct his particular researches to what quarter he chose, and yet be sure of keeping in sight the relative bearings of each locality. How different a process this, from that of going from place to place, and making a mere local survey of each, without knowing any

thing, or any thing of importance, in respect to mutual relations, distances, and bearings. An account of such a survey, i. e. a commentary of the secondary sort, is like the original mass of creation, before it was reduced to order, בְּהֵרֵךְ at least, if not בְּהֵרֵךְ. A world may perhaps be made out of it; but a mind must first come to the wielding of the elements, which can say: Let there be light.

My favourite critics and commentators, the Germans, may think that these remarks bear hard upon them. But if they seem to do so, they are not made in the spirit of carping or of envy. There are distinguished exceptions among them to the remarks I have just been making; men who leave a train of light behind them, and also scatter it before them, in whatever path they move; men who are furnished with such an abundance of philological materials, that they are able to stand at the head of the critical world, and have nothing to fear from any competitor. But there are others, and very many others, who write and publish books which correspond quite exactly to what I have been describing; others still, who think they have done nothing, unless they have published a book such as no man ever read, saw, or even thought of; who seem to measure their fancied importance by the degree of extravagance exhibited in their thoughts and expressions; and whose main object seems to be, to say that which will be controverted, or at least be talked about. "Sir," said Voltaire to a friend who asked him why he inserted certain false statements in a work of his, "Sir, *I must be read.*"

All other countries, which should carry the study of philology as high as Germany does, would probably exhibit commentators of the same, or of the like characteristics. Preparation is made for much of the mere *local* commentary that comes from Germany, by the drill of their primary schools. A various reading in a classic, seems to be made a matter of high and constant interest. Students are drilled into this. Hence we have, even from some of their best scholars in the classics, such works as Heyne's Notes on Homer, Schweighäuser's Notes on Herodotus, and a multitude of other works of like character, where *captat lectionem* would be the sum of all the characteristics which one could give of the editor and critic; for *commentator* I cannot call him. Is this to lead the youthful mind to an understanding and a relish for the classics, sacred or profane? *Quodque in loco suo*; let such annotations be published only for critics and commentators; but it is meet that the public should not be

deluded and disappointed, by what is of so little interest or utility to them.

I hold that man, and that one only, to be a *commentator*, who *explains* his author. The words; the phrases; the idioms; the course of thought, reasoning, or representation; the general object and purpose, or any particular object or purpose of a writer; are all to be explained, i. e. to be so placed before the reader, that he need not misapprehend them. This done, he is fairly prepared to begin his work of study, and pursue it with success. If he should not, upon mature study and reflection, agree in all respects with the commentator in his statements of the sentiments and views of the author, still the suggestions of the commentator have excited his own mind to think and act in relation to the subject, and this may be of serious advantage to him. And supposing the commentator to have made a correct statement of the matter and manner of his author, then the reader comes to the study of him with the advantage of knowing, at every step, what course he is pursuing, and what is to be attained by persevering in his journey. And even if the reader needs none of all this aid, then no harm is done, for he is not obliged to have recourse to it.

It is a cheering consideration, that commentaries, which aim, as a main point, at giving the course of thought and reasoning in the sacred writers, are beginning to find special favour in Germany, the great nursery of philology. I have already mentioned, that a part of Calvin's commentaries have lately been republished, and that more of them will probably be republished. Tholuck and Gesenius may be mentioned as having given many fine specimens of illustrating the course of thought and reasoning, in the writers on whom they have commented; Tholuck, particularly in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, and Gesenius in his distinguished work upon Isaiah. Hengstenberg, in his Christology, has shewn himself abundantly capable of doing this, should he ever become a regular commentator. Neander, the well known ecclesiastical historian and lecturer at the university of Berlin, is said, by my friend the Editor of this work, to be particularly distinguished, in his exegetical lectures on the sacred volume, which constitute a part of his yearly duties, for his attention to the logic of commentary, or the course of the writer's thoughts and reasoning. Platt has many commendable and able specimens of this nature, in his commentaries on the epistles of Paul; and recently, a very distinguished speci-

men of this kind of commentary has appeared, from the hand of Prof. Olshausen of Koenigsberg, which is designed to extend through the Gospels, and perhaps through the whole New Testament. Indeed, the course of thought, and things rather than words, are the chief object of this last named writer. He leaves, in the main, the commentary on words and grammar to his predecessors, and occupies himself principally with the topics or thoughts. This will answer a good purpose, where a reader is already well instructed in philology; but it must fail, of course, in the important end of leading him to *philologize* correctly. Still, the work is adapted to be eminently instructive to those who are able to make a right use of it. Accordingly, it has been received by the serious and judicious in Germany, as we are given to understand, with great satisfaction and approbation, and bids fair to aid in turning the current of public taste. A work on the New Testament, bearing the stamp of Calvin's best manner in his development of the course of thought; or the manner of Gesenius, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, many portions of the younger Rosenmueller, De Wette, and Olshausen, on the one hand; and of Kuinoel, Rosenmueller the elder, Koppe, Wiener, and many other acute linguists and philologists, on the other; would be, indeed, an invaluable treasure to the church and to the world. Time, we would hope, will yet produce such a work. It has been finely said, that "truth is the daughter of time;" and this is as correct in regard to a true model of commentary, as in respect to most other things.

Some readers will expect me to say something here of the popular and widely diffused commentaries of Rosenmueller on the New Testament, and Kuinoel on the historical books of the same. I am not writing a review, and therefore I can say only a few words. So much I may say, in the way of illustrating the subject, on which I am descanting.

Rosenmueller, who has written commentaries on the N. Testament, was a professor and pastor at Leipsic, and was the father of the well known and popular commentator of the same name on the Old Testament. His work is a very neat specimen of the second order of commentary, i. e. an explanation of words and phrases. He is, almost every where, a merely *local* investigator; and scarcely ever does he take a stand, from which he looks out and surveys the whole field in which he is labouring. His philology, in the main, is safe, and worthy of credit. But he is one of those commentators, who are more successful in

explaining *easy* than difficult things. Where you most need aid, you find yourself often deserted. He has a proneness not to look difficulties in the face, but to glide by them, in a smooth and easy manner, seeming to make little or nothing of them, and wondering (as it would seem) how any body can magnify them into matters of interest or of importance. He is ever ready to help you, with great good will, where you might go on without his aid; certainly after a little practice you might do so; but when you are in real trouble, he does not hear your call for help. He does well for the mere beginner; for he feeds him with milk, instead of meat. But the reader who is in any good measure *τέλειος*, and has *αἰσθητήρια γυμνασμένα πρὸς διακρίσιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ* in criticism, can well dispense with a great part of the aid which he proffers.

The student must not expect to find in Rosenmueller those high and commanding views, which such a man as Calvin was capable of taking. The developement of ratiocination, design, great object, are not his province. A secondary, but a pleasant, and generally accurate annotator on the philology of particular passages and expressions, he will find in him. Now and then, he partakes of the fault, so common among the popular commentators of England, of explaining what is already as plain as he can possibly make it. I have sometimes been amused, and sometimes been agitated by very different feelings, when I have read in a commentary, a very laboured effort at explaining something perhaps equally difficult with the following: 'And Jesus entered into a boat, with his disciples, and passed over the sea of Galilee.' Of course, explanations of such passages cost the writer nothing; he can therefore compose them with great ease, *currente calamo*, and they all help to make out a book. But so soon as we come to a passage of real difficulty, then, forsooth, he tells us, perhaps, that the Bible is full of mysteries, and that this is one of those passages about which critics and commentators have been divided; that one says thus, and another so; and that perhaps, after all, it may mean this or that. Hard work at the concordance, and thorough study of the context and idiom, are not the elements in which such a commentator chooses to move.

Much of Rosenmueller's commentary is like the production of the poet whom Horace introduces: *Trecentos in hora versus —stans pede in uno*. It might be written, and doubtless was written, off-hand. It is none the worse for this, so far as it re-

spects the beginner in the study of exegesis. But he must not expect to obtain from it the higher and ultimate ends of commentary of the first order. To meet and solve formidable difficulties; to throw strong light on the general course of thought and reasoning; to compare with other writers, and educe a harmonious sentiment from the whole; to render prominent the great doctrinal points which are urged; are not the province of this commentator.

In Hebrew, he could not have been deep. Much oftener would he have brought the Old Testament to bear upon the illustration of the New, if this had been the case. Of course, he would have seen many things more clearly, had he been well furnished here. But still, there is a commendable attention to this particular, and the student has no special reason to complain. On the whole, a mixture of Rosenmueller, Olshausen, and Tholuck, would make an admirable book. Each, separately, is valuable; but the two last exceedingly more so, in my estimation, than Rosenmueller. His book was designed, as it seems to me, for tyros; and as such, it remains for philological tyros still a very valuable book.

Of Kuinoel I must of course now say something. The extensive approbation which he has found, and the repetition of large editions of his works, seem to speak highly in his favour. As a philologist, he has certainly exhibited a great deal of labour and care, in the investigation of words and phrases. Most of all, however, he fails here, in respect to the nice and discriminating use of the particles, and various idiomatic constructions. He shews, in such cases, that he has not read the classics with special attention to these subjects; nor taken much pains minutely to inform himself, in regard to such matters as Winer has often developed in his *New Testament Grammar*. But still, he takes a stand very decidedly above Rosenmueller, in nearly all these things, and has, no doubt, studied the *New Testament*, or at least the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, with more thorough care and attention.

In general, he is a sober, judicious critic, as to idiom, etc. Oftentimes he makes remarks with respect to the connexion and scope of discourse, that are valuable and important. In all these points of view, he may be strongly commended to the perusal of the student; who still should not be ready to give implicit credit to every thing which is said. By long and patient labour, he has attained to making a summary of much important knowledge, in

his work. Yet there are characteristics in it that I know not how to bear with patiently, and which, I think, must operate in a manner exceedingly different from that which he expects or wishes, both upon the friends of the old school and of the new.

I come with sincere reluctance to notice some of these characteristics.

The great controversy in Germany, between the neologists and those who adhere to the doctrines of the reformation, must be well known to my readers. This, of course, extends itself to the exegesis of the Scriptures; and the hottest battle-ground is, and has all along been, within the province of hermeneutics. If there be any such thing as a revealed religion, it is contained in the Bible. What does the Bible teach, then, is of course the natural and ultimate question, in all controversies of this nature. Even where the Bible is disowned in Germany, as to its divine origin, so long as it is, by the professed religion of the State, the source of religious faith and order, the controversy must still be directed towards the point which has respect to the meaning of its contents.

Kuinoel, if I were to judge from the general tenor of his commentaries, must have been, in earlier life, under the instruction of men inclining toward what is called orthodox or evangelical sentiment. He seems to have a relish for what is grave, and sedate, and adapted to promote good moral purposes. He would seem really to desire, that his reader should think him to be a believer in miracles; in the extraordinary divine mission of Jesus; and of course in the reality of the Christian religion and of its importance. Now and then he undertakes, and with complete success, to vindicate some important controverted passages, from a neological exposition. For example; the celebrated passage in the address of Jesus to the Jews, in John 5: 19 sq. he vindicates from the interpretation given it by Eichhorn* and others, who refer the whole to a *moral* reformation merely, to be brought about by the instructions of Jesus. But here, Storr and Schott had led the way; and this so triumphantly, that even the advocates of neology could scarcely venture to defend the interpretation of Eichhorn.

So in other cases. Wherever some first rate commentator has led the way, and Kuinoel sees that the matter is brought to a final and triumphant close, he generally ventures to follow on,

* Allgem. Bibliothek, Bd. VII. p. 982 sq.

in regard to a controverted passage. Seldom does he express a very direct and plain opinion, on such passages, unless this be the case.

As it respects the Trinitarian controversy, he is what has been generally termed a *high Arian*. "For myself," says he, "I think that John, desirous of shewing that Jesus the Messiah was most intimately united with God in a sublime manner, meant by the term *Logos*, an intelligent nature, superior to all genii and creatures, *most intimately connected with God, YET DISTINCT FROM HIM*, who proceeded from God before the creation of the world, and who therefore may be, and ought to be, called God and regarded as such."* How a being *derived and distinct from God*, can be really and truly called and regarded as God, is a problem, the solution of which he has not given us.

But the characteristic to which I adverted some time ago, as one that gives little satisfaction either to the friends or foes of neology, is, that in some cases, where there is apparently something of a miraculous nature which lies upon the face of the evangelical narration, Kuinoel makes shift, but with no great dexterity, to steer between the parties, in order (so at least it would seem) to avoid giving offence to either. I must produce some examples here, to justify a remark which might otherwise appear to be unjust or censorious.

In his account of the *temptation* of Christ,† he remarks, at the outset: "Ingenue profitendum est, nullam hujus loci interpretationem hactenus prolatam, ita esse comparatam, ut difficultates omnino omnes plane evanescant." Then he proceeds to the various schemes of interpretation, and the arguments employed to combat them. (1) Satan was in reality the tempter. (2) The temptation was merely presented to the mind of Christ while in a state of ecstasy. (3) The temptation consisted in bad thoughts which presented themselves to the mind of Jesus, and which were immediately rejected. (4) The whole narration is a *μῦθος*, designed to account for the forty days' residence of Jesus in the desert. (5) The tempter was an agent of the high priest and the Jewish Sanhedrim, or the high priest himself. Near the close of this last head, he ventures to say: "Hæc sententia....omnino præferenda videtur." Yet in the sequel, we see little or no use made of his apparent concession

* Vol. III. Proleg. p. 103, Edit. 3.

† Recorded in Matt. 4: 1 sq. Mark 1: 12, 13. Luke 4: 1 sq.

to a most extraordinary supposition. In commenting on verse 9, viz. "All these things [kingdoms of the world] will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me," he relates what others have said, who defend the idea that the high priest, or his agent, was the tempter. But how little this contributes to solve the difficulty of such a proposal on the part of a *Jew*, is what he has not cleared up, and is (I must presume) what he was not willing to undertake to clear up.

On the whole, although one may gain considerable information that is valuable, from the introduction to his commentary on the history of the temptation, yet one is obliged to quit him at last, without really knowing where he has made up his mind to take his stand; although there is reason to conjecture, that he sides with those who hold the fifth, and most extraordinary opinion mentioned above.

Let us now look at his commentary on the history of Jesus at the time of his baptism. The evangelists tell us, that "the heavens were opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descended upon Jesus; that there came a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Here, indeed, is something, apparently, of a very extraordinary nature; something designed to bear unequivocal testimony that Jesus is the Son of God. But how is it with our commentator? "The heavens were opened; *fulgurabat*, it lightened," says Kuinoel on Matt. 3: 16. And what is the *σωματικῶν εἶδει*, the *bodily shape*, in which Luke says the Holy Ghost descended? "Referenda sunt ad fulmen," says Kuinoel, "ad nubem lucidam fulmen emittentem." The lightening, then, is the Holy Spirit in a *bodily form*! But what the voice from heaven? *Thunder* to be sure, which of course follows the lightning: "*φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν*, est *tonitru*." But how came these every-day occurrences, all of a sudden, and without any precedent, to be metamorphosed into such a miraculous phenomenon? Jesus, it will be remembered by the reader, had as yet no disciples; for he had not entered upon his ministry, and his baptism was the first public developement that he made. No one then was prepared, as yet, to expect extraordinary things. No superstitious and enthusiastic regard for a favourite teacher, and a man of wonderful talents, had prepared the multitude to construe the ordinary occurrence of thunder and lightning in this way. That any considerate man should do so, then, is quite incredible on every ground. Yet Kuinoel (on Matt. 3: 17) represents John

the Baptist, as construing these natural phenomena in this manner, *re accuratius perpensa*, i. e. after he had accurately weighed the matter.

I hardly know what to say respecting such a comment as this. Are we then to suppose, that John the Baptist, and those who surrounded him, were such novices and simpletons, as to the explanation of natural phenomena, that they would mistake lightning for the descent of the Holy Spirit in a bodily shape as a dove? Or that the thunder which followed, signified, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased?" If neology makes such demands as this upon our credulity, in order to rid itself of miracles, for one I cannot yield to its requisitions. And Kuinoel himself, with all his evident wishes here to make a peace-offering to the current and dominant theology of the day in Germany, can scarcely be serious, I think, in proffering such a criticism. *Pudet has nugas!* Yet, if there be any passage in the Scriptures, where serious examination and consideration are needed, this would seem to be one.

Quite as extraordinary as all this, is the interpretation which Kuinoel puts upon Matt. 8: 28 sq. Mark 5: 1 sq. Luke 8: 26 sq. which contains the story of the herd of swine, in the country of Gergesenes or Gadarenes, that perished by reason of demoniacal influence. In substance it is this: 'Two men possessed of demons, coming out from among the tombs where they dwelt, exceedingly fierce with raging madness, and prone to annoy all who passed by that way, met Jesus as he was passing by, and cried out, Jesus, thou Son of God, art thou come hither to torment us before the time?' From the tenor of the narrative it is plain, that the demons are considered, by the writers, as speaking through the madmen; for immediately after uttering the above words, they are represented as saying, 'If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.' This refers to a herd of two thousand swine, which were feeding in the vicinity. Jesus acceded to this request, and the demons entering into the swine, the whole herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters.

Such is the story; simple, but *unique* in its kind, and, as might of course be expected, an *offendiculum magnum* to the critics of the new school. Let us see how Kuinoel interprets it.

After stating the usual opinion, viz. that the evil spirits did enter the swine, i. e. exercise their influence over them, occasion madness in them, and thus cause them to precipitate them-

selves into the sea; or that Christ effected this by his own miraculous power, according to the supposition of Grimm; Kuinoel adds, that "others have explained this matter in a *more probable way*, as we shall immediately see. From the many conjectures which have been offered, I may be permitted to bring forward those, *quae probabilitate imprimis sese commendant*, i. e. which are particularly deserving of notice by reason of their probability."

What then are these? First we have the explanation of Eichhorn,* which is in substance as follows. 'The maniac [Eichhorn mentions but one, after the tenor of the narration in Luke 8: 26 sq.] had heard of the miracles of Christ, and especially in respect to casting out demons. Believing himself to be possessed by a legion of them, he thought Jesus would send him to Tartarus, and was terrified. Jesus indulged his caprice, and spoke in accordance with his belief. The madman rushed upon the herd of swine, and drove them over the precipice; and then, believing that the evil spirits must have gone into them, he became composed and rational.'

The whole herd, however, did not perish, according to this celebrated interpreter. Only a number of them, which stood near the precipitous shore of the lake, were crowded off, and fell into the water and perished; and rumour 'with her hundred tongues,' told this of the whole.

Thus much for one of the conjectures, "*quae probabilitate imprimis sese commendant*." What is the other? It comes from C. C. L. Schmid, and is as follows.† The herdsmen, who kept the swine, attracted by interest and curiosity, ran to Jesus, informed him of the maniacs, and advised him to be on his guard. In the mean time, the swine being left to themselves, drew near to the precipitous shores of the lake. There a quarrel arose among them, and some of them were forced down the banks into the water; and the rest struck with terror, followed on after them, until the whole herd were destroyed. In the mean time, the maniac luckily hit upon the supposition, that the demons had left him, and gone into the swine; whereupon he became calm and rational. The herdsmen and the spectators fell in with this conceit, and propagated the news of this occurrence all over the neighbouring country.

* Allg. Bibliothek, Bd. VI. p. 835 sq.

† Exeget. Beiträge, Th. II. St. 1.

These are the *probable* conjectures, then, by which the narrations in question are to be explained. Of the two, Kuinoel appears most to favour that of Schmidt; probably, because, in accordance with the direct assertion of the evangelists, it concedes the total destruction of the herd of swine.

To criticise on this exegesis, is not my present business; nor can I deem it necessary. Those who know the nature of swine, will be ready to believe, that nothing short of demoniacal possession, or mere physical force, would drive them over a precipice into the water. And those who believe that the demoniac in question was simply a madman, will wonder at least how he came to know that Jesus was the Son of God; or to imagine that the demons, by whom he believed himself to be possessed, should have entered into the swine now, any more than at any previous period. Madmen are not usually cured by conceits, that are as irrational as any part of their madness.

But enough. Such is what Kuinoel can do, and what he has done. It is enough, at least, to justify what I have said, in relation to the occasional conceits which his commentary exhibits.

How can the considerate reader help the impression, that in such cases there is a course like that of the Samaritans of old, "who feared the Lord, and served other gods?" The friends of scriptural integrity and credibility must of course be revolted, by such exegesis. The advocates of the so called *rational* interpretation of the Scriptures, although they may be satisfied with Kuinoel here and in other like exhibitions, will not, however, be at all satisfied with most of his interpretation, which seems plainly and directly to be in favour of supporting the miraculous claims of Jesus and his disciples.

The reader must not suppose, after all, from such specimens as these, that the commentary of the writer before us is filled with such revolting exegesis as this. It would be far from the truth. Yet there is enough of such interpretation in it, to shew that the writer is "haling between two opinions;" enough to fill every enlightened and unprejudiced reader with the deepest regret, that a man of so much knowledge and opportunity as Kuinoel, should not at the age of some sixty or more years, have made up his opinion on points that should be considered as fundamental in any one's views of theology. *Naturalism* or *Supernaturalism* seem to me to be the only alternatives. If I receive the Scriptures as a book of divine origin, the only proper inquiry that remains is: What have they taught? And in find-

ing out this, I must construe them by the usual laws of interpretation; and then receive, and give entire credit to the result. If I do not admit such claims; then I must regard them as a mixture of truth and error, and pick out my way in the best manner I can, by the light of nature as it dawns upon others, or glimmers within myself.

Within a short time, Kuinoel has published an additional volume on the Epistle to the Hebrews; which is "his setting sun, shorn of his beams." With the idiom and spirit of Paul's writings, I cannot help thinking him to be but very moderately acquainted. On questions of higher criticism, he details with a good degree of brevity and accuracy what others have said; but he adds nothing to the stock of thought already before the world.

For the sake of those who wish to pursue the critical study of the Bible, I add a word, respecting some of the other recent commentaries which appear to be coming into use.

Flatt's notes on the epistles of Paul, are, for the most part, of a solid and judicious kind; more distinguished for the *logical* than the *philological* cast of them. His attainments in philology were very respectable; but he was formed in the older school, and had not that nice susceptibility to idiom and grammar, which some recent critics exhibit. On the whole, his works can be heartily recommended to the attentive study of the learner; who will seldom fail to be really profited by the perusal of them.

Of Tholuck on the Romans I have already spoken. His work on John is ~~of~~ a more popular cast, and in some respects less fundamental. Still, it does honour to his head and heart. I have only to express my most sincere wish, that a man qualified as he is, would undertake a history of the Logos, as exhibited in the oriental and occidental systems of philosophy, specially in Plato and his commentators, in Philo, in the Chaldee Targums, (if indeed *מִמְרָא דִּיהוּהוּ* is to be deemed as Logos,) and indeed in all other sources of information; so that, at last, interpreters of the first paragraph in John's Gospel, might have some *terra firma*, some fundamental and credible collection of *facts*, on which they might take their stand. A life devoted to such an object, would be well spent for the church; and I know of no one to whom more sources of consultation are open, than to Prof. Tholuck.

I could also wish most sincerely, that he would consecrate some of his admirable talents to the special illustration of the

idiom of John, particularly as exhibited in chapters 13—17 of his Gospel, and in his Epistles. The union of Christ, as Messiah, with God; the union of all the disciples of Christ with the Father and with him; and the very frequent expressions which have their basis in these facts, are subjects for illustration, worthy of the pen of such a writer as Tholuck.

The work of Olshausen on the Gospels, will probably find its way into English; and if it should fall into the hands of a competent translator and editor, who is capable of judging where additions may be profitably made, and of adding (where it is expedient) some further notes, it would probably find, as it deserves, adequate support. The general spirit and temper and criticism which pervade the work, are deserving of most hearty approbation.

Of Rosenmueller on the Old Testament, I have given my views in a former number of this work.* De Wette, on the Psalms, Gesenius on Isaiah, Stück on Hosea, are worthy of very attentive perusal and study. And this is true of several other recent writers. But as they are not yet introduced among us, to any considerable extent, the occasion does not call for giving any opinion respecting them.

I would hope, that what I have said above may serve as a reply to some of the many questions, which I am almost every week in some way or other called upon to answer, respecting my views of the above named commentators. My object, however, is not so much to save myself the labour of answering these inquiries, as to communicate that which I would hope may be of some use to the young men, who are the rising hope of our churches, and who are entering upon, or pursuing, a course of biblical study.

I have made my first head of inquiry, respecting the nature of commentary, diffuse and excursive; but I have done so purposely, because there are many things comprised in it, about which the religious public have an interest and a curiosity; and which, in case they are justly treated, may be of some use to the interests of sacred literature. On this account, I must cast myself on the generous criticism of the reader, and beg him to bear with me patiently, although I have been so widely discursive.

* Vol. II. p. 210 sq.

II. I come now to say something on the second topic, which was proposed, near the commencement of these remarks, viz. *Why is commentary on the Scriptures needed?*

My readers are aware of the use which skeptics have sometimes made of the fact, that the Bible has had its thousands of commentators, and still continues to have them. 'Here,' say they, 'is a book, which you tell us is a *revelation* from God; a revelation designed for the use of all men, and adapted to make the path of duty and of doctrine altogether plain, so as to regulate both our practice and our faith. Yet all ages, ever since this book was written, have been prolific in commentators; and they are, at the present moment, multiplying beyond all example. But the Bible still remains a sealed book, as to a multitude of declarations which it contains; and the ever varying opinions of commentators, even of the greatest and most distinguished scholars, shews, that little indeed is ever to be hoped for, from what you call a *revelation*. How can that be a revelation for all men, which all men cannot easily understand, and about the meaning of which they must constantly disagree?'

I have stated the objection in its full strength, as I believe, because we can have no interest, as the advocates of revelation, to keep back, or to cover over, any thing of the full strength of the arguments urged by our opponents against us. The answer to the above questions will lead me directly on my way, in the canvassing of the topic suggested by my second general head.

We may be permitted to ask, in the first place, in what manner a revelation should be made, to satisfy the objector? Must one be made in a language that all men understand, and which no one is liable to misconstrue, in any respect? Then tell us what is that language? It is not Hebrew, nor Chaldee, nor Arabic, nor Greek, nor Latin, nor English, nor any other language on the face of the earth; because no one of all the languages that now exist or ever has existed, since the primeval age of man, is, or has been, universal. If then a revelation must be made in a *universal* language, it must be made in one which never existed since the time that a written revelation was made. But what kind of a *revelation* would that be, which should be made in a language that no one knew or understood? Such a revelation would need something more than commentary, to render it intelligible.

There is no alternative here, but to give up this part of the objection, or to say, that the Divine Being ought to have so con-

stituted the human race, that they all would speak and understand the very same language. Here then, in the latter part of this alternative, there is a mere *à priori* ground of assumption; which of course we need not attempt to argue down; for when an objection comes to this, that it decides what God ought to have done, in distinction from what he has done, argument is of course unavailing.

Enough for the advocates of revelation, that they believe it to be adapted to the *actual* condition and circumstances of the human race; and in as much as a variety of language is one part of their development, such advocates know not how, in any way, to attach weight to the suggestion, that revelation should have been given in a universal language, and one that needed no commentary. As men are, and have been ever since revelation began to be given, a particular language must be chosen, in order that it should be intelligible to any of them. There was no possible alternative, but either to make it in this way, or not to make it at all; unless, indeed, the human race were themselves made over again, and metamorphosed into something altogether different, in respect to language, from what they are or have been.

What *particular* language then, should be chosen as the medium of revelation? for we have seen that some particular one must constitute such medium. We believe that Hebrew and Greek have been chosen. Who will allege that the choice was not a wise and good one? Hebrew, for ages, was substantially spoken, and dialects of it still are spoken, over all hither Asia, the cradle and original nursery of the human race. The Greek diffused itself, with the conquests of Alexander and his successors, over almost all the habitable globe. Under the Roman power, at its height, it was not less extensive. It found its way into every considerable city and town; it was spoken by all well educated people, in the metropolis of the world. It is moreover, as all agree, one of the most perfect of all languages. How could the choice be bettered then, as to the costume which a revelation was to put on? Let the objector show us, if he can.

Where then are we now? We have arrived at the conclusion, that if a revelation be made at all, it must be made in some particular language. But if so, then of course many of the consequences must unavoidably follow, which the objector brings forward as an allegation against revelation itself. A *par-*

particular language is understood only by the people who speak it. If others, then, are in any way to be made partakers of the revelation given, it must be by virtue of a translation. Can a translation ever, in all respects, perfectly correspond with or fully represent all the features of its original?

To this I answer fully and freely in the negative. It is not within the bounds of possibility, that it should do so; and the reason why it cannot, may be made palpable to the most ordinary understanding.

Such is the nature of man, as a communicative being, that he ever forms words, i. e. articulate sounds which are significant of something, according to his wants and circumstances. Place him under the torrid zone, in deserts scorched by a burning sun, with only here and there a little oäsis for water and pasture and he names every object with which he meets, in such a manner as to express the ideas or conceptions in his own mind, which such an object occasions. The result of his reflections on them he invents names to express, in the same way; for, as a communicative being, he must find some channel in which he can convey his thoughts and feelings to other minds.

Place him within the arctic circle, and he there does the like thing. The eternal ice and snow, the lofty mountains and deep ravines, the stunted bush and lichen, the six-months day and night equally long, the aurora borealis and the splendid moon, in a word, every other object that meets his eye or affects his feelings, all find appropriate names by means of his inventive and articulate powers.

The same thing might of course be said, of every particular nation and tribe on the face of the earth. Their language is adapted to their wants. Something of it is native or indigenous; i. e. the original human pair in paradise, doubtless, had the power from the very first, of conversing with each other. But a great proportion of words, in all languages, has evidently been made by the *linguistic* faculty of men, as their wants or woes, the objects around them or within them, or their circumstances and feelings, gave occasion to form it.

Every language on earth, then, takes the hue of the people who speak it. It is the creature of their necessities; brought into being for the most part, by their wants, and nurtured and sustained both by these and their conveniences. Such an instrument, then, will always be shaped entirely by these wants and conveniences; as its very existence in the main, depends altogether upon them.

Let us now advance one step further. It follows inevitably from the above statement, that if the objects of different countries are diverse ; if the climate, soil, productions, seasons, animals, vegetables, minerals, etc. are in more or less respects peculiar ; if the manners and customs, religious rites, government, domestic utensils, arms, agriculture and its implements, arts and sciences ; in a word, if every thing, or almost every thing, which men see, and live upon, and operate by ; is different in a greater or less degree in one country, from what it is in another ; then, of course, the men of one country will have terms to express that, which in another country they have no terms to express. The *generic* idea, in a great number of cases, may be the same in both countries ; the *specific* one must of course be different, in order to correspond with the specific difference of objects.

Facts show that such is the case, beyond any possibility of contradiction. A few examples will set this in a striking and convincing light.

I ask the Latin scholar, how he is to translate the words *consul*, *aedilis*, *praetor*, and other words of the like class, into English ? The answer must be, that he cannot *translate* them ; he can only *transfer* them. Why ? Simply because the English world, never having had any of the offices among them which are designated by these words, have never coined any terms for the meaning of such offices. All we can do, then, is to receive the Roman words just as they are ; or with some slight variation, made merely for the sake of euphony to an English ear.

How easy now to ask the same question about thousands of Latin words, which once designated objects either physical or mental, that were peculiar to the Roman people or government. The same thing must of course be true, in regard to the Greek and Hebrew languages, and for the same reasons. Each nation has objects specific, and peculiar to itself ; or it has views and feelings respecting objects of any kind, of nature or of art, peculiar to itself ; and its language was formed for the very purpose of designating as well these peculiarities, as the generic nature of each object.

Let us reverse the case. I ask the Latin scholar to translate into the Roman language the following sentence : " The brig was hulled by a broadside from a man of war." How can he do this ? *Brigs* the Romans had not ; cannon were unknown to them ; cannon-balls, powder, the firing of guns, equally so. Their *men of war* were row-boats. Their naval assaults were

by missiles, and by the boarding of vessels, and fighting hand to hand. Not a single thing, then, in the above sentence, can be expressed by the Latin language, excepting the verb *was* and the prepositions *by* and *from*. Supposing now we should undertake to make out a Latin sentence, expressive of the above idea; what can we do? We must confine ourselves to the expression of *generic* ideas alone. We might say: *Frangebatur navis minor impetu hostili et tonitrali navis bellicosae majoris*. I am not aware how we could get much nearer than this, to the meaning which we attach to the sentence. But this leaves out of the question all that is peculiar to modern naval warfare. The *brig*, and *hulling*, and the *cannon-balls*, and the *man of war* with its awful array, all disappear; and then we have the mere generic idea left, that one larger vessel assaulted another with thundering force, and dashed it in pieces. The essential part of the great fact is indeed preserved; but all the colouring and peculiarity and animated force of the description, are sacrificed; and along with these, not a little of the interest which it might excite, and the pleasure arising from vivid representation.

We are approaching the point, that we have had in our eye. How is it with the Scriptures, which are written in Hebrew and Greek, i. e. the particular languages of particular nations? Can we translate them entirely?

The truth is simply this. Thousands of words in the original Scriptures have a hue which no translation can impart to them. It depends on the manners, customs, laws, religious rites, employment, climate, natural productions, arts, commerce, etc. etc. of the countries where the sacred books were written. How can we translate into any other language, that which belongs to no other nation, and where no corresponding words have been formed; or where, if they had been, they would not be intelligible? The thing is impossible. Circumlocution is the only expedient left, by which we can approach the exact attainment of such an object. Thousands of words, then, in the English Bible, must be, and must of themselves and by the necessity of the case continue to be, only an imperfect representation of the great original.

Does the skeptic cavil at this, and say that we have no Bible, or at least only a very imperfect one, so long as this is the case? My answer is, that the allegation is not true, in the sense in which he designs to make it. The great doctrines and duties of religion are capable of being designated in every language;

because the relations of men to God and to each other, are always and in every country the same. The *substance*, therefore, is capable of being translated. The *costume* of narration or precept, I acknowledge, is often incapable of direct translation; and this for the reasons stated above. But this must necessarily be the case, unless the constitution of the human race should be changed, and all nations be brought to speak one and the same language. This, however, is impossible, unless all shall be brought to live in the same circumstances, and be conversant with the same objects, and have the same laws, religion, customs, dress, utensils, etc. In the nature of things, and unless the physical constitution of the globe is changed, this can never be.

Here then comes in the need of commentary. Where an interpreter cannot adequately translate, by reason of the imperfection or inadequacy of his language, he can describe and paraphrase. This is the only expedient left. In explaining *consul*, one may describe the nature and duties of the office, as is done (for example) in Adam's Roman Antiquities; and when the reader is made acquainted with this, he learns how to attach to it the same ideas, which a Roman citizen attached to it in the days of Cicero.

The same, of course, is true of most of the words in the original Scriptures. We may get at the meaning of them, by the aid of discriminating and intelligent commentary. Here then lies the field of action, for writers of this class. If they understand the Greek and Hebrew of the Scriptures so well, that they are able to tell when an English word is adequate to convey the whole meaning of a word in the original, and when it is not, and are able definitely to tell wherein it comes short, then, and not till then, are they properly qualified to do the appropriate duty of a commentator.

The case, then, is not so desperate as the skeptic would represent it. Where translation will not fully serve the purpose, paraphrase may, and often does; and in this way, the original Scriptures may still be developed, even as to much of their costume as well as substance, to those who speak neither Greek nor Hebrew.

One word as to the number of commentators, and the alleged disagreement between them. The number may very easily be accounted for, on the ground of the deep interest which has so long and so extensively been taken in the Scriptures. The dis-

agreement is a natural result of the imperfection of men, of the unacquaintance of many commentators with the original languages of the Scriptures, of the prejudice with which many of them come to the reading of the Bible, of the want of discrimination, patient labour, candour, freedom from party spirit, and other things of the like nature. How is it with the heathen classics? Do commentators all agree in respect to the meaning of them? How is it with natural religion, in which the skeptic glories? Are all its disciples and commentators agreed? In order to bring all men of all times and countries to one opinion, in all respects, about a matter so important as the Bible, the nature of man must undergo a radical and universal change. Hitherto, good men and bad, learned and ignorant, orthodox and heretics, have written commentaries on the Scriptures; how should they all agree? The human race must be what they never have been, in order to bring about the agreement in question.

Let us inquire, for a moment, what progress we have made. We have seen that a revelation, if made at all, must be made in some particular language; for there is no universal one. We have also seen, that every particular language must, from the essential nature of the case, have peculiarities of signification in a great many of its words, which no other language is adapted to express; and this for the obvious reason, that every particular nation has more or less of objects exclusively its own, and which it must necessarily employ terms to designate. So in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, there are terms the exact meaning of which we cannot translate by any corresponding terms in English, because we have them not; and so there is a multitude of terms in English, for which there are no corresponding Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words. And thus of all languages, in relation to each other. We have also seen, that the Bible, on account of the interesting nature of its contents, has been the subject of a great many efforts at explanation, by men of a great variety of talents and character. All this comes in the usual course of things; naturally, and (as things are) necessarily, i. e. we could not well suppose it to be otherwise.

But in all this we do not see the vantage-ground of the skeptic. His demand as to the language in which the Bible must be revealed, is an impossible thing; impossible without an essential change of the constitution and condition of man. But this is asking too much. We are not bound to attribute any

weight to an objection which makes such an extravagant demand as this.

The objection, moreover, which he deduces from the ever-varying and inconclusive commentaries of men upon the text of Scripture, amounts to nothing serious. Does the Bible declare, or do its advocates maintain, that men who read and study the Scriptures are free from all imperfection and error? Just the contrary. Have all who have written commentary, aimed simply at the discovery of truth? By no means. Why then should it be a reproach to the Scriptures, and an objection against them, that bigoted, or ignorant, or prejudiced, or party men, have not adequately understood and developed their meaning? Is a book accountable for the character of its readers?

But we shall be told here, that 'the undertaking is in its own nature desperate; that no man of ever so much candour, knowledge, and desire to know the truth, can ever indulge a hope of reading all the Scriptures in an intelligent way; and that therefore a part at least of revelation, must be of little or no value.' And then we are asked: 'Would God have dictated such a revelation as this?'

Much as the skeptic seems to exult in such an argument, I am not aware that he has any good ground of exultation. 'There are passages in Scripture, which no man can well hope to understand, be he ever so candid and intelligent.' Be it so. Still, I ask, is not this the necessary result of the language becoming *antiquated*, in which the Scriptures were written? What provision now can be made against such an occurrence? We have seen, that if a revelation be made at all, it must be made in some particular language, actually spoken and written by some particular nation. If so, then the language in which such revelation is written, must inevitably be subject to become antiquated and in a measure obsolete. All languages on earth are, and ever have been, in a state of constant fluctuation. Many a word and phrase in our English translation of the Bible, made less than two centuries ago, has already become antiquated with us. Every district even, of our own country and of the whole English world, is forming more or less words that are peculiar to itself. How can the mutability of language be checked? It is impossible. The human race must be made over again, as I have said before, and metamorphosed into another and a different race of beings, before this is possible.

To suppose, then, that the Bible, once intelligible and plain, (as it doubtless was to those who wrote it and those for whom it was first written,) would remain so to all succeeding generations, would be to suppose that such generations would always speak the languages of the Bible, and remain conversant with the same state of things as that in which the Scriptures were written. To suppose this, would be to suppose the existence of a constant miracle, in order that the Scriptures might be understood. And when all this was done, the end would be answered only for such a part of men as spoke its original languages, and continued in the same state of things which existed when the Bible was written.

There is no possible way, then, of attaining what the skeptic demands, unless the whole constitution and condition of the human race be essentially changed, and men be brought to be and to do that, which they never have been or done. This is asking for more than is reasonable; and an objection founded on such a demand, has of course no good foundation.

I acknowledge readily, that no man, at least of the present time, can expect to understand every expression of the Scriptures. But they were once understood, both by those who uttered them, and by those (or most of those) who heard them. Why they may not now be understood, we can see in the light of what has already been said. We want an adequate knowledge of the language and circumstances in which they were spoken or written. But unless a standing miracle should be performed, this must sooner or later become the case, in respect to every or any revelation, at any time, or in any age. Its language goes of course, at some period, into desuetude. The nations who employed it, perish from off the face of the earth. Merely their name and remembrance are left. No commentaries of early ages have come down to us from them; none were written. How plain it is, that none were needed! What was said in the vernacular tongue of prophets and apostles, to others who used the same language, needed no commentator, no interpreter. These helpers are called in at a later period, when the language begins to grow antiquated and obsolete; and then it is already too late to remedy all the difficulty. In this way it comes, and in the natural course of things it necessarily happens, and always will happen, that what is written to day, may at a future time, and in a foreign land, be obscure even to the best scholars and

the most intelligent men. How can this be prevented? Only in a miraculous way, I answer; and means of this character we are not entitled to look for or to demand.

We are nearly 2000 years removed from the latest writers of the Bible, and almost 3500 from the earliest ones. We live on the other side of the globe. Our climate, soil, productions, modes of living, dress, habitations, state of society, education, manners, customs, religious rites, government, arts, sciences, philosophy, intercourse with other nations; in short, heaven above and earth beneath, and all within or around us; are in some respects, and many of these things in some most important respects, different from those of the inhabitants of Palestine, for whom the original Scriptures were written. How is it possible, then, that there should not be difficulties, and some insuperable ones, in our coming at once to the entire knowledge of all which the Scriptures contain?

So would it be, moreover, at some future day, if a new revelation were made to day, in the English language. Two thousand years hence, this language may exist only in a few remains of authors that have escaped the ravages of time. If an inhabitant of Persia should then take up a book containing a revelation in the English language, and assay to read it, would he not find the same difficulty that we do now in reading the Hebrew and the Greek?

How can a thing, then, which is the necessary result of the constitution and condition of the human race, be charged upon the Bible as matter of objection? It is palpably unjust.

God has never intended to give a revelation to the human race, which should supersede all effort and all pains-taking to learn, on their part. If this had been his design, he would have made all the world alike, and given to all parts of the human race the same language; or else he would have given to every nation and tribe a distinct revelation, in the respective languages of each. So he has not done; and consequently he intended, that effort on the part of men, to study the Scriptures, and to translate them, and to comment upon them, should not be superseded, but rendered necessary. In like manner God has required, that the gospel be preached to all nations, in order that they may be saved. He could have made an arrangement, had he deemed it wisest and best, to save them in another way, and without all the effort which preaching demands. But this he

has not done. Shall we object to such an arrangement as he has made, because we may conjecture that the ends which he has in view might be accomplished in another way?

I hope this may be deemed a sufficient answer to those who object to Scripture, on the ground that some of it is now obscure and that it is written in languages which are now antiquated and no longer vernacular. Be this as it may, my main object is accomplished by what I have said, viz. *to shew why commentary on the Scriptures is now needed in order to explain them.* It is a necessary result of the nature of language, and of the condition and circumstances of the human race.

After all, however, which may be justly said in regard to this subject, it remains palpably true, that *all the essential parts of doctrine and duty, as revealed in the Scriptures, are capable of being made plain in every language.* This results from the fact, that the essential relations of the human race to God and to each other, are the same, at all times and in all places; and consequently the duties resulting from these, can be expressed in every language. If this cannot be done at once, and in full perfection, it may be gradually done, and finally in a manner sufficiently adequate for the great purposes of sanctification and salvation.

My readers will easily see, from the views which I have now taken, what the proper duty of a commentator is, in order that he should explain the original Scriptures. He must first of all have a spirit or state of mind which is like that of the writers themselves of the sacred volume, in order to render him capable of entering into their views, sympathies, and feelings. Next he must have such an acquaintance with their language, as in some good degree places him in the condition of a man, who had a vernacular knowledge of it. How extensive a study of the language, antiquities, history, geography, etc. of any ancient people, such a knowledge renders necessary, every one who has had any experience in translating an ancient author, and commenting upon him, must in some good degree understand. In the last place, he must be able to express himself in such a way, that his language will render that plain which before was obscure; in other words, he should so write, as not himself to need an interpreter.

‘But why do any thing more than *translate*? Of what importance can it be, that the light and shade of all the representations made in the Bible should be placed before the eye of every beholder?’

If you mean by this question, to ask whether this is essential to his salvation, I answer at once in the negative. A few simple truths are all which are essential to this. But if intelligent Christians are to be formed; if the Scriptures are to have the full and entire influence which they are adapted to have, and will when fully unfolded produce; then commentary is needed, for the reasons already stated. There are very many expressions in the original Scriptures, which no mere translation can fully convey. But in a multitude of cases, paraphrase or explanation may express the colouring of them, in some good degree. When the idiom is once learned in this way, then the Bible may be read with more intelligence and with more satisfaction. Who that knows what effect the light and shade of a picture exquisitely drawn, have upon the feelings of the beholder, would not desire, that every one who sees a picture drawn by the sacred writers, should have a full view of all its perfections?

In saying this, we shew the need of commentary. It is easy, moreover, to explain the nature of that need, if we reflect upon all that has been said above, in respect to the nature of language.

III. We come now to make a few remarks on the different kinds of commentary adapted to the wants of the public.

The task is delicate, although not very difficult in other respects. It is plain enough, that the same kind of commentary which is best adapted to the wants of a common reader, unacquainted with Hebrew and Greek, would answer but very imperfectly for the critical student, whose business it is to be an interpreter of the sacred volume, and who desires to obtain a knowledge which would enable him adequately to perform this duty.

Men who study the original Scriptures, want a commentary which will solve the difficulties of grammar, idiom, phraseology, peculiar style, geography, antiquities, history, etc. They must be instructed in the literary history of each book, and the collective history of the whole. They need to have their attention called up, and their inquiries answered, relative to the course of thought which any writer develops, the objects which he has in view, and the means which he chooses in order to accomplish them. In a word, philology, theology, rhetoric, and critical literature, i. e. the language, the sentiments, the manner of expressing them or style, and the critical history, are all proper objects of consideration for an interpreter, who writes in order to aid in the formation of other interpreters.

If any of all these things is neglected in a commentary, then something is left out which ought to be comprised in it, in order to adapt it to the highest measure of usefulness.

On the other hand, a popular commentary may be, and in some respects should be, of quite a different cast. All that is not capable of being understood by the reader who has no knowledge of Greek or Hebrew, should be omitted. It would be an empty and useless parade, yea even a matter of offence, to insert it. But after all, I do not feel by any means certain, that it does not require more talent and more acquisition, in order to write popular commentary as it should be, than to write what in the technical sense may be called *learned* commentary.

It is related somewhere of archbishop Usher, that on one occasion of visiting the clergy in his diocese, he gave out beforehand, that he was going to preach on a special subject, and wished a full meeting. The clergy, who had a high reverence for him, assembled in great numbers. His sermon was one on a plain, practical, experimental topic, very serious, very discriminating, and very earnest. After the service was ended, one of his friends expressed his astonishment that such a subject should have been chosen; adding, that all of the clergy preached on such topics. The archbishop heard him very patiently, and replied, that "any one could preach a *learned* sermon; but it was not the province of every one to present old truths in a manner that was new and interesting."

So in writing commentary; to put on the appearance at least of learning, is a matter very easy to be accomplished by even a smatterer in philology. But to give the results of extended critical study; and to give them divested of all that is technical in criticism, and make them intelligible to a common reader; is no easy task. A thorough philologist, if asked to make out a commentary on a difficult passage, so that it might be at once solid, discriminating, and popular, would be very apt to say: "Sir, I can make out a *volume* on the text you ask me to explain, for the use of scholars; but to say all that ought to be said in order to explain it in a satisfactory way to intelligent readers, unacquainted with Greek and Hebrew, is indeed a task that I should be slow in engaging to perform."

The question why readers in general need a commentary, has, I trust, been made so plain, that no more is necessary to be said respecting it. The question why different classes of readers need commentaries of different characters, can be made equally

plain. Their need respectively, is the result of the different objects which they have in view. The man whose object is *philological* study, must have helps that are truly and properly philological. Here is ground which another class of men, who have no proper concern with philology, cannot possibly occupy, while in this condition. Whatever of this nature should be said, would, so far as it was technical and appropriately philological, be unintelligible to them. It would be incongruous, therefore, for a popular commentary to put on a costume of such a description.

Still, nothing can be plainer, than that the most important features of a good commentary belong, after all, in common both to a popular and a learned commentary. These are, first, *the logic*, or course of thought and reasoning. To attain this, is the high and ultimate end of all commentary. All study of language and criticism, all antiquarian research and literary acquisition, are mere handmaids to this great object. In themselves they are of little worth; but viewed as a means of obtaining an important end, they must be regarded as highly valuable. Still they are means only, and are not to be put in the place of the end itself.

The meaning of the sacred writers constitutes revealed religion, or theology in its highest and most holy sense. To trace out and disclose this meaning, then, whether for the sake of the learned or unlearned reader, is the ultimate and highest end of all efforts at commentary. The aid of philology and criticism may be called in, and should be summoned, in order to assist the interpreter in ascertaining what this is. This being done, the result of his investigation may be stated, without necessarily involving any thing at all of technical language. The end which the sacred writer has in view; the means by which he attains them, i. e. the arguments or declarations by which his positions are supported; in a word, the whole course of thought may be, and should be, so explained, that the reader, whether learned or unlearned, may easily understand it.

In the second place, the mutual connexion of the writer's thoughts with each other, and the relation which they bear to the main scope of his discourse, and to other truths of revealed religion, should be pointed out; and this whether the commentator designs his book for popular use or for a critical one. All this should be common ground.

Thirdly, the meaning of particular words and phrases ought to be given, in both kinds of commentary, divested of technical

language as far as the nature of the case admits. But in a popular commentary, results only can be given, in many cases; in a learned one, the process by which we come to them, is in substance to be laid before the reader.

This brings us now to the place, where the popular commentator begins to diverge from the path of the critical one. Both should investigate in the same way; both should use *all* the means appropriate to aid them in ascertaining the meaning of the original text; both should represent plainly and intelligibly the things that have just been named; and both should give the result of all their investigations, whether philological or of a different character. But in presenting the detail of their labours, the critical commentator spreads before you the grammatical principles of the original; the idioms; the special and general meanings of words; the grounds of departure from common usage in particular cases, which depend on special rules of interpretation and of language; and other things of the like nature. He tells you, in addition to all this, and as a matter of course, what the result of all is, in respect to the sentiment of the writer. The popular commentator goes through the same process in all respects, in regard to his own individual labours; but all which he records is, the result to which he comes, i. e. the *sentiment* of the writer expressed in our own language and idiom. It should be so expressed, that every intelligent man may easily understand it.

So far our way is plain; and thus much is all which properly belongs to commentary as such. When the meaning of a writer is ascertained, and fairly and plainly stated, the appropriate duty of a commentator is at an end. But shall he do no more? Shall the critical commentator stop here? And if this be conceded, is the popular commentator bound to confine himself within these limits?

Practice seems to have determined both of these questions in the negative; if indeed practice can be appealed to as settling principle. There are critical commentaries which abound in *preaching* as well as commentary; and there are scarcely any popular commentaries, within my knowledge, which are not made up principally of preaching.

As to the first; I know of no rule which would hinder a critical commentator, if he chooses so to do, to admit doctrinal discussions to a certain extent, provided they are conducted in a critical manner; for thus much the nature of his work would

seem to demand. Nor can he be debarred from *preaching* some, if he chooses so to do. Yet if he makes long sermons, and often repeated ones, he will at least be in great danger of fatiguing and turning away his readers. In regard to both of these matters, viz. doctrinal discussion and practical reflections, taste, and tact, and the times, may have more or less influence. If a man wishes to secure patient readers, and avoid overgrown volumes, it is plain enough that he must indulge very moderately in any thing besides proper commentary. But whatever is necessary, in order to illustrate and defend the positions taken by his author, may be succinctly stated; and in respect to great and difficult subjects, it should be stated. The *excursus* of a critical commentary may be made, to most readers, and perhaps to all, the most interesting, and in some respects the most useful, part of the volume. But—*est modus in rebus*; these must be succinct, direct, and just as brief as the nature of the case permits.

In making practical remarks, or giving vent to his own religious feelings and affections, it is difficult to know exactly where to begin or to end. If a critical commentator is to say all that can be said, on every practical subject which comes up, or on every one in which the feelings may be interested, where is to be the end of his work? Not a page, nor a paragraph of the Scriptures, nor scarcely a verse, (if you except some genealogies, and descriptions of the ancient ritual of the Jews,) but may call forth remarks. And suppose he goes upon the principle of saying even all which might be appropriately said, where is to be the end of his work?

The answer is easy. As a specimen of this nature, look at the four folios of Owen on the Epistle to the Hebrews; a work which is the fruit of a master-spirit, but which is too endless to find patient readers, notwithstanding all its good sense and great learning.

It is true, then, that there may be too much of a thing which in itself is good. Four folios on a brief epistle, is what the nature of man cannot endure, be the qualities of them what they may. The reader spontaneously asks: 'To what number of volumes would an explanation of the whole Bible amount, should all be written in the same manner? What life would serve to peruse them even once? Or what estate would be adequate to purchase them? What is to become of the illiterate, the poor, and those who have scarcely any time to read, if such

commentary must be read, before the Bible can be understood? And even scholars and critics might ask: 'When are we to obtain a knowledge of the *whole* Bible, if each part must first be studied in this way?'

It follows, of course, that a great part of Dr Owen's commentary (so called) is made up by theologizing and preaching, and only a small part by exegesis. Why not separate the two things, and let each have its own proper place? I may be permitted to say again, *Ne quid nimis*. After all, however, an excess in this mode of writing, so as even to weary or disgust, can never prove that the kind of writing itself may not be very useful and interesting, even in a commentary, when compressed within narrow limits, and made critical, discriminating, concise, and full of thought, and life, and energy. I would never deny a critical commentator such a privilege; but thank him for making use of it. But if he abuses it, and prosed on through interminable and hair-splitting divisions, I must lay him up quietly upon my shelf, to be meddled with just as seldom as I would seek a very dull companion, in order to enjoy the pleasures of society.

It is in vain to remonstrate against this, and to tell the public of the profound depths of wisdom, and knowledge, and learning, that are to be found in Owen on the Hebrews, Caryl on Job, Venema on the Psalms, and other endless *tomes* of the same description. They will not hear you. It is not a little amusing, every now and then, to see some writer come forth and tell the public, very gravely, what boundless mines of wealth they are neglecting, in not attending to the diligent study of such old and endless writers. He who announces this, forsooth, has been diving deep into this ocean, and has brought up so many pearls, and accumulated such splendid stores of wealth, that he longs to have the public know it; for this I take it, is often the predominating motive, in declarations and addresses and prefaces of such a character. In the next place, we may charitably suppose, that he really believes what he says, and has a desire that others should participate in the abundant harvest which is free for all to reap. Then in the third place, possibly, there lurks, at the bottom of his mind a conceit, that it is no small proof of a genius in himself superior to that of men in general, that he has made discoveries of so great value, and that he has a taste for such sober and solid thinking and discussion, as those old folios exhibit.

All these and some other motives may concur, many of them probably do so, in producing, once in every few months, some flaming panegyric of an old writer, of whom, the eulogist seems to think, the public are profoundly ignorant. Some bookseller, perhaps, wishes to engage in a reprint of some large work; he hires a reviewer to bring the work before the public, and to praise it in the manner above stated; he takes advantage of the impression thus produced on the public mind, and sends round an agent for subscription; he obtains a large number of subscribers; he fills his pockets with their money; and gives them, in return, books so voluminous and endless, so tedious in manner although solid in matter, that after a few attempts at reading, and after strong effort to bring themselves up to the feeling of estimation and interest, which the reviewers had promised them they would certainly entertain, they quietly lay up the volumes in their place upon the shelf, and devote them as a legacy to the generation which is to come. Who does not know that this is the true history of many an undertaking of this nature?

“Drive out nature even with a fork, and she will come back again,” said a shrewd observer of human feelings and sympathies, eighteen hundred years ago. Men will find out, sooner or later, when they are plainly, directly, and satisfactorily instructed; and since life is very short, and there is so much to be done, it is difficult to persuade them, that all their time is to be occupied with one book, or with one subject. Hence the method adopted in much of the old commentary, be the merit of the thoughts whatever it may, will unavoidably bring it into general desuetude. In some respects this decision of the public is just.

A perfect standard of critical commentary can hardly be made out. There is no Homer here, to make out *à priori* a model for all others. Nor is it desirable that interpreters should be very rigidly confined to one set of rules, as to manner. As they have different talents and inclinations, let there be some scope for all these. Yet—*sunt certi denique fines*; they must not overstep these. If they do, let them not complain that the public seek to be instructed, in a manner that is more pleasing to themselves.

I must now say a word on *popular* commentary. It is a subject of deep interest, and hints upon it, if they contain any thing which is correct and worth consideration, may be of some value to the public. They may, at least, stir up other minds to think

upon the subject; and in this way may lead to some improvement, in the end, of this very important species of writing.

I have already stated, what characteristics a popular commentary should have in common with a learned one; and also where the dividing line begins between them. The main question that remains is, how far theologizing and practical remarks are to be indulged in, when one is writing this species of composition.

Here again, if the practice of some writers, and of some who have been very popular, is to be the standard by which this matter is to be estimated, we might conclude, that the maxim of Horace respecting "certain metes and bounds," could hardly be current among us. But the popularity of *preaching* commentary has hitherto depended more upon the wants of the community, than upon a careful and studied examination of the subject. A commentary on the whole Bible, brought within moderate bounds of expense, is surely an interesting book to every serious reader, who desires to be well acquainted with the Scriptures. When it is proffered him, under the sanction of names in which he has confidence, and with assurances of the writer's piety, ability, and success in interpretation, how natural, and how laudable also, for him eagerly to embrace the opportunity to purchase it.

The task of criticising the popular commentaries now before our public, is too delicate, and involves too many important interests of individuals, to be undertaken at present. A few questions, directed to the reflecting portion of the public; and then I shall dismiss the topic.

How can any man study and understand the whole Bible, and write commentary on it *all*? When I see a life devoted to a few books, I am inclined to believe that something important may have been achieved, if the writer was earnest, and persevering, and well instructed, and discriminating, and patient of minute and almost endless investigation. But when I take up a commentary by one man, on the *whole* Scriptures, I am instinctively led to ask: 'Did he live to the age of the antediluvians? for nothing short of this would seem to be adequate to such a purpose. How then can he have *commented* on the whole Bible?'

The question always to be asked respecting any commentator is: Did he critically study the original Scriptures? Was he capable of judging in cases of idiom, and of nice and difficult

construction, depending entirely on the genius of Greek or Hebrew? Was he well versed in ancient history, antiquities, geography, etc.? Were the laws of exegesis familiar to him, so that he could easily apply them on all occasions of doubt and of difficulty? Did he study for himself; draw from his own resources; depend on the efforts of his own mind to see and understand and judge, first of all; and then consult others, not for the sake of being led, but of being enlightened, aided, and confirmed, or dissuaded? Has he shown, in his productions, that such was the actual course of his labours?

If these questions must be answered in the negative, then what follows? It must of course follow, that you have not the commentary of the man whose name is prefixed to his books; but a composite substance, made up of a great many different elements, taken from sources that are very diverse. Or if the commentator thought and wrote for himself mainly, without a critical knowledge of his original, how is it possible that he should avoid a great number of mistakes? Let his mind be ever so solid and judicious, still it cannot be supposed, by any one who understands the nature of critical study, that the avoidance of many mistakes is possible, in such a case. Fact establishes this, beyond all doubt.

Our popular commentators, one and all, have made a great many mistakes on this ground, and from this cause. They were men for whom I cherish the most unaffected reverence and esteem. Henry, Doddridge, Scott, are names which cannot be pronounced without veneration, by such as are acquainted with the whole worth of their characters. And this I might say of others, whose names are not so much, at present, before our public. But how great a part of all their works is proper *commentary*? It is surprising how small a quantity of actual commentary there is. The rest is *preaching*, i. e. practical and other remarks, shewing the use to which the passage, on which they are making remarks, is to be put.

I do not object to more or less of this, in a popular commentary. But when I lose myself in a boundless field of remarks, which any sensible and judicious man may just as easily make for himself, I am instinctively led to ask, Why not leave the reader to make these remarks? When one sits down to read the Bible, in a devotional way, (which all men should do every day of their lives,) and has but little time, as being a man of business, which he can spend upon the reading; which is it best

for him to peruse? Scott and Henry, or Paul? Yet he can hardly get a taste of the food which Paul himself proffers, he is obliged to eat along with it so many other viands. Why not explain what Paul says, as briefly and perspicuously and solidly as possible, and then leave the reader to enjoy him; or at most, merely suggest heads of reflection and instruction?

My objection to sermonizing commentary lies not against sermonizing; but against doing it when the Scriptures are to be allowed directly to speak for themselves. Good sermons are excellent, I may say, indispensable means of popular instruction. But they should ever be in their place. When I desire to hear Paul, instead of a preacher of the present day, why not gratify me, and let me hear him? Surely there is nothing unreasonable in my request. But how can I hear him, when another, instead of simply explaining him, is talking to me in a strain, in which any sensible man is as well able to indulge as himself.

Nor is it unjust to say thus much; certainly it is not claiming much for one's self. It is plainly true, that most men of tolerable education, and even many who have been but slightly educated, are capable of making a very large proportion of the remarks or reflections, which are found in Henry or in Scott. How then are such men instructed by them?

It were easy to draw out the respective characteristics of these writers, and of Doddridge and others; but the nature of my undertaking calls on me to state principles, rather than to review authors as individuals.

The simplicity and elegance of Doddridge's style and diction, must long continue to give him a high place as a popular commentator. He had, moreover, a fine classical taste, and only wanted opportunity to become a thorough adept in the business of commentary.

I rejoice most sincerely, that so much good has been done by each and all of the popular commentators whom I have named; and named because they are the most prominent, at present, before our religious public. But that they come a great way short of doing all that is to be done, or should be done, in way of popular commentary, seems as certain to my mind as any thing whatever in relation to this whole subject. And if this be true, how can a commentary made up out of all of them, and composed of such diverse, not to say heterogeneous materials, really advance the cause of sacred and popular interpretation among us?

A reflecting man, who has given any serious attention to the

business of interpretation or commentary, is often constrained, when reading or hearing one of the popular commentaries of the present time, to stop and ask, "What can be the object of a commentary? If it is to explain the works of another writer, then how much of what I am reading or hearing, is properly commentary? If it is intended to be a book of sermons, or of reflections and meditations on Scripture, then let it come out plainly and openly under that title. Sermons and meditations may be exceedingly useful; but it is meet that things should be called by their right names, and then we may all know what to depend on. When I take up a book, purporting to be a commentary on the Scriptures, I have a right to expect, that in the main it is *explanation*, not sermons. When I wish to read sermons, I like to find them under that title. In this way I can meet my wishes and satisfy my wants, without disappointment. When I thirst to know the sentiments and feelings of David, and Isaiah, and Paul, and John, I do not wish to be put off with those of a recent writer; who, be he ever so pious and sensible, is not an inspired man, and therefore cannot open for me those fountains of living water, which are the only ones that can quench the thirst of my soul. 'My soul thirsteth for God; yea for the living God! When shall I come and appear before him?'"

Why now should we blame feelings like these? Are they not natural to an upright and well informed and pious mind? I think we may venture to call them so. Nor can I see any just ground of complaint or of suspicion against them.

I cannot help relating a remark here, from a pious, judicious, and well educated friend of mine, in answer to a question which I once put him, respecting one of the popular commentaries of the day. "I do not know that I can answer your question satisfactorily," said he, "for I do not read it." Why not? said I. "Because," said he, "when I want a cordial which will revive and cheer my languishing frame, I do not like to have the person who administers it, first mix it with a large vessel of water, and then give me some to drink. It does not answer the exigencies of the occasion."

This was an unbiassed judgment, and from one who never wrote commentaries, and therefore was free, at least, from any ground of suspicion as to a rival or jealous spirit. I cannot help thinking, that it accords with the unbiassed judgment of multitudes, if they would venture to speak what they feel, when they read commentaries on the Bible.

These remarks, however, are very far from any design to

prejudice the public mind against the popular commentaries that are before them. Most of these are filled with excellent sentiments; the fruits of great experience and much religious feeling. In a department so interesting, important, and difficult, it was not to be expected that all would be done at once, or even in a considerable time, which needed to be done. "There remaineth yet much land to be possessed." Some has been won, and well occupied. Who shall win the remainder? It is a glorious enterprise, one worth many and many a life. May the great Head of the church speedily provide for all the need of his flock!

The different plans devised to satisfy the popular need of commentary, and the somewhat restless state of the public mind in relation to this subject, which seems not to be wearied with trying new experiments, betoken that more effort is necessary, and that more will therefore be made, before general satisfaction is obtained. The more intelligent, who study our present popular commentaries, soon find their want of something deeper and more substantial in the way of explanation. Hence they subscribe for the next new one that is offered, in hope of obtaining what they wish; and especially will they do this, when the proposal comes sanctioned by venerable names, in which the public has great reason to put confidence. This is a very delicate subject indeed to be touched; but one remark may be permitted without offence, where no offence surely is intended. Is it not best to examine, and to examine well and thoroughly, before a man of character, in whom the public confide, gives his name by way of recommendation to any book? How can a specimen of a page or two, wrought with great effort, like the *travelling* sermons of some preachers, be a warrant for recommending a whole book? And much more; how can the *theory* of a plan, the execution of which has not been seen or examined at all, justify any man of sobriety and intelligence, for giving his name in this way?

In fact, the public have come at last, as we might expect them to do, to place little or no confidence in a string of recommendations to a book; which commonly cost no more than to go round with a paper, and to solicit the approbation of various individuals; who not unfrequently give it, in order to get rid of the importunity of the applicant.

IV. It remains only to say a word on my last head, respecting the *MEANS of supplying the public with commentaries adequate to their wants.*

In the present state of the church, I know not that any thing can be done more than is done, viz. to leave the whole matter to the efforts of individuals, and to patronize them as they may prove themselves worthy of patronage. The great objects of missionary effort and the educating of young men for the ministry, take the precedence of all others; and they ought to do so. But may we not hope the time will come, when the church will have her Biblical Institute; in which a corps of men shall be devoted, *as the great business of their lives*, to the study and explanation of the Scriptures? Let them *teach*; for this is the best of all the means to learn. Let them be directly useful in training up pious youth for the ministry of the gospel; but let them have only enough of this to do, to keep alive all their active powers and their christian sympathies, and let the rest of their time be all consecrated to the study and explanation of the Bible. They must be men of God, well versed in pastoral duties, not given to speculation, warm-hearted, judicious, sober, discriminating, persevering; in a word, with all their heart and soul entirely devoted to their work.

Do you ask, How long would it take some ten or twelve men to accomplish such an object? My answer is, that it would take several generations of them, to accomplish all that needs to be done; but one generation might do the most essential part of the work. A popular and a learned commentary might go on, hand in hand; which is just what ought to be done. Many persons might be employed in gathering materials; one in arranging them for publication. But the joint concurrence of all such labourers, and their united deliberations and judgment, if they were men of candour and ability, would help to give the world a commentary, such as has not yet been seen.

The proposal of such an object by such means, will seem to many as visionary. I dare not indulge the hope that any such thing will be accomplished in my day. But the generation to come may be blessed with such an Institute. Possibly the reading of these pages may give birth to a desire, on the part of some individual, to commence the plan of such a work. If so, it will not be in vain, that I have written, or he has read, these pages. May that God, who gave his Holy Word to be a light to our feet, and a lamp to our paths, speedily cause its blessed light to spread over the whole earth, and chase away forever the darkness which has so long rested upon it!

ART. V.—LITERARY NOTICES.

I. *Extract from a Letter to the Editor, from M. KOPITAR, Custos of the Imperial Library at Vienna.*¹

VIENNA, AUSTRIA, SEPT. 3, 1832.

“As a notice for your Repository,—a work which cannot fail to be of high utility in your country,—permit me to offer as the most recent intelligence, that we have at length received from Ofen (Buda) a catholic translation of the Scriptures in the Servian dialect; the first satisfactory version in this language of five millions of people of the Slavonic race. The translator is the late Franciscan monk and professor Katancsich; but the printing of it was brought about by the deceased primate of Hungary, cardinal Rudnay.—In like manner, in consequence of this step, the *Slovaki*, [or *Slovenes*, the Slavonic portion of the Hungarian people,] who have heretofore made shift to help themselves with the Bohemian version, as being the most intelligible to them, have now been induced to undertake the printing of a pure *Slovenian* version of their own, made by the canon Palkowitsch. Consequently, at present, of all the Slavonic tribes, only the provincial Croatians still remain without the Bible in their own dialect. And even they have several versions lying in manuscript; which are only waiting for some Mæcenas, or for some favourable conjuncture, in order to make their appearance.—The version of Katancsich needs only to be printed in the alphabet of Cyril, in order to come into use also among the Greek Servians.—The Bulgarians, finally, as well as the Albanians, are still almost without any literature; yet the latter, since 1827, have had in their hands the New Testament, through the aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society.”

II. *American Works in Press.*

1. A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. By EDWARD ROBINSON. Revised Edition. Andover, Flagg, Gould, & Newman.—See *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. I. p. 553.

2. BUTTMANN'S Larger Greek Grammar, for the use of Universities and High Schools. Translated from the 13th German edition, by EDWARD ROBINSON. Andover, Flagg, Gould, & Newman.—This work is expected to contain about 500 pages large octavo, and will probably be ready for publication early in the spring. Price in boards, \$ 2,50.

¹ M. Kopitar is highly distinguished in Germany, for several publications, exhibiting a very extensive and profound acquaintance with the languages and literature of the various Slavonic nations.

3. KNAPP'S Theology. Translated by L. Woods, Jr. Vol. II. Andover, Flagg, Gould, & Newman.—This volume completes the work, and will be ready for delivery in a few weeks.

4. Select Classics. Vol. I. Containing the first book of Cicero's *Questiones Tusculanae*, with Notes and a *Critique* on the arguments of Cicero; by Prof. STUART. Andover, Flagg, Gould, & Newman.—Will be published shortly.

5. A Dictionary of the Holy Bible, for the use of Schools and Young Persons. With Maps and Engravings on wood. By EDWARD ROBINSON. Boston, Crocker & Brewster.

III. European Publications.

1. The Greek Testament with English Notes. By the Rev. S. J. Bloomfield. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1832.—The Rev. T. H. Horne, author of the 'Introduction,' remarks in a letter to Prof. Stuart, that "Dr Bloomfield, author of the 'Recensio Synoptica N. T.' has had in press during the last two years, a *critical* edition of the text of the New Testament, with exegetical notes. Of this, I have seen a specimen; and I expect that it will prove a very useful aid to biblical students. The press work is beautifully executed. Nearly one third of each page is given to the notes, which are printed in a small, but very clear type. The principal various readings are very *distinctly* exhibited, and in his notes he gives a concise statement of the evidence for each reading."

2. ROSENMUELLERI Scholia in V. T. Pars X. *Daniel*. Lips. 1832, 8vo.—The Scholia of Rosenmueller now cover the whole of the Old Testament, excepting the historical books from Joshua to Esther. These will all be comprised in Part XI, which is announced as being in a state of forwardness, and to be published speedily. The ten Parts already published, make 21 volumes, and cost in Germany 54½ rix dollars, or not far from \$40, in sheets, with a discount of one sixth part. The price of them is much enhanced in this country, by the tax on learning imposed by our laws, in the shape of a duty of 13 or 15 cents a pound, because they happen to be written in Latin rather than in German.

3. ROSENMUELLERI Scholia in V. T. IN COMPENDIUM REDACTA. Vol. IV. *Jobus*. Lips. 1832.—Of this work, Vol. I. *Pentateuchus*, and Vol. III. *Psalmi*, have heretofore appeared. Vol. II. is to contain *Isaiah*, and will appear later. Vol. V. *Ezechiel*, was announced to be published in 1832; to be followed by Vol. VI. *Prophetæ Minores*.

4. GESENI Lexicon Manuale Hebraico-Latinum.—This was announced to be published in September last.

5. *Die Mischnah*, mit Punctation und Interpunction, beigefügter deutscher Uebersetzung, etc. Herausgegeben zu Berlin von einem Verein gelehrter Männer. In 6 vols. The first volume appeared early in 1832; the remaining ones are to follow at intervals of three months.

Announced for Publication in the course of 1832.

1. NEANDER, Kirchengeschichte : *Apostolische Zeit*, 2 Theile, 8vo.—See p. 70 above.

2. RHEINWALD, Compendium der Kirchengesch. nach Neander.

3. THOLUCK, Lehre von der Sünde. 4th Edition.

4. ——— Commentar zum Evangelium Johannis. 4th Edition.

—A new edition of Tholuck's Commentary on Romans is also proposed, to be accompanied by several dogmatico-exegetical dissertations upon some of the fundamental ideas and principles of the Epistle.

5. DE WETTE, Die heilige Schrift des A. und N. Testaments, übersetzt. 2te umgearbeitete Ausgabe, in 3 Theilen.—Part I contains the historical books; Part II, the poetical and prophetic books; and Part III, the New Testament.

6. HENGSTENBERG's Christologie, etc. Vol. II.

7. HAVERNICK, Commentar über den Propheten Daniel.—See *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. II. p. 205.

8. OLSHAUSEN, Echtheit der Schriften des Neuen Testaments; für gebildete Laien.

9. TWESTEN's Dogmatik. 2ter Theil.

10. UMBREIT, Psychologie als Wissenschaft.

11. TITTMANN, Dr. J. A. H. *Opuscula Academica*, ed. G. T. M. Becher.

12. NEUMANN, C. F. *Asiatische Studien*. 1ter Band, mit lithogr. Karten und chinesischen Textblättern. 8vo.—The second volume is also announced as in the press. The author is a celebrated Chinese scholar; and has recently returned from a voyage to China, undertaken under the patronage of the Prussian government for the purposes of observation and study.

Preparing for speedy Publication.

1. BRETSCHNEIDER, Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 1ter Band.

2. WAHL, C. A. *Lexicon in Libros Apocryphos* V. T. 8vo.

3. FLECK, F. F. *Commentarius in Libros Apocr.* V. T. Vol. I.

4. SCHOTT, H. A. et J. F. WINZER, *Commentarius in Epistolas N. T.* Vol. I.

5. VON CÖLLN, Dr. K. G. *Handbuch der biblischen Theologie*, in 3 Bänden. 1ster Bd. *Historisch-kritische Entwicklung des Hebraismus, oder die heiligen Sagen, Religionslehren und Symbole der Hebräer, bis auf die Zeit der Rückkehr aus dem Exil.* 8vo.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. X.

APRIL, 1833.

**ART. I.—THE DOCTRINES OF PAUL AND JAMES RESPECTING
FAITH AND WORKS, COMPARED WITH THE TEACHING
OF OUR LORD.**

Translated from the "Scripta Varii Argumenti" of George Christian Knapp. By William Thompson, Abbot Resident in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

WITH AN APPENDIX FROM NEANDER.

IF among philosophers of the same ancient school, as for example the disciples of Socrates, a diversity of sentiment be detected in treating upon some capital point in philosophy, it is sometimes difficult, from their own statements merely, to determine whether they differ in reality, or only in appearance. But if by any means we can become acquainted with the form of doctrine held by the founder of the sect, it is often easy to explore the causes and the origin of the discrepancy. So also, if we inquire respecting the disagreement which seems to exist among the apostles in the exhibition of certain doctrines,—as in the noted case of Paul and James on faith and works,—it is not enough, in order to explain and reconcile them, that we diligently study what they have themselves written on the subjects in question; but we should also refer to the discourses of Christ which treat upon those subjects, to whose sayings, as a common source, may be traced many principles and precepts found in each of the writers seemingly at variance. Whoever will accompany us in this mode of investigating the origin and causes of the appa-

rent disagreement between Paul and James, may be easily convinced, that to neither of them can the alleged inconsistency be fairly ascribed. It will appear, indeed, that their Master himself, on account of the various dispositions and attainments of those whom he addressed, employed methods of instruction as diverse from each other, as the expressions of Paul from those of James. So that his disciples have but imitated him, in the skilful use of a wise mode of communicating truth.¹

Indeed, nearly all the discourses of Christ on the subject before us, are such, that while to some you might prefix as a theme the declaration of Paul, "A man is justified by faith and not by works"; to others the words of James would be equally appropriate, "A man is justified by works and not by faith only."² Of the first kind are those passages which teach, that the sum of true religion, and the spring of all human happiness, consist in *faith* exercised towards God and Christ the Saviour of men; i. e. an affection of the mind according to which one not only holds as unquestionable truth whatever God and Christ have in any way revealed, but also, with firm reliance on this truth, confides heartily in God and Christ.³ As Christ often declared to those whom he cured of diseases, that faith alone procured them health of body;⁴ so he also affirms that faith is the surest means of spiritual health and everlasting life.⁵

When, therefore, the Jews inquired respecting "the *works* of

¹ Krug, in a book entitled 'Der Widerstreit der Vernunft mit sich selbst in der Versöhnungslehre, dargestellt und aufgelöst,' Zulich u. Freystadt 1802, has treated, with ingenuity, of the *synthesis* in which the Pauline *thesis* and the *antithesis* of James may be reconciled; pp. 38 sq. 62, 79 sq. His labours justify us in passing briefly over some points, which might otherwise have required a more expanded discussion. But while we must dissent from him on several other points, so also more particularly in the position, that in the attempt to harmonize these apostles, less can be effected by *interpretation* than by *philosophy*. Indeed his own philosophical speculations in the case, are sometimes confirmed by interpretation; while sometimes, without the aid of interpretation, they would be destitute of any basis whatever.

² Rom. 3: 24. Gal. 2: 16.—James 2: 24.

³ John 3: 16—18, 36. 6: 40, 47. 11: 25—27. 14: 1. Mark 16: 16. al.

⁴ Matt. 9: 2, 22, 29. 15: 28. al.

⁵ Comp. Acts. 4: 9, 10, 12. 16: 30, 31.

God," as if there were many things which we must do to be approved of God;⁶ he answered, this *one* thing is especially pleasing to God, that men should believe in Christ whom he hath sent. He intentionally uses the singular number: This is *the work* of God, *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ*, signifying that upon this *one* work depends, as the effect upon the cause, every thing acceptable to God.⁷ And when Paul goes so far as to say,⁸ that even the *ungodly* may be justified by faith, this is so far from being repugnant to the precepts of Christ, that it seems rather to be drawn from them. No one will doubt this, who remembers the answer of Christ to the thief on the cross, or the parable respecting the humble publican, both of whom obtained forgiveness without making amends for their crimes by any outward acts of obedience.⁹ Yet in other discourses of Christ, forgiveness and eternal life are attributed to *works*. In Matt. 7: 16—20, he declares, that every one is known and *judged by his fruits*, or

⁶ John 6: 28, 29. coll. Rev. 2: 26.

⁷ Thus Philo, in his book 'Quis rerum divinarum Haeres,' calls *faith τὴν τελειωτάτην τῶν ἀρετῶν*, and then subjoins: "To believe in one God—this is the work, *τὸ ἔργον*, of a great and celestial soul."—Indeed, nearly all that is said in the sacred writings concerning faith, harmonizes also with what Seneca teaches respecting virtue in general; Ep. 66.⁷ "Animi virtus *una* est—ceterum *multae* ejus *species* sunt, quae pro vitae varietate et pro actionibus explicantur.—In alias atque alias qualitates convertitur, ad rerum, quas actura est, habitum figurata. Quidquid attingit, in similitudinem sui adducit et tingit; actiones, amicitias, interdum domos totas, quas intravit disposuitque, condecorat; quidquid tractavit, id amabile, conspicuum, mirabile facit."—"Virtue is *one*, though it varies in its form. In its developement, it adapts itself to the several conditions and actions of life. Its qualities are marked with all the shades of difference found in the occasions which call it into exercise. Whatever it touches it conforms and assimilates to itself. It moulds and adorns external conduct and private friendship. Sometimes whole families which it enters, partake of its order and beauty. Whatever falls under its influence, becomes amiable, attractive, and ennobled."

⁸ In Rom. 4: 5.

⁹ Luke 23: 40—43. 18: 9 sq. Comp. Matt. 21: 31, 32. 18: 26, 27, 32. Luke 7: 37—50. 15: 11—32. (coll. vv. 2—7.) 19: 1 sq. Such passages also as Matt. 19: 16—22, and Luke 10: 25 sq. 13: 23 sq. cast light on Paul's mode of expressing himself.

κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ, *his works*.¹⁰ He then subjoins in verse 21, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of my Father who is in heaven." With this agree the declarations of James.¹¹ In that passage too which sets forth the principles according to which Christ will proceed in the general judgment, no express mention is made of *faith*; while eternal rewards and punishments are assigned to every man according to his *works*.¹² Of the same import are the words of Christ, where he promises inexhaustible treasures in heaven to those who sell what they have and distribute to the poor.¹³ He had before said, "By thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned."¹⁴ Why then should James, who, we know, studiously imitates the words of his Master, hesitate to say, "A man is justified by works?"

In attempting to reconcile James with Paul, some understand him, where he speaks of faith generally,¹⁵ to mean only *knowledge*, or speculative belief, and the profession of it; not cordial *trust* united with knowledge and conviction. Thus, with more subtilty than judgment, they separate, contrary to the intention of James, these two states of mind. Nor can it indeed be shewn, that *faith* has a more limited sense in James, than in those sayings of Christ which connect it with the highest rewards, or than where it occurs in the writings of Paul. According to both Christ and Paul, faith in God or Christ, consists in knowledge and conviction joined with a cordial trust springing from these sources.¹⁶ James in c. 2: 19, "Thou believest there is one God, etc." describes this first part of faith, i. e. knowledge and conviction; while in v. 23, "Abraham believed God," he obviously has regard to the other part of faith as described above. Here the phrase itself "believed God," ἐπίστευσε τῷ θεῷ, implies that the speculative belief of

¹⁰ Matt. 16: 27. coll. 12: 33, and Prov. 24: 12.

¹¹ James 1: 25. 2: 14, 17, 24, 26. Compare also Matt. 7: 24—27, and Luke 6: 43—49, with James 1: 22, and c. 2; also John 14: 15. 15: 10, 14.

¹² Matt. 25: 31—46. Comp. John 5: 28, 29.

¹³ Luke 12: 33. Matt. 19: 21. 6: 20.

¹⁴ Matt. 12: 37. coll. Ecc. 12: 14.

¹⁵ James 2: 14, 17, 18, 20, 24, 26.

¹⁶ Heb. c. 11.

Abraham, pertaining to God and divine things, was joined with affectionate confidence in him : *He trusted in God.* The same must be concluded of Rahab, in v. 25.¹⁷

Those, moreover, who thus suggest that James is not here treating of that evangelical faith which is grounded on the death of Christ, (of which alone Paul speaks in Rom. c. 3,) make no progress by this means in their attempts to harmonize the doctrines of Paul and James ; since James in this place, and Paul in Heb. c. 11, and elsewhere in his epistles, both discourse in general on the nature and operations of true faith, in a way, which shews that they both have in view that faith which procures for a man eternal salvation. Nor yet is the phrase, *to be justified*, *δικαιοῦσθαι*, as used in James 2: 21, 24, 25, to be understood in a sense different from what it bears in the writings of Paul. For as Paul uses the expressions, 'to be blessed,' 'saved,' *εὐλογεῖσθαι*, *σῶζεσθαι*, and the like, as equivalent to the word *justify*;¹⁸ so James substitutes for it the word 'saved,' *σῶσαι*, and the phrase 'to be blessed,' *μακάριον εἶναι*.¹⁹ To these he opposes the word 'tremble,' *φρίσσειν*, speaking of devils, to indicate that their faith cannot save them, *οὐ σῶζειν, οὐ δικαιοῦν*. Indeed the word *δικαιοῦν* has very often, in addition to the idea of release from punishment, the sense of favour and reward bestowed, or to be bestowed, on those who are treated as innocent. In this sense also *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν* is sometimes used, to denote not only pardon but also the effect of pardon, or that *happiness* which follows the forgiveness of sins.

But to return to the point from which we have digressed. It is seen now, that the question relative to the disagreement between the doctrines of Paul and James, affects not only these apostles, but also the author of the christian scheme ; to such a degree indeed, that if you decide there is between the two former, not merely a verbal, but a real and radical difference, you cannot doubt that on the same point Jesus contradicts himself. But who can suppose HIM liable to the charge of inconsistency, whose plan of instruction, not only in all other respects, but particularly in the various use of the terms in question, is remarkably uniform and steady ? True it is, that on the authority of

¹⁷ See the author's 'Scripta Var. Argumenti,' Comm. XIV. § 13, 14.

¹⁸ Gal. 3: 8, 9. Tit. 3: 5, 7. Eph. 2: 8. 2 Tim. 1: 9.

¹⁹ James 2: 14. 1: 25. Comp. 1: 21.

Christ it may be confidently affirmed, that men obtain pardon and salvation by works, ἐξ ἔργων. But *what* works? Such as exclude faith, or are separate from it? By no means; but by such as spring from faith in God and Jesus Christ, as good fruit from a good tree. So that if one should profess to hope for salvation on the ground of *good works*, ἐξ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, it is to be regarded as if he had said, *the effects and evidences of faith*. Indeed all the sacred writers, from Moses onward, agree in teaching that faith is the source of all good works acceptable to God. Their instructions may be summed up in these words: "Without faith it is impossible to please God;" and again, "The end of faith," is the "salvation of the soul."²⁰ Nor, as will shortly appear, does James differ on this point from all the rest.

But, as we have already remarked, our Saviour, when he uses these different forms of phraseology in communicating instruction, employs them in a stated and uniform method. When his language ascribes every thing to *faith* alone, it is in order to show that the genuine piety towards God which springs from faith, and is the foundation of every virtue, resides solely in the *mind*. He means that principle of a mind devoted to God and Christ, which is called *faith*, and which is both antecedent to, and the cause of, *works*.

This mode of teaching has *primary* reference to penitent sinners, who are disquieted and perplexed by past sins. That such may not despair of salvation, it is necessary to foster in their minds the hope of receiving pardon through faith, while as yet they are destitute of good works; or, (which is the same thing,) destitute of the fruits of faith, which are not to be looked for in the beginning of its existence.²¹ In this doctrine there is an entire agreement among the writers both of the Old Testament and the New.²²

This mode of teaching, in the *second* place, is eminently suited to confute those, who, from a proud conceit of their supposed virtues, claim the praise and rewards of righteousness. Such persons having an imperfect acquaintance both with themselves and the divine character, ascribe little importance to faith in Christ; they not only indulge in a foolish self-complacency, but

²⁰ Heb. 11: 6. 1 Pet. 1: 9. Comp. vv. 5, 21.

²¹ Luke 23: 40 sq. 15: 17 sq. 29 sq. 18: 13, 14.

²² See 2 Sam. 12: 13. Ps. 32: 1, 2, 5. 51: 3 sq. 18, 19. Acts 2: 37 sq. c. 9. c. 16: 30, 31. Rom. 10: 9—11. 1 Tim. 1: 12, 16. Tit. 3: 3 sq.

contemn others in comparison with themselves. Such was the righteousness of many of the Pharisees and doctors of the law, in the time of our Saviour; who, he declared, could not enter the kingdom of heaven.²³ He therefore delivered the parable of the Pharisee and publican not only to weaken the self-esteem of those proud men; "for he spake this parable" says Luke, "to certain that trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others;"²⁴ but also to console penitent sinners, who condemn themselves. Hence the publican is represented as going down to his house justified in the sight of God, rather than the self-complacent Pharisee.

On the other hand, when Christ ascribes forgiveness and salvation to *works*, it is that he may fix the marks by which sincere and genuine faith is to be distinguished from spurious; on the ground, that an active inward principle will, as opportunity occurs, certainly shew itself in outward signs. A good tree cannot be destitute of good fruit.

This mode of teaching is indeed the fittest way of convicting those, who, thinking that the profession of some kind of faith is advantageous, (such as saying, "Lord, Lord;" or, "I believe in Jesus Christ,") so live as to contradict their profession by their conduct.²⁵ In like manner, (to compare also opposites,) Christ and his apostles affirm, that men will be condemned not only for unbelief, but for vicious actions, as the effects and evidence of unbelief. Indeed, if we listen to Christ, it is from within, out of the hearts of men, that all bad actions as well as good proceed.²⁶ Whatever a man has concealed within, ἐν τῷ θησαυρῷ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ, that will he exhibit in his life and conversation.²⁷ As therefore, when Christ teaches that the perverse disposition of men is to be presumed from their wicked acts, and that the perverse in heart will be punished on account of their sinful conduct, he implies that their perverseness in itself deserves punishment; so, on the other hand, when he teaches that faith becomes known by means of good works, and that the believer is rewarded on account of his good works, he implies that faith of itself may procure salvation for a man, though it may not as yet have shewn itself by good works. Man, indeed,

²³ Matt. 5: 20.

²⁴ Luke 18: 9 sq. comp. v. 14.

²⁵ Οἱ τινας οὐ ποιοῦσιν ἅ λέγει ὁ κύριος. Luke 6: 43 sq. 46 sq. Comp. 19: 20, 21 sq.

²⁶ Mark 7: 21—23.

²⁷ Luke 6: 45. Matt. 12: 33—35.

has no means of judging in regard to the faith of another, except from its effects; God, however, the searcher of spirits, must know what dwells in the mind of every man, without the aid of external acts. Hence it is manifest, that men are not necessarily and of course punished because they may have performed no good works; for no blame can be imputed, where the opportunity for action is wanting; but if men fail to use their power of acting, according to their duty and ability, then punishment is justly and deservedly incurred.²⁸

Who now does not see, that according to the example of Christ, Paul speaks of faith in the way first mentioned, in order both to tranquillize the minds of penitent sinners, and to restrain the temerity of such as place too much confidence in their own goodness? According to him, a man is justified or saved freely by the grace of God, by faith, through faith, on account of faith; not by the law, not by works of the law, (or more briefly, not by works, without works,) not by works of righteousness, but according to the mercy of God.²⁹ To render the sense of these expressions obvious, it will be proper to place in one view the entire doctrine of this apostle, respecting the condition and the way of obtaining salvation. No one can be pronounced *just* or innocent, and worthy of reward, and treated as such, in the estimation of God, *δικαιος παρά τῷ θεῷ* or *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, unless in every particular he complies with the known will, *νόμος*, of God.³⁰ This, undoubtedly, is *ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*, or innocence entitled to reward, which results from fulfilling the law.³¹ He who thus does all that the law requires, must be accounted just before God, *ἐν νόμῳ δικαιούται παρά τῷ θεῷ*.³² Such an one could not receive a reward as a gift, but as a debt; as Paul justly affirms.³³ For though considered absolutely, God can be

²⁸ See Matt. 25, 41 sq. James 2: 15, 16.

²⁹ *Δικαιούται, σώζεται ἄνθρωπος δωρεάν, τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ, πίστει, ἐκ πίστεως, διὰ τῆς πίστεως· οὐκ ἐκ νόμου, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, (or briefly οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, χωρὶς ἔργων,) οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (παινημένων), ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλεον.* Rom. 3: 20—30. 4: 1—5. 9: 11, 31. 11: 5 Gal. 2: 16. 3: 2—13. 5: 4. Eph. 2: 5, 8, 9. 2 Tim. 1: 9. Tit. 3: 4—7.

³⁰ Rom. 2: 13.

³¹ Rom. 10: 5. Phil. 3: 9.

³² Gal. 3: 11. 5: 4.

³³ Rom. 4: 4. coll. 11: 5, 6.

in debt to no one,³⁴ yet he cannot violate his pledge; and the sum of the divine promises as to this point is, "Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them."³⁵ This, in substance, is often repeated by Moses, and also by Christ;³⁶ in such a manner, however, as at the same time to indicate that none will obtain happiness in this way; and this point Paul has illustrated more at large, according to time and circumstances, in his epistles.³⁷ For, owing to an inbred disposition to evil, *διὰ τῆς σαρκός*,³⁸ we cannot render such obedience to the divine law, as to entitle us to be treated as innocent, and rewarded at the hands of God. We are therefore all guilty before God our Judge, and deserve more or less of punishment; since there is no one who has not transgressed the divine law.³⁹ Human actions are either entirely opposed to the divine law, (such are *ἔργα ἄνομα, πονηρά, φαῦλα*, which are enumerated under the manifest works of the flesh, *φανερὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*,⁴⁰) or if lawful according to the letter, they in part deceive by the semblance of virtue, and in various ways swerve from the requirements of duty,⁴¹ or, in part, they are defective, interrupted, imperfect, and in every respect fall short of the divine precepts.⁴² To all these Paul refers, when he denies that any one can be justified and saved by the law, i. e. by works of law;⁴³ in other words, *because he has obeyed the law*;

³⁴ Luke 17: 9, 10. Matt. 19: 27. 20: 16. Rom. 11: 35.

³⁵ Levit. 18: 5.

³⁶ E. g. Deut. 5: 33. Matt. 19: 16 sq. Luke 10: 25 sq.

³⁷ Comp. Luke 18: 9—14. Matt. 9: 16—22. Rom. 2: 13. 10: 5 sq. Gal. 3: 10—12, 21, 22. al.

³⁸ Rom. 7: 7—25. 8: 3. coll. John 3: 6.

³⁹ Ps. 143: 2. Rom. 3: 19, 20, 23. 9: 31, 32. Gal. 2: 16. 3: 10—12.

⁴⁰ Gal. 5: 19—21, coll. Tit. 3: 3—5. Rom. 1: 21. 3: 10—20.

⁴¹ Some actions of this kind are noticed by Christ, Matt. 6: 1, 2, 5, 16. 23: 5, 28. Such can hardly claim the name of *νόμιμα ἔργα*.

⁴² Matt. 5: 46, 47. 19: 16, 17, 18—22. Luke 10: 25 sq. 18: 9 sq. James 2: 10, 11, coll. Gal. 3: 10.

⁴³ *Ἐν νόμῳ*, or *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου*. The phrase *ἔργα νόμου* corresponds to the *מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה* of the Rabbinic writings; see the author's *Scripta Var. Argum.* Com. XII. p. 449 sq. But Paul by using the substantive *τοῦ νόμου*, instead of the adjectives *νόμιμα, ἔγνομαι, νόμιμα*,

for no one either does or can so satisfy the requisitions of the divine law, as to leave nothing imperfect. Beza well remarks: "*Works of law* consist in the performance of those things which the law requires; or they are *works, so far as they are performed, or not performed, by us*, but not *simply*, as being required by the law."⁴⁴ Paul himself gives a clearer view of the subject in Tit. 3: 5, "Not by works of righteousness *which we have done*, (for we were foolish, disobedient,—serving divers lusts,—living in malice, etc. v. 3.)—hath he saved us." So also in 2 Tim. 1: 9, "Who hath saved us—not according to our own *works*;" and in Eph. 2: 8, "By grace are ye saved through faith,—not of *works*." In such passages, the words *law* and *works of the law* do not relate solely to the *ritual* service of Moses, but also to the *moral* precepts or law, imparted from God to mankind, whether by Moses, or by the light of nature, or by Christ himself, or by any other teacher; and in most instances, indeed, they relate chiefly to this latter. The very object of Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, was to demonstrate, that *no one* could hope for pardon and forgiveness on the ground of obedience rendered to *any* law, whether written, or made known in any other way.⁴⁵ Nor does Christ present any different view upon this point. In the parable of the publican,⁴⁶ he introduces the Pharisee who sought the divine approbation on the ground of law, or his own works, as boasting not only that he had observed the Mosaic rites and institutions, but also, what he held of still higher consequence,⁴⁷ that he had not neglected to obey the precepts of the moral law. This Pharisee certainly represents

carefully avoids the ambiguity which attaches even to the Hebrew phrase. More of this in the sequel.

⁴⁴ Notae ad Rom. 3: 20. "*Opera legis* vocari eorum praestationem, quae lex praecipit, seu *opera, quatenus a nobis aut praestantur, aut non praestantur, non autem simpliciter, quatenus praecipuntur a lege.*"

⁴⁵ The author has treated more fully of Paul's doctrine respecting δ νόμος and τὰ ἔργα νόμου, in his *Scripta Var. Arg. Com.* XII. p. 444 sq. Even the Rabbins also have this sentiment: "The words or promises of the divine law are not certain and ratified, מִתְקִיּוּמֵן, except to him who esteems himself as *nothing*, and regards himself as *unworthy*." See Buxtorf *Lex. Chald. Rab. Talm.* col. 983.

⁴⁶ Luke 18: 9 sq.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* v. 11, 12. Compare Mark 12: 33.

those 'who trust in themselves that they are righteous,' and are willing to justify themselves;⁴⁸ of which every age produces many examples in all ranks of society. These are the same whom Paul describes as 'seeking the righteousness of the law,' and 'endeavouring to establish their own righteousness which is of the law.'⁴⁹

It follows from these premises, that all those who rely upon the law, in such a way as to expect by keeping it to obtain salvation,⁵⁰ must fail of the happiness expected; and must, moreover, be condemned, *ὕπο καταραὴν εἶναι*, on the well known principle, that whoever does not completely fulfil each divine precept, (especially the moral precepts,) subjects himself to the curse.⁵¹ The reason then is obvious, why Paul both denies that any account is made of faith in a procedure of law,⁵² (for the law excludes, as a ground of hope and bliss, every thing except human virtue,) and opposes to *ἔργα νόμου* a certain peculiar purpose of God, and that *free grace and mercy* of his⁵³ to which we owe the pardon of sin and future reward; and all this on account of faith in Christ, exclusive of all merit on our part.⁵⁴ To the doctrine which promises eternal life to the keeper of the law, *νόμος τῶν ἔργων*, is opposed what the apostle calls *νόμος πίστεως*,⁵⁵ i. e. the doctrine, which refers the salvation of men solely to hope and trust in divine grace, exercised through Christ. This latter doctrine, while it strips men of their own righteousness, which is of the law, commends and proposes the righteousness of faith,—called, also, the righteousness which is by faith in Jesus Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, the righteousness according to faith.⁵⁶ Nor was Paul the first to employ this mode of speaking; he quotes rather with care

⁴⁸ Ibid. v. 9. Luke 10: 29.

⁴⁹ Rom. 9: 30—32. 10: 3. coll. Phil. 3: 9.

⁵⁰ *Οἱ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ὄντες, or οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι*, Gal. 3: 10. Rom. 4: 4, 5.

⁵¹ Deut. 27: 15—25, 26.

⁵² Gal. 3: 12, *ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως*.

⁵³ *Ἰδὲ πρόθεσις, χάρις, ἔλεος, δῶρον Θεοῦ*, 2 Tim. 1: 9. Tit. 3: 5. Eph. 2: 8. Rom. 9: 11. 11: 5, 6.

⁵⁴ *Δωρεάν*, Rom. 3: 24.

⁵⁵ Rom. 3: 27. Comp. Gal. 2: 19.

⁵⁶ Rom. 4: 13. 9: 30. 10: 3, 6. 1: 17. 3: 21, 22. Phil. 3: 9. Heb. 11: 7.

from the writers of the Old Testament, lest any one should suppose there might be, in the doctrine, something repugnant to the ancient discipline, which was confessedly of divine origin. Indeed, it is the remarkable declaration of an ancient prophet: "The just shall live by faith," which Paul repeats in his very words.⁵⁷ The same point is confirmed and illustrated by the force of many examples, proposed for imitation in the ancient Jewish writings, and enumerated in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. Hence David also, who had a deep conviction that no one can be just in the sight of God, so frequently celebrates with joy the mercy of God, which alone afforded him a refuge and safe protection under a sense of sin.⁵⁸ All these instances clearly illustrate the declaration of Paul, in Rom. 3: 20, 21, "Therefore *by the deeds of the law* no flesh shall be justified before God; for by the law is the knowledge (not the justification) of sin. But now *without the law*, the righteousness of God (i. e. the righteousness of God *by faith*, v. 22,—being justified *freely* by his grace, v. 24,) is manifested, *being witnessed by the law and the prophets.*"

Such therefore as *depend on their own works*, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι,⁵⁹ or who suppose that their justification is to be sought by their own legal deeds,⁶⁰ *do not*, according to Paul, *have faith*, οὐ πιστεύουσι, i. e. they refuse to rely upon faith, they reject faith,⁶¹ as the sole condition of being justified in the sight of God.⁶² In

⁵⁷ Habak. 2: 4. Rom. 1: 17. Gal. 3: 11. Heb. 10: 38.

⁵⁸ Ps. 143: 2. Ps. 119: 124. 32: 1, 2. al. Comp. Rom. 4: 6.

⁵⁹ Rom. 4: 4, 5.

⁶⁰ Οἱ διώκοντες δικαιοσύνην ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, οἱ τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην (sc. τὴν ἐκ νόμου, which in fact is nothing) ζητοῦντες στήσαι. Rom. 9: 30—32. 10: 3.

⁶¹ This follows from the antithesis in which the apostle always places τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι and τὸ πιστεῖν.

⁶² To the same purpose are the words of Christ, Luke 13: 24, "Many, I say unto you, will *strive to enter in*, ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν (at the strait gate), but *shall not be able.*" So v. 26, 27. Matt. 7: 21—23. On this point profane writers differ wholly from the sacred penmen, not only in respect to the language and general modes of expression, but also in the very notions of the things themselves; compare note 45 on p. 198 above, and the author's *Scripta Var. Argumenti*, p. 414 note, p. 427. The former mostly held with the Stoics and Academics, that "we ought to rely on *virtue alone*, (as Cicero says, Tusc. Q.

short, those *who seek or follow after justification without faith*,⁶³ are they who do not submit to the terms on which God is pleased that men should be reconciled to himself.⁶⁴ But it is also manifest, that James, when in cap. 2 he is treating of pretended believers, does not speak disrespectfully of true faith; nor when he says that men *ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, are justified by their works*, does he affirm them to be *δικαιοῦσθαι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, or χωρὶς πίστεως, justified without faith*. For, besides commending those who are "rich in faith,"⁶⁵ and ascribing to faith the same remarkable effects as Christ does,⁶⁶ he also recog-

V. 1.) in order to secure to ourselves happiness; nor ought we to demand of the gods, by the performance of vows, either virtue or the rewards of virtue." Cicero enlarges upon this idea, in his work *De Natura Deorum*, III. 36, as follows: "Virtutem nemo umquam deo acceptam retulit.—In virtute recte gloriamur; quod non contingeret, si id donum a deo, non a nobis haberemus.—Num quis, quod bonus vir esset, gratias deo egit umquam? At quod dives, quod honoratus, quod incolumis. Jovemque optimum, maximum, ob eas res appetant, non quod nos justos, temperatos, sapientes efficiat, sed quod salvos, incolumes, opulentos, copiosos.—Judicium hoc omnium mortalium est, fortunam a deo petendam, a se ipso sumendam esse sapientiam." "No one ever yet reckoned virtue as a gift of God.—In the possession of virtue, we have reason to boast; but this could never be the case, if it were a gift from heaven rather than an acquisition of our own.—Who ever rendered thanks to God for being a good man? But we do homage for wealth, safety, and renown. And Jupiter is not invoked to render men honest, sober, and wise; but to make them healthy, secure, opulent, or powerful.—It is the universal sentiment of mankind, that prosperity should be sought of God, but that wisdom is the fruit of personal effort."—In like manner Horace, *Epist.* I. 18. 111.

—"Satis est orare Jovem quae donat et aufert;

Det vitam, det opes; aequum mi animum ipso parabo."

And Seneca says, *Epist.* XLI. 1, "Stultum esse bonam mentem optare, cum possis a te impetrare." "It is absurd to pray for a virtuous disposition, when it is altogether within the reach of your own powers."

⁶³ Scil. οἱ τὴν δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς πίστεως, seu οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ζητοῦντες vel δῶκοιτες. Comp. note 60.

⁶⁴ Rom. 10: 3 οἱ οὐχ ὑποταγέντες τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

⁶⁵ James 2: 5, comp. vs. 1. See *Script. Var. Arg.* Com. XIV. § 6.

⁶⁶ James 1: 3, 6. 5: 15. Comp. Matt. 21: 21. Mark 11: 23.

nizes in Abraham the true efficacy of faith in rendering his works acceptable to God.⁶⁷ And if now we always bear it in mind, that the works urged by James, and which he would have joined with faith, differ widely from the works of law, *ἔργα νόμου*, which Paul places in opposition to faith; we shall perceive both that James does not differ from Paul, and that neither of them is at variance with Christ or with himself. Nor is there any doubt, but that *ἔργα* in James signifies the same as τὰ ἀγαθὰ v. τὰ καλὰ ἔργα, (elsewhere, οἱ καρποὶ, οἱ ἀγαθοὶ καρποὶ,) which Christ represents to be so essential, that those who are destitute of them by their own fault, cannot enter heaven. Such he classes among *evil doers*, *ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας*.⁶⁸ This view is not only supported by the whole scope of James's argument from c. 1: 22 onward, (very closely resembling the instructions of Christ in the places just cited,) but it is plainly set forth in c. 3: 17, where those very *ἔργα* of which he spoke in verse 13 and c. 2, he interprets by *good fruits*, *καρποὶ ἀγαθοί*,⁶⁹ and opposes to these, in verse 16, *every evil work*, *πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα*.⁷⁰ If now *ἔργα ἀγαθὰ* are such as spring from genuine faith, as good fruit from a good tree, it cannot appear strange, that while James earnestly sets forth the importance of works, he should also warmly commend true faith, and even applaud those Christians who were "rich in faith;"⁷¹ nor that Paul likewise, who reasons at length to shew the inefficacy of works to procure salvation, should also direct his disciples to "be rich in good works."⁷² But farther; often as Paul affirms *ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου*, 'that a man is justified by faith, and not by works of the law,' he yet plainly and repeatedly declares, not only that both rewards and punishments will be assigned of God to every man according to his works;⁷³ but also that even eternal life *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, awaits those who by

⁶⁷ James 2: 22.

⁶⁸ Matt. 5: 16. 7: 21 sq. 25: 21 sq. Luke 13: 23 sq.

⁶⁹ Comp. 1 Pet. 2: 12.

⁷⁰ So in the discourses of Christ, both ἀγαθὰ ἔργα and πονηρὰ ἔργα, are called shortly ἔργα, as John 3: 20, 21. So very frequently in the Apocalypse, e. g. 2: 2, 22, 23, 26. 3: 15. 14: 13.

⁷¹ James 2: 5. Comp. 2: 22.

⁷² 1 Tim. 6: 18.

⁷³ Rom. 2: 6. 2 Cor. 5: 10. 2 Tim. 4: 14.

patient continuance in *well doing* seek for substantial and permanent felicity.⁷⁴ Shortly after, he subjoins a sentiment bearing a close affinity to James: "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."⁷⁵ This, be it remembered, stands at the opening of that very epistle, in which he denies that any benefit is to be derived from works of law. Nay more; in the epistle to the Ephesians,⁷⁶ after denying that our legal works avail any thing towards procuring salvation, he in the same sentence calls believers "the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto *good works*, that we should walk in them." As Christ would have his followers conspicuous for good works; so Paul, not less than James or any other apostle, requires Christians to shew themselves "zealous of good works," and "fruitful in every good work."⁷⁷

We must however bear in mind, that the phrase *ἔργα ἀγαθὰ* v. *καλά*, or as James says here simply *ἔργα*,⁷⁸ is used in a two-fold sense by the New Testament writers. Sometimes they intend by it the entire circle of duties which a Christian has to perform.⁷⁹ At other times it means *liberality*, and in particular *benefits* bestowed on the poor, etc.⁸⁰ The phrase is thus very nearly equivalent to the Latin *bene facere*, and the Greek *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*, *ἀγαθοουργεῖν*, *καλῶς ποιεῖν*, which sometimes mean *to act honour-*

⁷⁴ Rom. 2: 7.

⁷⁵ Rom. 2: 13. Comp. James 1: 22.

⁷⁶ Eph. 2: 8—10, *Τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ἑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον· οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων κ. τ. λ.*

⁷⁷ Matt. 5: 16. — Tit. 2: 14. Col. 1: 21. So also Eph. 5: 11 sq. 2 Thess. 2: 16, 17. 1 Tim. 2: 10. Tit. 1: 16. 2: 7.

⁷⁸ The *טובים טעמים* or *טובין טעמים* of the Rabbins, rendered by Lactantius *actus bonos*, D. I. VI. 24, 26.

⁷⁹ So Rom. 2: 7. 13: 3. Col. 1: 10. Tit. 2: 14. 1 Tim. 5: 25. In this sense it is *ἡ καλὴ ἀναστροφὴ, ἡ ἀγαθὴ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴ*, James 3: 13. 1 Pet. 3: 16; which Chrysostom somewhere calls *ἡ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐργασία*. Xenophon calls it *εὐπραξία*, a word which with him does not alone signify *res secundas*, as Mem. III. 9. 8; but also, like *εὐπραγία*, means sometimes *well doing, the love and practice of virtue, virtuous deeds*, as *ibid.* n. 14, 15; where too *εὐ πράττειν* denotes *to act well, virtuously*, which elsewhere signifies *to be successful, prosperous*, etc. as Mem. I. 6. 6. II. 4. 6.

⁸⁰ So Acts 9: 36. 2 Cor. 9: 8. 1 Tim. 5: 10. 6: 18. John 10: 32, 33.

ably and uprightly in general; and again, to shew kindness to any one.⁸¹ In respect now to what James says in c. 2, concerning ἔργα (καλά), although the language, in accordance with the sentiments of the writer himself, is entirely applicable to every species of virtue and well doing; yet it is plain from c. 1: 27 and c. 2: 8, 13, 15, 16, that he here has special reference to those who are distinguished for *beneficence*, and who manifest their good will towards others in their actions. In this too he again follows Christ,⁸² and is also supported by Paul; who, as well as John, assigns to *love* the first rank among all the virtues, and affirms that nothing can avail unto salvation, Christ himself being judge, except *faith*,—not a solitary, isolated faith, i. e. destitute of works, but a faith which, as occasion offers, shews itself by love, πίστις δι' ἀγαπῆς ἐνεργουμένη.⁸³ Now as the love which a pious man feels towards his fellow men, is closely interwoven with the love of God, and depends upon it; so all other virtues or good works, ἔργα ἀγαθά, hold the same intimate relation to the love of God.⁸⁴ But the foundation of piety, or love to God, is *faith* in God; for no one can be devout towards God unless he *knows* God and *confides* in him.⁸⁵ And the faith and piety of those devoted to the service of the Son of God,

⁸¹ Hence Cicero says that Jupiter was called *optimus* because he was *beneficentissimus*; de Nat. Deor. II. 25.—So likewise Paul several times calls any *ecclesiastical office* or *duty*, καλὸν v. ἀγαθὸν ἔργον, i. e. a distinguished, honourable office; 1 Tim. 3: 1. 2 Tim. 2: 21. 3: 17. Tit. 3: 8, 14. Comp. 2 Cor. 3: 7—11. Indeed, the word ἔργον in the New Testament, like πράξις in the Greek writers and especially in Herodian, very often signifies *office, duty, business*, and so also the *performance* of any kind of duty or service, e. g. ἔργον Χριστοῦ, ἔργον δούλου, ἔργον ἐπαγγελιστοῦ, etc. John 17: 4. Mark 13: 34. 2 Tim. 4: 5. Acts 13: 2. Eph. 4: 12. We find also in Xenophon ἔργον ἰατρικόν, *munus medendi*, Mem. IV. 2. 5.

⁸² Matt. 25: 35. 19: 21. al. as above.

⁸³ 1 Cor. 13: 2, 13. Gal. 5: 6. Both these passages are also frequently cited by Augustine, as showing that Paul does not differ from James and the other apostles; see his *Quaestiones*, Lib. LXXXIII. Quæst. 76; *De libero Arbitrio*, c. 8; and his book *De Fide et Operibus*. Comp. Philem. v. 5, 6.

⁸⁴ Mark 12: 29—33. Deut. 6: 4, 5. Lev. 19: 18.—Comp. John 14: 15. 1 John 2: 5. 5: 3. 2 John 6.

⁸⁵ Heb. 11: 6.

must have special reference to him whom the Father gave to be our glorious Saviour.⁸⁶

Hence therefore, *ἀγαθὰ ἔργα*, according to the prevailing usage of the New Testament writers, are *pie facta*, works of piety, or *ἔργα τῶν πιστευόντων*, proceeding from their faith, and constituting both its manifestation and its evidence. Nor do we any where find in the sacred writings any works of men, however noble and praiseworthy in themselves, called *καλὰ* v. *ἀγαθὰ ἔργα*, except in the case of those persons who have faith, or, which is the same thing, in whom is seen sincere piety and religious obedience towards God.⁸⁷ On the contrary, *πονηρὰ* v. *κακὰ ἔργα* are reckoned as the effects and evidence of *τῆς ἀπιστίας* v. *ἀσεβείας*, a want of faith and piety, whence they are denominated *ἔργα ἀσεβείας*, being appropriate and familiar to those who disbelieve the truth.⁸⁸ But the charge of unbelief, *ἀπιστία* v. *ἀπειθεία*, is incurred, not only by those who openly condemn and reject the truth as it is in Christ, but also by all those who, having known the truth and approved it in their understanding, do not conform their lives to it. Again, in like manner, the works of those who believe in Christ with the whole heart, being done through divine aid, conformably to the precepts of God and Christ, (which is the true notion of *ἀγαθὰ ἔργα*, so far as they appertain to Christians,) are elsewhere called *καρποὶ ἀγαθοί* and *καρποὶ ἄξιοι* v. *ἔργα ἄξια τῆς μετανοίας*,⁸⁹ while those actions which are the effects and proofs of *τῆς ἀπιστείας* are commonly named *καρποὶ πονηροὶ* v. *σαπροί*, and those persons too who by their own fault are destitute of good works, are denominated *ἀργοί*, *ἄκαρποι*, *δένδρα ἄκαρπα*.⁹⁰ So too the works of believers are called *καρπὸς πνεύματος*, and *καρπὸς φωτός*, since the power to perform good works, imparted by the Holy Spirit, is manifested only in those whose minds are illuminated by his light; while the opposite to these are *ἔργα σαρκός*, and *ἔργα σκότους*.⁹¹ The act of Mary, therefore, in anointing the Lord Jesus, so sharply reproved by his disciples, was

⁸⁶ John 3: 14—18. 14: 1. al.

⁸⁷ See 1 Tim. 2: 10.

⁸⁸ Jude 15. Rom. 2: 8.

⁸⁹ Acts 26: 20. Matt. 3: 8. 7: 16 sq. 12: 33. John 15: 2 sq.

⁹⁰ 2 Pet. 1: 8. Jude 12.

⁹¹ Gal. 5: 22. Eph. 5: 11.

pronounced good, *ἔργον καλόν*, by the Lord himself, only because it was *piously* done, i. e. from love and gratitude to Jesus, and because it was a clear proof of faith in him.⁹² We see then, that as Paul agrees with James in commending a faith which works by love, *τὴν πίστιν δι' ἀγαπῆς ἐνεργουμένην*, so, in an equal degree he exhorts to a love joined with faith, *ἀγαπή μετὰ πίστειως*, and to faith and love which is in Christ Jesus, *πίστις καὶ ἀγαπή τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, and he affirms, too, that those shall be saved who 'continue in faith, charity, and holiness with sobriety.'⁹³ But wherever, therefore, *ἀγαθὰ ἔργα* are wanting, or as Paul calls them, *τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως*,⁹⁴ and especially the manifestations and proofs of love to God and Christ as well as towards man,⁹⁵ there can be no true and sincere faith, but only what is imaginary, pretended, and false, *λεγόμενη, υποκριτικὴ, ἀδόκιμος πίστις*. On this point Christ and all the apostles hold the same language.⁹⁶

⁹² Matt. 26: 10. Mark 14: 6. Comp. Matt. 25: 35 sq.

⁹³ Gal. 5: 6; comp. James 1: 27. 2: 8—13, 15 sq. Also 2 Tim. 1: 13. 1 Tim. 1: 14, coll. v. 5. 1 Thess. 3: 6. Col. 1: 4. Philem. 5. Eph. 1: 15. 6: 23.—1 Tim. 2: 15.

⁹⁴ 1 Thess. 1: 3. 2 Thess. 1: 11. That is, *ἡ πράξις τῆς πίστεως, ἢ ἡ πίστις ἐνεργῆς, ἐνεργουμένη, πρακτικὴ, a faith active, efficacious, manifesting itself in deeds*. To the word *ἔργον*, as here used, corresponds *עֲשׂוּת*, which the Rabbins often employ in the sense of *usus, experientia, actio rerum, πράξις*. Hence *עֲשׂוּת* with them means *πρακτικός, one versed in the practical use of things*; and *רְבִי עֲשׂוּת רַחֲמֵי* are *practical precepts*, or precepts pertaining to the doing of things. See Buxtorf *Lex. Rab. Chald. Talm.* f. 1678 and 983.

⁹⁵ Scil. *ὁ κόπος τῆς ἀγαπῆς, or sedulus amor*, 1 Thess. 1: 3. Heb. 6: 10.

⁹⁶ See 1 Tim. 1: 5. 2 Tim. 1: 5. 3: 5. James 2: 14. 1 John 2: 4, 6. al.—Hence too the entire truth of the citations from ancient Greek interpreters, found in the *Scholia Codd. Mosquensium*, on James 2: 20. (*Ἀβραάμ*—*ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη*.) *Σφραγίς*—*τῆς πίστεως γέγονε τὰ ἔργα. Διὸ ἐκ πίστεως ἅμα καὶ ἔργων* [vid. v. 22, 23] *εὐλόγως δικαιώθηται λέγεται ὁ Ἀβραάμ*.—*Οὐκ ἐναντίον τῶ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου*. [Rom. 4: 5.] "*Τῶ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ --- εἰς δικαιοσύνην*." *Ταῦτόν γάρ ἐστι, ὃ λέγει*. "*Ὅτι ὁ τοῖς οἰκείοις ἔργοις αἰχῶν ἀρκεῖσθαι πρὸς σωτηρίαν, καὶ μὴ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος θεῖσθαι, ἐστιρήται τῆς σωτηρίας. Οὔτε γὰρ δὴα ἔργων ἢ ἐν ἡμάσι πίστις, οὔτε ἢ δι' ἔργων καύχησις δικαιοῦ*." Works are the seal of faith. Hence Abraham is properly said to have been justified by faith along with works, v. 22, 23.—Not in opposition to what

But the kind and the degree of difference between the two sorts of *works*, becomes more apparent by adverting to what escapes common observation, viz. the judicious and consistent method adopted by Paul in treating upon each class. We have already remarked, that he opposes to faith, not *good works*, *ἔργα ἀγαθά*, but *works of law*, *ἔργα νόμου*. The former, since they are the effects of faith, he would have considered as in close connexion and union with faith. But with good works he contrasts *evil, dead, unfruitful works, works of the flesh, and works of darkness*,⁹⁷ as being the sinful products of unbelief. *Works of law*, though never classed in Paul's writings with good works, are yet in no instance placed in direct opposition to good works, *ἔργα ἀγαθά*. For there was reason to fear that cavillers, by a false interpretation, would have misconstrued his meaning, and represented him as teaching that the divine *law* causes the destruction of mankind, and is the minister of sin.⁹⁸ The reason why Paul does not reckon *works of law* among *good works* is, because the term *good works* is inappropriate to such acts as are not good in reality, *re ipsa*. According to him, owing to the deep depravity of the soul, men are in such a condition that they are not able of themselves fully to perform their duty. But in order that works of law might not be confounded with good works, he takes care not to place *ἔργα πονηρά, κακά, ἄνομα, ἔργα ἁμαρτίας, ἀδικήματα*, or any word of like import, in contrast with *ἔργα νόμου*. Nor is it superfluous to remark, that he uniformly says *ἔργα νόμου*, and not *ἔργα νόμιμα* v. *ἐννομα*, *lawful, appointed by law, agreeable to law*; nor *νόμιμα*, *legal, pertaining to the law*.⁹⁹ In other places, indeed, he does not hesitate to employ these words; but the latter adjective is too comprehensive to be applied in connexions of this kind; and the two former have an ambiguous sense; for one might interpret

the apostle says, Rom. 4: 5, *To him that worketh not -- his faith is counted for righteousness*. The sense here is, that he who glories in being able to obtain salvation by his own works, and so does not rely on the grace of God, must fail of salvation; for neither the bare profession of faith without works, nor boasting on account of works, can procure justification."

⁹⁷ With *ἔργα ἀγαθά* he contrasts *ἔργα πονηρά, ἁμαρτια, νεκρά, ἔργα σαρκός, ἔργα σκότους*.

⁹⁸ Rom. 7: 7 sq.

⁹⁹ See note 43 above.

νόμιμα v. ἐννομα ἔργα, either as opposed to ἔργοις ἀνόμοις, or as designating *faultless rectitude*, or *virtuous conduct*, τελεία ἀρετή v. κατορθώματα. But either of these senses would be foreign to the mind of the apostle in the cases referred to; because ἔργα νόμου are neither opposed to ἔργοις ἀνόμοις v. πονηροῖς, nor to ἁμαρτίαις, nor do they deserve the praise of perfect moral virtue; otherwise Paul could not deny that they might procure salvation. Without doubt, in the judgment of both Christ and Paul, he who should fulfil each part of the divine law, i. e. who should attain to the merit of spotless virtue, would have a sure title to salvation.¹⁰⁰ This however none but Christ ever did attain; and his exalted virtues, which are often eulogized in the writings of Paul, are never called ἔργα νόμου.

On comparing the main points already discussed, it will be apparent that Paul and James differ only in this one thing, viz. that the former imputes the forgiveness and salvation of men, their δικαιοσύνη καὶ σωτηρίαν, to *faith*; while the latter ascribes them to the *effects* of faith, ἐξ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, and *not to faith alone*;¹⁰¹ i. e. not to a faith which is destitute of these effects.¹⁰² When James affirms that men are justified by works, i. e. ἔργα ἀγαθά, he neither does nor could affirm that they are justified *without* faith, or which is the same thing, by works of law, ἔργα νόμου, which are in no way connected with faith. He does not place works in opposition to true faith; but like Christ and his other disciples, he recognizes and declares true faith to be the origin and source of all holy actions. And, although Paul frequently affirms, in perfect agreement with Christ and James, that a man is not justified by the works of the law, or that he is justified *without* the works of the law, ἔργα νόμου, he yet in no instance contradicts Christ or James, by saying that a man is *not* justified by *good* works, or that he is justified *without* good works, ἔργα ἀγαθά, i. e. separately from, and exclusively of the love and practice of christian virtue.

But, it may be said by some, 'We no where read in Paul's writings, that a man is justified by *good works*, ἔργα

¹⁰⁰ See above, p. 196.

¹⁰¹ James 2: 24, Οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον, i. e. μόνης, as often elsewhere, *not from faith alone*, i. e. solitary, isolated, (v. 17,) destitute of the love and practice of christian virtue. See the *Scripta Var. Argum. Com. XIV.* §§ 9, 13.

¹⁰² James 2: 14, 17—19, 22, 23, 25, 26.

ἀγαθά.' This is true, if you insist upon these very words. And who denies that these apostles have adopted different words and modes of expression and instruction? Yet in substance and sentiment they are remarkably harmonious on this very point. He who declares, Rom. 2: 5, 7, that 'according to the just judgment of God, eternal life will be awarded to those who by patient continuance in *well doing*¹⁰³ seek for glory, honour, and immortality,' could not deny consistently with himself, that a man may be justified by *good works*, ἐξ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, while yet he might hold that no one can be justified by *works of law*, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. Of the same import is the passage in the epistle to the Hebrews; which epistle in other places also refers salvation wholly to faith.¹⁰⁴ "But we are persuaded better things of you, and things which accompany salvation; (for the opposite things see verse 8;) for God is not unrighteous to forget your *work*, ἔργον, and labour of love which ye have shewed towards his name, in that ye have ministered to his saints and do minister." That is, in the *good works* of the Hebrew Christians consisted the evidence that their faith was not extinct. So also opulent Christians who trusted in God, are assured of eternal life, on condition that they do good and are rich in good works, ready to distribute, and willing to communicate.¹⁰⁵

After these explanations, it remains for us to show, that each of the apostles employed his respective mode of teaching, not inconsiderately, but with design and from the necessity of the case, in accordance with the example of Christ.

In the first place, it is manifest, that Paul and those who adopted his mode of teaching, being called to instruct Jews and others living in the Roman provinces without the bounds of Palestine, ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, and to gather churches among the Gentiles, often came in contact with one or other of those classes of men so strongly depicted by Christ, in his parable of the Pharisee and publican.¹⁰⁶ The instruction most suitable for such, we have shown to be, that which refers every thing in the

¹⁰³ Rom. 2: 5, 7, τοῖς καθ' ὑπομενίην ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ—ζητοῦσιν.

¹⁰⁴ Heb. 6: 9, 10. Comp. Matt. 25: 40, 45. 10: 40, 42. Also Heb. 10: 24.

¹⁰⁵ 1 Tim. 6: 17—19. Comp. Matt. 19: 21. 6: 20.

¹⁰⁶ Luke 18: 9—14.

progress and work of salvation, to the inward and concealed disposition and workings of the mind. Those who resemble the publican were smitten with a sense of their misery, and anxiously inquired, "What shall I do that I may be saved?" And now, whatever their teachers prescribed for the relief of their fear and distress, might all be comprised in these few words: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."¹⁰⁷ In general, the foreigners to whom Paul devoted his principal labours, differed from the Jews, in not confidently trusting either to their own or their fathers' virtues; and thus they would be much more easily and speedily convinced of their need of pardon. Thus the event corresponded with the predictions of Christ: "Publicans and harlots enter the kingdom of God before you."¹⁰⁸

Others on the contrary, especially Jews and Jewish converts, following in the footsteps of the Pharisees, in view of their integrity and sanctity, and in reliance upon the merits of Abraham and other ancestors,¹⁰⁹ were indignant at being classed with unhallowed and wicked Gentiles. The fatal error of these self-conceited men, who made no account of faith, was to be refuted in such a way as to show that no one could be saved while destitute of faith; and moreover that Abraham himself, and all the pious worthies of ancient times, were approved by Jehovah on account of their faith in him; which was at the same time the efficient cause of all their holy actions.¹¹⁰ But the most faithful christian teachers, while assiduously inculcating these truths, were constantly charged by the ignorant and ill-disposed with urging *faith* too far, and in this way sundering the bonds of virtue, and giving license to depraved affections. And notwithstanding the gross injustice of this insinuation, yet it cannot be denied, that there were often to be found in christian communities idle, careless, and even vicious persons, who, to screen their sloth and licentiousness, were accustomed to pervert the doctrine of faith, so as to render pernicious that which in itself is salutary. They endeavoured to persuade themselves, that to a believer in Christ, nothing is unlawful; at least, that good works are not very essential to salvation.

¹⁰⁷ Acts 16: 30, 31. Comp. 2: 37, 38 sq. Rom. 10: 8, 9, 11. al.

¹⁰⁸ Matt. 21: 31. Comp. Eph. 2: 2 sq. Tit. 3: 3. 1 Cor. 6: 9—11. Rom. 1: 21 sq. c. 10. c. 11. Acts 11: 42—46.

¹⁰⁹ Rom. 10: 3.—Matt. 3: 9. Luke 13: 28. al.

¹¹⁰ Rom. c. 3, 4. Gal. c. 2. Heb. c. 11.

Coming nearer our own times, we remember the commotions excited in the sixteenth century, by those who either cherished and expressly taught this fatal tenet, or without authority imputed it to religious teachers of established reputation. Nor was it otherwise at the commencement of Christianity; not through the fault of the doctrine itself, but of those who abused it. Even Paul himself did not escape this reproach; in consequence of his insisting upon faith in Christ as the surest aid to a holy and happy life. And there were those in his time who extolled faith at the expense of morality and virtue; some of whom even went so far as to pervert christian liberty into a license for sinning.¹¹¹ How widely these errors had spread even in the infancy of the christian church, appears from those epistles which by ecclesiastical usage are called catholic; nearly all of which dwell repeatedly upon this topic.¹¹²

More effectually now to resist this evil, it became necessary to fix certain marks, by which one might distinguish true faith from false, both in himself and others. For this end, as we have already observed, that formula of teaching was remarkably adapted, which Christ employed to refute such as *call him Lord*, without exhibiting by their conduct a sincere attachment to him.¹¹³ But James expounds the signs and evidences of genuine faith in c. 2, for the purpose of opposing those who held injurious views of faith. This is plain from his designating, by the word *faith*, an opinion or disposition which he deemed utterly unworthy of that honourable name. For that faith which he affirms to be unable to save a man (v. 14), is not the principle of true believers, but belongs only to those who have the word frequently in their mouths, while they are entirely ignorant of the thing intended by it. Such persons are ostentatious of their *knowledge* of divine things, though it be sterile and destitute of effects, *χωρὶς ἔργων ἀγαθῶν*, and also of a vain hope and as-

¹¹¹ Rom. 3: 8, 31. 6: 1 sq. 15 sq. Gal. 5: 13. coll. v. 16, 18.

¹¹² 1 John 2: 19. 3: 6, 7. 2: 3, 4. c. 4. c. 5. 1 Pet. 2: 16. 2 Pet. 2: 19, 21. 1: 8. Jude v. 4, 12.—The same thing was remarked by many of the ancients; e. g. by Augustine, *De Fide et Opp.* IV. 14, 15. "Since this opinion [viz. that not only works of law but also works of righteousness were excluded] began to spread, other apostolical epistles, as those of Peter, John, James, and Jude, were expressly directed against it."

¹¹³ Matt. 7: 21.

surance as connected with this¹¹⁴ Hence the question, "What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man *say* he hath faith, [not, if a man *have* faith,] and have not works?" Of the same import is the language of John, (1 Ep. 2: 4,) "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar." Paul speaks of the same class of men, Tit. 1: 16, "They *profess* that they know God; but in works they deny him." Also 2 Tim. 3: 5, "Having the *form* of godliness, but denying the *power* thereof," which is seen in good works. To the same point are the words of James, when enforcing obedience to the divine law; he calls the doctrine of Christ *the law of liberty*, *νόμος ἐλευθερίας*, in such a way as to signify, not that it *absolves* and *releases* us from those precepts which relate to moral conduct, but on the contrary binds us to the performance of them by still stronger motives.¹¹⁵ Indeed the law of God is not made void by this doctrine respecting faith, but its authority is strengthened; and God, according to Peter, purifies the hearts of believers by faith.¹¹⁶ But we perceive it would be easy for one who entertains a sluggish and barren faith, to use liberty "for an occasion to the flesh;" and pretend to draw a license for his crimes from the freedom of the gospel.¹¹⁷

Since therefore it may be considered a settled point, that James in this place intended to expose the folly of those who embrace the shadow of faith instead of faith itself; it is a question of small moment, whether those whom he had in view, coined their devices in the name of Paul, or took shelter under the authority of some other distinguished person. Nor is it necessary here to inquire, at what period James wrote; or whether the epistle of Paul to the Romans, or any of his other writings which treat

¹¹⁴ So ἡ *θρησκεία* James 1: 26, is not *true* religion, but denotes the character of one who seems to himself to be religious, *θρησκός*,—i. e. *this* religion, before designated. Comp. c. 3: 15, *αὐτὴ ἡ σοφία*. So Col. 4: 16, ἡ *ἐπιστολή*. Gal. 5: 8, ἡ *πείρασμόν*. 1 John 5: 10 init. *τὴν μαρτυρίαν*, for *ταύτην τὴν μαρτυρίαν*. Luke 18: 8 *τὴν πίστιν*, for *ταύτην τὴν πίστιν*, coll. v. 7. Matt. 25: 32, *τὴν παραβολήν*, for *ταύτην τὴν παραβολήν*. John 11: 55, *ἐκ τῆς χώρας*, etc.

¹¹⁵ James 1: 25. 2: 12. Comp. John 8: 32—36. See also James 2: 1, 8 sq.

¹¹⁶ Rom. 3: 31. Peter in Acts 15: 9.

¹¹⁷ Gal. 5: 13. 1 Pet. 2: 16. coll. 2 Pet. 2: 19.—See the author's *Scripturæ Var. Argum.* Comm. XIV. § 2.

on the subject of faith and works, were extant before that time ; or, if extant, whether James had read them. It is difficult to pronounce an opinion upon these points. The epistle itself furnishes no such evidence that the writings of Paul were known to James, as we find in regard to Peter, in 2 Pet. 3: 15, 16. What Wetstein and other learned men of recent times have written, to prove that James had read some of Paul's epistles, e. g. those to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, must fail to satisfy one who thoroughly investigates the point in question.¹¹⁸ Nor even if we admit, that James wrote after he had heard of the abuse of Paul's expressions and mode of teaching, is it necessary to suppose that he had reference to the *writings* of Paul. Indeed, all eyes had been turned towards Paul from the commencement of his public teaching ; his manner of instruction could be unknown to no one professing the same religion, especially to an apostle ;¹¹⁹ and we may believe, that James was familiar with the doctrine and entire plan of teaching adopted by Paul, though he might never have seen his writings. For who can suppose that Paul used in his addresses and language

¹¹⁸ As yet the author has seen no occasion to change his views on this subject, as published in his *Commentatio in cap. II. Ep. Jacobi*, 1784, p. 27 *Note*, reprinted as Comm. XIV, in his *Scripta Varii Argumenti*. The substance of them is as follows : "Learned men have brought forward from the epistle of James, and from the writings of Paul, passages of similar import, from which they argue that the writings of one had been read by the other. So Wetstein in his notes on the epistle of James says : "Scripsit post Pauli epistolam ad Romanos—et ante primam Petri, in quam multa e Jacobo translata leguntur." But the resemblance between these passages is not so great, as to remove all doubts in the case. Some of them contain sentiments which were daily in the mouths of all Christians of that age ; sentiments which they had received either from the Jews, or from Christ who had first employed them. Declarations of this sort their teachers were wont often and suddenly to recall to their minds, for the purpose either of admonition, of confirmation, or of comfort. There was besides, at that period, a certain peculiar phraseology, which might be termed the *religious dialect*, so prevalent among Christians, that all who belonged to their society, used it as if by concert. Of this sort are many words and phrases in the writings of Paul and James, as also in those of John and Peter ; from which, however, we cannot justly derive the conclusion, that one apostle drew from the writings of another."

¹¹⁹ Comp. Acts c. 15. Gal. c. 2.

when present, forms of expression, opinions, and examples, essentially different from those contained in his epistles when absent? It was impossible, surrounded as the apostle was by so many companions, disciples, and fellow-labourers,—Barnabas, Timothy, Titus, Aquila, Luke, and others,—that his method of instruction should not have been at that time universally known. As it prevailed chiefly in places out of Palestine, ἐν τῇ διασπορῇ, where the disciples of Paul were most numerous, so in those regions his mode of teaching was especially exposed to cavil and perversion. Indeed, those who found it for their interest to shun the personal presence of Paul, were wont, during his absence, to become loud and bold in the very places where he or his companions had before taught. Some opposed his doctrines openly; others, pretending to be his friends, and to embrace his mode of teaching, perverted sometimes his discourses, and sometimes his writings, as best suited their interests.¹²⁰ Nor were there even wanting some, who, in order to give currency to their opinions, published spurious epistles in the name of Paul.¹²¹ Hence the superintendants of the churches which he had himself gathered, are frequently admonished to contend earnestly for the faith, against those false teachers who should come among them during his absence.¹²²

Nevertheless, we may assign a very probable reason for the opinion, which is by no means of modern date, that James in his epistle had particular reference to those who abused the doctrine of Paul. As James also was writing respecting faith to Christians living in foreign countries, and was refuting those who employed the word *faith* in an unwarranted sense, he was led to use expressions closely resembling those employed by Paul, when treating on the same subject, for the purpose of commending faith; but he does this in such a way as to seem like one disputing on the opposite side. Both present us with the same terms and sentiments, ἔργα, πίστις, πιστεύειν, σώζεσθαι, δικαιωθῆναι ἐξ ἔργων καὶ ἐκ πίστεως, λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, etc. both cite the same passage from the Old Testament,¹²³ and refer

¹²⁰ 2 Pet. 3: 15, 16.

¹²¹ 2 Thess. 2: 2. Comp. 3: 17.

¹²² Acts 20: 29, 30. Eph. c. 5. 2 Tim. c. 3. al.

¹²³ Gen. 15: 16. Comp. James 2: 23, with Rom. 4: 3. Gal. 3: 6. Heb. 11: 7.

to the same examples; not only that of Abraham, so common and notorious, but also that of Rahab which is more peculiar, and of which mention is also made in the epistle to the Hebrews; which, if not composed by Paul, must have been written at least by one well versed in the system of Paul.¹²⁴ Who can suppose this entire agreement, in the midst of such apparent discrepancy, to be accidental? Nor, because history does not settle the question respecting the time when James wrote, can we invert the process, and say, that Paul intended to prevent any one from perverting the doctrine of James to an unauthorized use. Any person accustomed to treat upon faith and works after the manner of Paul, would naturally have at hand such examples as he cites, and such declarations as Gen. 15: 6; while, on the contrary, such examples and such expressions would not readily suggest themselves to one pursuing the method of James; nor would he be the first to quote such examples as at first sight appear to be in commendation of *faith* rather than *works*. He would not indeed avoid examples of this kind, as if opposed to his doctrine, nor decline using such a text as that just referred to in the Old Testament; but still, this class of illustrations he would be likely to employ, only so far as might be necessary in order to refute evil-minded interpreters, by shewing, that so far from containing any thing repugnant to sound doctrine, they even serve to illustrate and confirm it.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ The example of Rahab would naturally occur to Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, and to his disciples, as particularly deserving mention, because it afforded them a decisive argument, that the faith even of *strangers and foreigners*, i. e. of Gentiles, is acceptable to God. (So too Peter attributes to them *φύβος θεοῦ*, Acts 10: 35; and Paul *ἔργα ἀγαθὰ*, Rom. 2: 6—11.) To this also James assents; but shows that Rahab's faith was such, as manifested itself in *works*. Such alone, according to him, can be well-pleasing to God, whether in Abraham and other Jews, or in Rahab and other Gentiles.

¹²⁵ Storr, in his *Opusc. Academ.* II. 375, holds the following language: "That form of doctrine common to all the apostles, which the readers of James distort by a perverse interpretation, is so far peculiar to Paul, that he only of all the apostles uses the word *δικαιοῦν* and its cognate *δικαιοσύνη* in connexion with it; and he also, more clearly than the other apostles, separates *ἔργα* (using the same word as they) from the efficient causes of salvation." No one can deny that there is truth in this, though I would not subscribe to it in every particular. Nor is it improbable, that Paul, having been taught under

It is moreover obvious from the New Testament, that there was sufficient reason why Paul, no less than the other apostles, especially the three, Peter, James, and John, (who were considered pillars, particularly by those who held Paul in slight esteem,¹²⁶) should have respect each to what the others taught or were said to teach; and should endeavour to prevent, as much as possible, the abuse and perversion of their own teaching and declarations, through what might be added to or taken from them, either by the stubborn, the wavering, or by false teachers who crept in unawares.¹²⁷ Although there was in fact no discrepancy between the apostles in their statements of christian doctrine, there were nevertheless, even in their own times, men who, in order to gain authority and credit for their own errors, represented them to be at variance. For this reason, Paul in writing to the Galatians, c. 2, took care to state plainly the causes and the extent of his controversy with Peter, (which might have been made to bear the appearance of a dispute upon the essential doctrines of Christianity,) lest any one should afterwards call in question his entire *coincidence both in opinion and teaching* with Peter, James, and John. To compare more recent events with ancient, we may refer to what took place in Germany after the reformation. At that time, some persons introduced the sentiment that good works are useless; and, not without a show of reason, appealed to the authority of Luther, against his decided convictions and repeated protestations. In like manner, if any in the age of the apostles adopted this opinion, they could easily persuade the unlearned, that Paul and his followers held the same view. For Paul says expressly, "A man is justified by faith and not by works." *His meaning is, works of law; while they would interpret it of good works.* In opposition, not to the doctrine of Paul, but the error of these men, James, speaking after the manner of sententious writers, i. e. antithetically, affirms, "A man is not justified by faith only,

Gamaliel *κατὰ ἀκριβειαν τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου*, Acts 23: 3, coll. 26: 5, was the first christian teacher who used certain Rabbinic words and phrases, with the design of expounding particular theological points as accurately as possible. A proof of his *ἀκριβεια* is seen in the fact, that, to prevent all mistake through the ambiguity of the word *ἔργα*, he distinguishes, by the term itself, *ἔργα νόμου* from *ἔργα ἀγαθά*.

¹²⁶ Gal. 2: 9. 2 Cor. 11: 5. Comp. Acts c. 15.

¹²⁷ 2 Pet. 3: 16. Gal. 2: 4. Comp. Acts 15: 1, 5.

(i. e. faith destitute of works, such as these men cried up,) but by works," i. e. *good* works, which are the fruits and evidences of faith.¹²⁸

Whatever may be thought of our remarks upon the relation in which James would seem to have stood towards the doctrine and teaching of Paul; (they are conjectures merely and do not affect the main point;) we trust that we have made it plain, that there is no contrariety between the two apostles in respect to the things under discussion. But a far different view prevailed with Luther and his followers, the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* and Andrew Althamer;¹²⁹ and this has also lately been revived and adopted by Augusti, who maintains, that Paul openly confesses his *dissent* from Peter, where he narrates in Gal. c. 2, that at Antioch he contradicted James who was absent, and Peter who was present.¹³⁰ Augusti does not indeed deny, that what Paul censured in Peter (v. 12—14) was his time-serving refusal to sit at meat with the Gentiles, after certain had come from James, although he had done it before; but still he contends that Paul on this occasion made the declaration in v. 16, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ," in order to contradict the *doctrine* of Peter, who now accorded with James. But it needs first of all to be shewn, that James actually agreed with those 'certain who came from James,' v. 12, to whom Peter thought he ought to yield at Antioch; for surely the mere circumstance, that certain persons came in the *name* of James, whether sent by him for any purpose, or coming of their own

¹²⁸ James 2: 24, 'Ορᾶτε, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον. Comp. v. 14.

¹²⁹ The latter is said to have used this harsh language: *Si Jacobus dixit, ex immolatione filii sui justificatum esse Abrahamum, mentitus est in caput suum.* But who that looks back on former days, and regards also the present age, will believe that *Bengel* could have employed the following language, in his *Gnom. ad Gal. II. 9.* "To receive both James and Paul on an equal footing, will not be easy either for one and the same person, or for one and the same church." And in the same strain he immediately subjoins: "Luther let fall the saying, that the epistle of James is *of straw*; but let those who censure this, take care, lest they cherish a monster against Paul."

¹³⁰ See his work: *Die catholischen Briefe, neu übersetzt und erläutert von J. C. W. Augusti, Th. I. Lemgo 1801. p. 164 sq.*

accord, does not establish the fact, that they entirely accorded with him both in sentiment and conduct.¹³¹ Besides, Paul, in giving an account of what had been done at Jerusalem, Gal. 2: 1—9, enters into a particular detail, to make it plain that James and the other apostles at Jerusalem were unanimously of the opposite opinion; and that those ‘who came from James,’ either really or professedly agreed with them. Who those were that came to Antioch at this time, whether they were messengers or servants of James, or only members of the church in Jerusalem over which he at that time presided, may be conjectured from the words of Luke in Acts 15: 1, 5, who informs us that certain Christians in Judea, (chiefly those who had before belonged to the sect of the Pharisees,) travelling into foreign countries, taught that no one could be saved unless he were circumcised; and that Gentile Christians ought to be required to observe the law of Moses. In the celebrated council at Jerusalem, Acts c. 15, Peter and James not only did not assent to, but openly opposed these men; and in the letter directed to be written, which embraced the unanimous opinion of the church relative to foreigners, they declare that what these persons had done was without the consent or knowledge of the apostles, elders, and the other brethren, *οἷς οὐ διεστειλάμεθα*, v. 23, 24. From the class of men just mentioned, there gradually arose a faction extremely hostile to Paul and his disciples; and to this faction Paul judged it necessary to make resistance and opposition; but not to the other apostles, who never sought at any time to derogate from his authority.¹³² But why enlarge? Paul, speaking (Gal. 1: 6, 7) of those turbulent persons who would introduce another gospel, uses the very words of the letter sent from Jerusalem, *εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς*, ‘there be some that trouble you;’ and then in what he subjoins, *καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, ‘and would pervert the gospel of Christ,’ he shews what was meant in the same letter, by the *ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν*, ‘subverting your souls.’ But how can the doctrine of Peter even appear to

¹³¹ Persons may be said ‘to come from any one,’ who come without his knowledge or even against his will. So in Cicero, *De Offic.* III. 22, coll. I. 13, the deserter from Pyrrhus, *perfuga*, who had promised the Romans to poison the king, is said to have come from him into the Roman camp, *ab eo venisse in castra Fabricii*.

¹³² Gal. 1: 1 sq. 2: 2, 9. 1 Cor. 9: 1 sq. 2 Cor. 11: 5.

be contradicted by the declaration, "A man is not justified by works of law but by the faith of Jesus Christ?"—a declaration brought forward by Paul, who reproves Peter. Why? Because through fear of persons of different sentiments, *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, he dissembled his own views, which were entirely in accordance with the doctrine thus stated;¹³³ and thereby his example induced Gentile Christians to yield obedience to the Jewish institutions.¹³⁴ In order now to demonstrate that Peter had acted contrary to his real convictions, (for he charges him in v. 13 with *ὑπόκρισις*, i. e. a discrepancy between his doctrines and practice,) he at first addresses him thus, v. 14, "If thou then being a Jew livest as a Gentile, [first in other places and now here in Antioch,] why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" i. e. *now*, since certain men have come from James. Then in v. 15—17, using the first person plural, (*we* who are Jews by nature, etc.) he both spares his colleague, and signifies that Peter and those who dissembled with him (v. 14) had been, and still were in reality, of the same opinion with himself. Surely he would not have charged them with *hypocrisy*, had they now really thought differently concerning a doctrine from what they did formerly; since to those who had openly abandoned the true faith, the terms *hypocrisy* and *dissembling* would not be so appropriate, as the charge of *teaching another gospel, perverting the gospel of Christ, being turned to another gospel*, etc. charges which Paul does apply to the false teachers among the Galatians, and to their followers, c. 1: 6 sq. but never to Peter and his followers. At last, in the close of his remarks, v. 18—21, to produce the greater effect upon his hearers and to mitigate the severity of his reproof, he says as if in his own name and person,¹³⁵ that which he would have all carefully remember and consider, especially Peter the author of the dissimulation: "For if I build again the things which I destroyed, etc."

We may here add, that he who shall have followed this discussion with care, will need no refutation of the opinion held on this point by Origen and other Greek interpreters; to which

¹³³ See Acts 15: 11, and the epistles of Peter.

¹³⁴ Gal. 2: 12, 14.

¹³⁵ *Μετασχηματίζων εἰς ἑαυτόν*, transferring them in a figure to himself, as he says in 1 Cor. 4: 6. On the force and use of this figure of style, see the *Scripta Var. Argum.* Comm. XII. p. 431, 457.

Jerome also assents in his commentary on the epistle to the Galatians; and which he zealously, but vainly endeavoured to maintain against Augustine, who had signified in his letters that the opinion found no favour with him.¹³⁶ These interpreters, in order (as Jerome says) "to check the arrogance of the blasphemer Porphyry," pronounced the whole contention between Paul and Peter a mere pretence, and not a real dispute. According to them, Paul in fact approved of Peter's conduct, although he both *said* and *wrote* that he thought him to have acted wrong; and this he did in order to calm the excited minds of the church. Augustine has well termed this an *officiosum mendacium*, a 'gratuitous falsehood,' fixed upon Paul by these commentators. Porphyry had said, according to Jerome, that "Paul and Peter engaged in a childish controversy with each other; yea, Paul became so inflamed with envy at the virtues of Peter, as to boast of what he had either never done, or else had done it impudently, condemning in another that which he practised himself."

APPENDIX.

From Neander's "Gelegenheitschriften."¹³⁷

God has given us his Word, as the richest pledge of his unspeakable love, to conduct us to eternal life. His infinite wisdom is strikingly displayed, by the manner in which this word is imparted. He has not always spoken to us in the same identical way, but has adopted various methods. He chose a di-

¹³⁶ See the letters of Augustine and Jerome on this subject, in Jerome's *Epp. ad Theoph. et Augustinum*, Opera Tom. IV. ed. Martianay, Ep. 65, 67, 76; especially Ep. 74, p. 618—622. Also Jerome's *Praefatio* to his commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians, *ibid.* p. 224. Also the *first book* of the Commentaries, p. 243 sq. and the *Comm. in Esa. LIII.* 12, in Tom. III. p. 388. We learn too from his *Ep. 74 ad Augustinum*, that the view of Origen was adopted by the most celebrated interpreters of the Greek church, Didymus, Apollinaris, Eusebius of Emessa, Theodore of Heraclea, Chrysostom, and others.

¹³⁷ This Appendix is extracted from an occasional Essay of Prof. Neander of Berlin, written in 1822, and entitled: "Paulus und Jako."

versity of instruments, inspired and sanctified by the same Spirit, in order to make known to us, in various ways, the same simple truths of salvation. The identity of the Spirit which guided those holy men by his illumination, as also the identity of the doctrine which they taught, is only rendered still more striking, by the very difference in their constitutional peculiarities.

In how many instances does history shew us, that men truly enlightened, instead of uniting with one another in the divine gift of which both really partook, have separated from each other on account of a diversity in things merely human! Instead of embracing each other, as brethren in that one Christ to whom they were attached with equal affection as their God and Redeemer, they have fallen into mutual contentions on account of the different modes by which they expressed their affection to this one Christ! One refusing to recognize, in the diverse language of the other, that Christ who also filled the heart of his brother; instead of rejoicing that so many various tongues, all formed by one God, could unite in praising the one Lord. With this mournful experience of history before us, we cannot hesitate to acknowledge a special proof of the continual operation and guidance of God's Spirit, in the fact, that while we find among the apostles such a diversity of personal qualities as are seen in John, Peter, James, and Paul, placed also in very different spheres of action, by which their peculiarities would be the more strongly developed and exhibited; we yet behold them harmoniously labouring to make known the same divine truth; whose identity becomes indeed more obvious, by the variety of modes in which it is presented. It happened very early, it is true, that when, owing to some constitutional bias, a person felt himself specially attracted by the mode of teaching of one or another apostle, he would gladly acknowledge none but him as a preacher of the gospel; just as even now one feels a peculiar attachment to that apostle, or that book of the sacred

bus. Die Einheit des evangelischen Geistes in verschiedenen Formen." It stands first in his "Gelegenheitsschriften," 3te Ausg. Berlin 1829. He takes the same general view as Knapp, in the foregoing dissertation. The following extracts were translated with the intention of inserting them as marginal notes to the preceding article; but it was afterwards thought preferable to unite them in the form of an Appendix.—TRANS.

Scriptures, by which his inward life was first awakened. But it was far from those enlightened men to encourage this partiality. How does Paul himself point away to Christ, those who would have none but him for an apostle: "Was Paul then crucified for you?" He shows the Corinthians, who, from their partiality to this and that preacher of the gospel, were divided into sects, that they degraded themselves by thus adhering to men, and becoming their servants; since they ought to treat men only as instruments appointed of God for their service, to lead them to Christ. "Therefore let no man glory in men; all is yours, and ye are Christ's." To him only should they cleave, since by him alone they are united with the supreme fountain of all light and life, even God himself.

The freedom which the Son of God bestows, being in its origin and its nature, *heavenly*, depends on no temporal relations whatever. It is infinitely exalted above every thing earthly; above all the power of flesh and blood. No form of human policy can either give it or take it away. The citizens of the kingdom of God, which has its own peculiar constitution, possess this freedom as an unalienable good. But it can also subsist and be enjoyed under any human constitution, and elevates him who has received it, above all secular relations. However he may be outwardly, according to the flesh, subjected to men, yet inwardly, according to the spirit, he can be the servant of no man; first, not the servant of himself, not the servant of sin; and, consequently, the servant of no creature. First of all, **FREE FROM HIMSELF**; and this is the most costly and the only true freedom, the foundation of all other liberty, without which all other pretended freedom is only degrading servitude, even though its chains be chains of gold.

Whoever has received this freedom, acknowledges in his heart only God in Christ, as Master, as becomes the dignity of one whose internal nature is created in the image of God. Hence the apostle Paul thus addresses believing servants. "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it. For he that is called in the Lord being a servant, is the Lord's freeman." To one externally free as to the flesh, who in the enjoyment of true freedom had no advantage over the servant, he says, "Thou art the servant of Christ." In this consisted the *true* freedom of him who was free according to the flesh, as well as the true freedom of the slave. If he could not content himself with *this* service, nor thus take the easy yoke of Christ; he

was, notwithstanding the greatest apparent freedom, in reality a slave, excluded from the enjoyment of that true liberty which the Son of God gives to those who take his yoke upon them. Hence the same apostle after saying, "He that is called being free is the servant of Christ," declares to the Corinthians, "Ye are bought with a price, *be not ye therefore the servants of men.*" Such would the Corinthians be, if, instead of cleaving solely to Christ, they should rely upon men, even upon such beloved ministers of the Lord as a Paul and a Peter.

History teaches by numerous examples, that erroneous views of the doctrine of justification, however much their advocates may have talked about righteousness and sanctification, have always led men away from real internal righteousness and holiness, which is not the fruit of outward acts, but of the secret operation of God. For this reason, the apostle Paul vigorously opposed those heretical Jewish teachers, who enjoined upon heathen converts the observance of the ceremonial law; and he opposed likewise such as gave way to their precepts. Hence he says to the Galatians, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you is circumcised." Not that these men could have been cut off from Christ by the mere external rite of circumcision, in itself considered; but because they could have been persuaded to submit to this rite, only by the delusive hope, that by this external means they could obtain justification. While under this delusion, Christ could be of no avail to them; because his benefits are confined to those who seek justification and sanctification through him alone, giving themselves up to him with undivided hearts.—Yet, this same Paul, who uses the words above cited, while he frankly and publicly preached salvation by Christ alone, felt no scruple in circumcising Timothy, the son of a Jew, to avoid giving offence to the Jews, among whom they expected to preach the gospel in company, Acts c. 16. In presence of the Jews, in the temple, he gave public thanks to God for preservation at a certain time, according to a form borrowed from the Jewish ritual; thus to the Jews becoming a Jew, as to the manner in which he presented his thank-offering to Jehovah.

As Justin Martyr has said in his second Apology, conversions from Heathenism were not only more numerous than from Judaism, but they were also more genuine. Each of these facts admits of an easy solution. As Judaism was preparatory to

Christianity, it was natural that many should remain satisfied with that introductory state, and refuse to acknowledge a more perfect dispensation; while others, again, could not easily so far disengage themselves from the Jewish economy, as to recognize and apply to themselves what Christianity offered to them as entirely *new*. The heathen, on the contrary, as they were in a more destitute condition, came more readily to a consciousness of their wants. Besides, from the first, Christianity came into direct collision with the *whole* religious system of the heathen, and therefore presented to them no temptation to mingle the latter with the gospel.

The same fact has been witnessed in different periods of time. For example, the gospel has gained access among nations entirely rude and without any knowledge of the true God, more easily than among Mohammedans, who have received some ideas of God from divine revelation. It is not so difficult to impart a living Christianity to those who are wholly ignorant of the gospel, as to revive it among those who imagine they already possess it, while in fact they have only a superstitious attachment to the bare *forms* of Christianity.

It was to such mere hearers of the word, who introduced their Jewish notions into Christianity, that James wrote his epistle. These persons, by means of a religious knowledge with which their lives were wholly at variance, by heartless confessions, and by such discourse concerning religion as would indicate a deep acquaintance with the sacred writings, supposed they satisfied the claims of religion and felt secure of justification and the grace of God. To understand the epistle of James, we must view it in all its relations and bearings, and consider moreover, in their full extent, the opinions and practices which he opposed. It has been a common mistake to pursue a different course, and dwell upon the antitheses found in the epistle, without comparing them with others, or with the general antithesis which lies at the basis of all the rest. We must look not only at the opposition made by James to that empty faith which produces no influence on the life, and is not attested by works; but we must also compare other expressions of his, which designate the same empty religion and its opposite. When James speaks of one who "bridleth not his tongue," he puts a single striking example, for a full statement of his idea. He means to characterize one who vainly supposes, that he truly

serves God, while he does not regulate his perverse inclinations. For his example, he selects the passion specially prevalent in the community to which he wrote. In the other member of the antithesis, which contains the positive description of acceptable worship, he again chooses a single striking example to represent the whole. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." This example, again, was selected because, in that community, widows and orphans were specially exposed to oppression from the rich and powerful Jews. From this particular illustration, therefore, we easily draw the general idea, that true obedience and worship consists in active love. James himself subjoins the general truth in these words: "And to keep himself unspotted from the world," i. e. keeping the heart free from all contact and fellowship with ungodliness, comprehended under the general designation, "the world." James 1: 26, 27.

James withstood those who extolled an imaginary faith, a mere external Pharisaical monotheism, as the distinguishing faith of Abraham; and hence concluded themselves to be like him. To meet this error, it was necessary for him to exhibit the outward manifestation of Abraham's disposition. Had not the faith of Abraham proved itself by works, it would have been a nullity. But it did show itself by works, and James means here a species of works, which did not consist in the mere external fulfilment of the law, like that which Paul calls *ἔργα νόμου*, but such a kind as presupposes that faith in Abraham which Paul intended, a genuine *ἔργον ἀγαθόν*, like the offering up of Isaac, which was the expression of a filial surrender to God, a child-like confidence, an entire resignation. In *this* sense James says that "Abraham was justified by works;" i. e. his works were the necessary occasion of that justification by faith. By works, his faith was perfected (*ἔτελειώθη*); i. e. by works, his faith shewed itself to be *πίστις τέλεια*, true, genuine faith; since James by *τέλειος* designates what "corresponds to the true idea of a thing, as it should be, genuine."

Thus did Paul and James coöperate, to establish and diffuse that active and saving Christianity, which consists in obedience springing from faith. Or rather the Lord wrought by them.

Thou Lord, our God and Saviour, who didst work by thy Spirit in those preachers of thy word, and through them wilt

continue to work till the end of time ! We now feel deeply moved with gratitude to thee, as we remember thy unspeakable love towards thy children fallen from thee by unbelief, and what powerful effects thou hast recently produced in many hearts by the diffusion of thy word. Yea we acknowledge it before thee with grateful and joyful hearts ; but also with fear and trembling. Thou hast by thy grace prepared us an important seed-time ; the seed can spring up and thrive only by the shelter of thy grace. By thy fatherly aid alone, can the weeds be plucked up which the adversary of thy kingdom seeks universally to spread. Oh, we beseech thee, accompany still the preaching of thy word as thou hast done, since thou didst promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against thy church !

From the example of these inspired teachers we learn how to contend, in an evangelical spirit, with prejudices, superstitions, and errors of every kind. We should not begin with things external. In this way an outward change may be forcibly wrought, while the attachments of the heart remain the same. Nor are we to prescribe *laws* to men ; which in things of religion, instead of improving, may easily render the case still worse. Religion must spring from spontaneous conviction, which the Spirit of God only can implant in the heart. On the contrary, we must affectionately descend to those who err, and earnestly declare to them the truth, which, if we let it operate alone, prevails with its gentle force beyond all earthly power. When this has once taken possession of the heart and mind, every thing else surrenders of course. The whole fabric built on error falls suddenly of itself ; and there succeeds a sincere, cheerful, and willing obedience.

With this spirit, and according to these principles, have all genuine reformers carried on their work ; and no reformation conducted in a different spirit and on different principles has been permanent. Thus, many witnesses of the truth in the middle ages, like Arnold of Brescia, and Peter of Bruys, who saw and longed to heal the disorders of the church, produced by their well-intended and pious zeal, only a transient agitation of men's spirits, without being able to establish a new organization in the church. They failed, because they wished rather to act themselves, than to let the truth act, which begins its work in the heart and manifests it in the life. They aimed to remodel every thing at once, and abolish whatever did not an-

swer to their idea of a perfect church; instead of first sowing the seed of the gospel in the heart, and giving it time gradually to germinate and expand.

The pious Peter Waldo took a different course. At first he had no intention of entering into a contest with the ruling church. So far from it, that he sought the protection of the church authority, when attempting to teach practical religion among the neglected, ignorant, and superstitious common people; and he was driven to separate himself from her communion, only because she would not permit him to preach the gospel in its simplicity and purity. This man, by means of the simple truth, began a work in the minds of men which continues to advance and spread without external aid; and, as a monument of what a simple evangelical spirit may accomplish without foreign support, it propagated itself century after century through every species of persecution.

John Huss was an example of the same spirit. His undertaking, however, proved abortive, because he had no followers to prosecute his work with a disposition like his own; and because others took his place, who either made it their main object to bring about reform in outward things, or aimed to fashion every thing new at once.

With the same spirit and the same principles, Luther came forth; and on this account the Lord, through him, wrought far greater effects than he had himself intended or desired; for the power of evangelical truth far exceeds the calculations of human reason. But when the seed of truth, sown by Luther, had taken effect in various sorts of minds and caused a general fermentation, enthusiasts arose, as is usual, who sought by their own strength to outdo the operations of the truth; fanatical reformers, who, supposing that Luther had stopped short of the true point, proposed at one blow to demolish all ecclesiastical forms then existing, because they saw in them only so many forms of popery; men, whose great object was to destroy every thing ancient, and through whose progress, the work of God begun by Luther, was in danger of the same catastrophe that befell the labours of Huss in Bohemia. The impending danger induced Luther to leave his solitary seclusion in the Wartburg, and return to Wittenberg; and also drew from him the noble sentiments which follow, in opposition to the prevailing error. "We may preach, and write, and publish; but we must drag no one by the hair. We ought to commit all to God, and let his word work alone, with-

out our interference. Why? Because, I have not, like God, the hearts of men in my hand, as the potter has the clay, to fashion them at my pleasure. I can go no farther with the word than to the ear; I cannot enter the heart. Since then man cannot pour faith into the heart, no one should be violently forced and compelled to believe. God only can do this, and make his word efficacious in the souls of men. The application of such force produces only false shows, outward bustle, apish mockery, and human additions; and thence, specious saints, deceivers, and hypocrites. In all this there is no heart, no faith, no love. Where these three things are wanting in a work, be it ever so correct and good, it will amount to nothing."

Luther thus speaks of his own example. "Had I entered upon my work with violence, I should have begun a game that would have deluged all Germany with blood. And what would this have been but fools' play, and the ruin and destruction both of body and soul. I SAT DOWN IN SILENCE AND LET THE WORD OPERATE."¹³⁸ Of the same import is the noble letter written by Luther to the Elector Frederick in the year 1524, for the purpose of dissuading his sovereign from attempting to suppress false teachers by violence.¹³⁹ "Your Majesty should not interfere with the office of the word. Suffer them to preach with all boldness what they are able, and against whom they please. For there must be heresies, (1 Cor. 11: 19,) and the word of God must stand in the field and contend. If their spirit be right, it will have nothing to fear from us, and will abide. If ours be right, it will have nothing to fear from them nor from any one else. Sire, let mind conflict with mind, and the struggle be confined to them."

¹³⁸ Luther's Werke, von Walch, Th. XX. p. 24.

¹³⁹ Luther's Briefe, von De Wette, Bd. II. p. 547.

ART. II. CHRISTIANITY CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE
PERFECTABILITY OF OUR MORAL BEING.

Translated from the French. With additional Remarks. By John Wheeler, Pastor of the
Congregational Church in Windsor, Vermont.

The following is a translation of a review in the "Archives du Christianisme," for July 1830, of a work with the following title: *Essai sur le Christianisme envisagé dans ses rapports avec la perfectibilité de l'Être Moral, par F. Diodati*; i. e. "An Essay on Christianity considered in relation to the Perfectibility of our Moral Being." M. Diodati is a member of the Company of Pastors and Professors at Geneva; and is the author of one or two other works, related more or less to the general subject treated of in this; and which are well spoken of by the Editors of the "Archives." The translator has taken the liberty to add a few thoughts at the conclusion.—TRANS.

In the *Pensées de Pascal*, this remarkable expression is found: "It is necessary to have thoughts in reserve, while we speak in other respects like the people."* This expression, apart from its connexion, is susceptible of an erroneous interpretation; but viewed as it stands in the work of Pascal, and interpreted by the nobleness of his personal character, it contains a true and profound thought. It is certain that the same ideas are not couceived in the same identical manner by men of genius and learning, and by the people at large. Though equally accessible to all classes in one aspect, in another, they are seen only by profound thinkers, by those accustomed to investigation. The popular view is certainly best adapted to the mass of the people, but profound

* "Il faut avoir des pensées de derrière, parlant d'ailleurs comme le peuple." The somewhat ambiguous meaning of this apothegm is remarked upon in the text. It is there correctly explained; and seems to correspond in its general sense, as intended by Pascal, very much to our English proverb a little modified: "Talk with every body, but think with the wise.—ED.

minds, from whom the popular view is not hidden, and who are supported by it as well as the multitude, find, in the contemplation of points of view less generally perceived, an additional conviction, which yields an intellectual delight, a spiritual repast, which is perhaps necessary to *them*; and which may be appropriately styled *strong meat*. This food, being adapted only to their particular constitution, is not distributed to the multitude. It is confined to the cultivated. With the people generally, they unite in the common forms of expression, which for them are equally true and respectable. In a word, in the language of Pascal, "there must be thoughts in reserve, though we speak in other respects like the multitude."

This twofold view of the same truths, this species of parallelism among superior and inferior minds, exists also for all the ideas which carry the mind into the spiritual world; taking it only for granted that it is still within the domain of religion. Thus there is established a *difference*, though not a *division*, among those of the same faith, the recipients of the same truths. With this different manner of understanding the truth, or rather these different degrees of intelligence respecting it, they are both equally orthodox; and with equal propriety avow themselves as such. The pious of the two classes recognize each other, principally, because the more popular view of the truth, the most simple expression of belief, is equally acknowledged by all; and also because the emotions experienced, as the result of this belief, and the fruits of these emotions, are exactly alike in both cases. Like a noble concert, where variety of sounds produces no discordance, this harmonious unity gives birth to the blissful thought, that religion, approached from any quarter, and examined in any manner, is always constant to itself, always equally true, always evident.

From these deeper researches of thinking minds, comes what is called, in our day, the philosophy of religion; which is nothing more than religion viewed from the position of philosophy. In two words, it is the *idea** sought and discovered by the *fact*. The idea, in its simplicity and naked integrity, as being, in itself, wholly independent of the fact, is perceived and proclaimed. But as all existence or *fact*, produced by a will, is the spontaneous development of a principle, and the manifestation of an

* The word *idea* is here used in the sense of *ideal notion* or *conception*, independent of any real or substantial existence.—Ed.

idea ; this idea is sought, not as temporal and local, under the circumstances of place and time, in which it is realized, but as that which is independent of time and space. Thus, as there are the metaphysics of geometry and of all other sciences, so there are the metaphysics of religion.

It could be shown, from ancient and illustrious examples, that this direction of the mind, in relation to religion, is not peculiar to our day ; although it is now manifest in a more remarkable manner. Christianity, though it makes no concessions to our passions or our errors, adapts itself so far to the intellectual wants of each age, as in a measure to satisfy them. It challenges, with noble ingenuousness, all kinds of examination ; and it being the notable tendency of our age to search for the *ideas*, which lie under facts, and thus, so to speak, to comprehend the metaphysics of all things ; this holy religion, though a fact, yields freely to the investigation of the learned, the ideas which are hidden under its manifestations. Happy will such persons be, if they find in this path of abstract meditation, some with whom they can join in adoring that God, who is not a spiritual abstraction, but a personal and ever living Being. It was with good reason that the apostle, in his zeal, cried out, "Some preach Christ of contention ; but whether of pretence or sincerity, Christ is preached, and therein do I rejoice."* Some come to Christ by the path of philosophy ; but whether by one path or another, if they come to Christ, God is glorified.

It is however very important to notice an error, of which this method of viewing the subject is susceptible. Modern rationalism domineers over Christianity, for the purpose of changing and amending it. Instead of subordinating the ideas to the facts, according to christian philosophy, it subordinates the facts to the ideas. It creates, by anticipation, a rational religion ; and then seeks to encase itself within the beautiful facts of the christian revelation. These it regards only as the arbitrary symbols of those abstract ideas with which it is preoccupied. The history of the gospel, in the hands of such persons, becomes a kind of fable, upon the historical foundation of which, it is not important to insist. Thus the most vital doctrines are destroyed, the essential character of Christianity is founded in metaphysical reveries, the gospel of God is changed into the gospel of man ; and we may see how man is regenerated !

* Phil. 1: 16, 18.

This abuse, as may be seen, leads to a procedure altogether diverse from the wise and prudent course, which we describe; and which indeed merits to be called an opposite course, a mere disguise, rather than an abuse. We would say, however, that the method we have hinted at, if too exclusively followed, may detract somewhat from simple faith. We will endeavour to make ourselves understood. Metaphysics place us at once without the relations of time, and take no account of circumstances of which time and place are the conditions. The science does not examine causes and effects, but principles and results. It does not seek for *facts*, but *ideas*; and when rashly brought into the field of contingent and particular events, it retraces its steps, as though upon the wrong scent. If, however, it is occupied with facts, it is in their collective, generic character, that they are examined; while a thousand details, which it might be difficult to trace to their principles, are voluntarily neglected. When philosophy has come to the point of admitting the intervention of God in human affairs, and looks at religion with philosophic delight; when searching into the depths of human nature, it perceives the necessity of a peculiar education for it, which involves in itself certain advances on the part of God; it is, from the height of these ideas, a glorious descent to fall into the order of visible occurrences, such as the calling of Abraham, his departure from Mesopotamia, the institution of circumcision, of the passover, the passage of the Red Sea, the manna, the tabernacle, the altar-service, the institution of the priesthood, and Judea as the theatre for manifesting the designs of an infinite Intelligence, and a spiritual Providence. From these general views, from this immense perspective, where one delights to extend his vision, it may perhaps be unpleasant for the mind to descend to details in one's own condition, local and assimilated to those with which the history of man is filled. He will come down to them like the naturalist, who occupied with the contemplation of the one great unity, and of the regular connexion of the phenomena of the world, finds difficulty in making himself familiarly acquainted with events, which by their extraordinary character are excluded from the field of science. It is on this account, that, without objecting to those researches to which allusion has been made, and in which we take great pleasure, we think there is required much sober discretion, lest the coast be lost sight of, viz. the facts which are necessarily connected with the historical conception of religion; and to which we are con-

stantly carried back in our philosophical meditations upon Christianity; and which enable us to see, in religion, a history of actual occurrences in this world, under the particular direction of heaven.

If there is a work on the philosophy of Christianity, where the abuse of which we have spoken is happily avoided, it is the *Essai sur le Christianisme*, by M. Diodati. It is the work of a Christian filled with the truths of the gospel, and embracing it in its entire character, facts and ideas, body and spirit, without reservation. It is delightful thus to observe religion in its contact with the human heart, which it is destined to renew. The book is itself a history of regeneration. In the gospel, regeneration is announced as a fact, of which the Holy Spirit is the author. Without departing from this settled position, M. Diodati considers the fact as a *phenomenon*. He shows that a certain moral constitution being assumed, a certain power, in like manner assumed, ought to act upon it, and modify it. This happy action, he follows step by step, marking its principal features, its progress, its vicissitudes, and its continuance, until the achievement of the work, until the triumph of divine power in human weakness. The character of the essay may be understood by this rapid analysis. It is truly philosophical, and the philosophy is that of observation, and the most rigorous induction, applied to Christianity. It is not to simple minded Christians alone, that the work is addressed, but specially to philosophers; and we have little doubt, that it may attract the attention of some, who have been more interested in the law, than in works of this kind.

As the excellence of M. Diodati's work does not consist mainly in the style, but in the fundamental conception, and in the general outline, it may, to a certain extent, be understood by an analysis. This we will attempt, premising however, that in suppressing the author's illustrations, his thoughts will be found more difficult to be understood, or to be followed. In the work itself there is no difficulty of this kind; for nothing can be more luminous, and in general more easily understood, than the ideas contained in it.

The perfection of our moral being is the object common both to philosophy, and to Christianity. Christianity makes this perfection the principal business of this life, and the pledge of the life to come; she attaches eternity to the work, and thus elevates her views far above those of philosophy. The system she

proposes as the object of faith for her disciples, is worthy the attentive study of every unbeliever.

It is necessary to know, in the first place, upon what foundation, upon what substance, Christianity operates; or, in other words, what is the constituent element of the moral being on which it acts. This element is a *principle of activity*, free and spontaneous, which is not the will itself, but its root; and around which are grouped, in the unity of *self*, all the diversely characterized faculties. It is in the will, that this primordial element becomes manifest. It is therefore upon the will, that it is necessary to act to modify the moral being; and the perfection of this being consists in the education of the will.

The fact is too little recognized, that "the care of forming the will is abandoned to the uncertain and often vicious education of habit and example. The cities swarm with institutions to aid the development of the intellect, and have diverted those destined exclusively to the formation of the moral being, into the same channel." Philosophy has made the same mistake; "proclaiming the discursive faculty supreme, she has absorbed, in a degree, the will in the intellect. By this means she has expected successfully to attain the true end of moral being, and establish in the same way a moral government, as if the education of the will did not demand more care and present more difficulties, than the education of the intellect." Christianity has been kept from this mistake. It is to the will she has addressed herself; it is directly upon the will she acts; and her system of moral perfection is nothing else than a system of education for the will.

But for acting upon the will it is necessary to have a just conception of it, to know its actual state. Christianity declares that it is not only feeble, not only undecided, but actually perverted. It regards this perversion as a mysterious fact, the account of which occupies some of the first pages of the Bible. Man has fallen. Amid the ruins of his primitive excellence, the moral instinct remains; not however as a rule or power, but as an accusing witness, an utterer of upbraidsings. His wretchedness is manifest, in the constantly renewed conflict between the moral instinct and the perverted will. His wretchedness—his nobleness also. "Is man indeed perfectly wretched, because he is constrained to accuse himself? rather is he not truly noble, because he does accuse himself?"

It is difficult, by a single word, to designate the evil-working

principle in this great catastrophe; but taking selfishness in its most extended sense, it is *selfishness*.* To this may be imputed the dreadful victory of sin, in our nature; for sin always presents itself as the impious preference of *self* to the adorable Being from whom self proceeds. Self, preferred to God, is the foundation of all sin.

Christianity attempts the radical cure of this perverted will, and seeks to transform the man into the image of God. But where shall he find this image? Passing by the incommunicable perfections of God, he seeks it in his moral attributes. It is in the *will* of God, that the model and rule of the human will may be found. The intellect would apprehend this image only in a vague and imperfect manner, if we had no other means of acquainting ourselves with it. But Christianity presents it to us in the person of Jesus Christ, in the most lively manner, *God manifest in the flesh*. In Jesus Christ we contemplate the divine perfection in human nature; we see it applied to our relations, and to our circumstances. We see how God would conduct, if God were man. Not satisfied with realizing the image of God, in his own person, Jesus reproduced and developed it in his precepts. Thus man may know what God is, and what he himself ought to become.

Is it the simple melioration of his character that man ought to seek? Philosophy has thought so; and therefore her efforts have failed. Constantly building upon a ruinous foundation, she has, as constantly, seen her structure falling in pieces. What is the use of making progress in one direction, when the very direction is wrong? "To attempt to rectify the moral nature of man, in its degenerate condition, is merely to adjust the passions, to establish among them a system of balancing the one against the other,—to regulate them according to the interests of selfishness. The radical vitiosity still lives, and its tendency, so violent and arbitrary, always exhibits itself with invincible obstinacy." Christianity takes other views; she asserts the necessity of *regeneration*; she proposes *conversion*; not

* *L' égoïsme* ought not perhaps to be translated *selfishness*; for we are liable to misunderstand the author, from our almost technical use of the word in theological discussion. The word *L' égoïsme* expresses it, as the *egomet* sin, the sin of *I*,—in distinction from those, who make selfishness an acquired habit, the *result* of wrong volition, instead of the *ground* of wrong volitions.—TRANS.

progress in the *same*, but in the *opposite* direction. Of this immense work we can deny neither the necessity, nor the obligation, without causing the moral instinct to assert a lie; for that, since the fall, constantly murmurs in the bosom of the inner man, and being listened to, proposes nothing less than our perfection.—But since regeneration is necessary, where is the means, the element, the regenerating power?

There is in man a power, which obliges him to pursue unceasingly some end or purpose. This end, which is commonly regarded as the principle of his activity, is only the occasion of its exercise; except perhaps for mere necessary wants. This principle in man regards not so much the fact, that he is in want of an end or purpose, as it does the very pursuit itself. Were all his ends answered, and his desires satisfied, he would constantly invite new ones, solely to furnish aliment for the activity of his soul. Without this he could not exist. “To offer food to this power, is the secret of life; which, if taken away, moral life becomes extinct.”

This want is manifest, among men generally, in two particulars. The mind seeks satisfaction from this present world; and it seeks this only to gratify self. “We always find *ourselves* at the bottom of all the interests that occupy us; the human *self*, (*le moi humain*,) seeks itself with obstinate and invariable perseverance in the very midst of those objects, which ought to captivate its activity; it is the pivot on which all the world revolves for us. With the constancy of a natural instinct, self is placed at the centre of the system; and to it we give the power of stamping its own impress upon every act.”

Now then, this want, this fall of human nature, Christianity turns to profit in our regeneration. “To establish in the soul an interest, which shall suffice wholly to occupy the principle of activity, and which shall give to it a new direction, and that the opposite of the one marked out by the objects which have heretofore occupied it, will be indeed to change the soul. This new interest would become the regenerating principle; and the occupation of the power of activity by this interest, would consummate the work of regeneration. Thus the re-establishment of the man in his first estate would be obtained by a very simple view,—the substitution of one interest, in the place of another. The whole life would be changed by the change of the dominant interest.”

The business of Christianity is to create a new interest in the

soul; but this interest must be supreme, and must give to the soul a direction the opposite of that which it has pursued; in short, it must dethrone *self*, which has violated all the soul's previous activity.

What then is that interest, in which all these considerations meet? What is that interest, which is capable of satisfying the soul, which carries it beyond all visible and temporary things, which indeed wrests it from the dominion of *self*? It is **THE LOVE OF GOD**. "It is to the love of God, that is confided the task of breaking the corrupt inclinations of the soul, and of bringing it into union with God. All the objects which we love, stand between us and God, and thus intercept our worship.—Still more, it is our own *selves*, that we seek in the objects we pursue. It is to ourselves we offer incense, and thus become the idolaters of *self*. All the ostensible objects of our worship, are only victims which we seek to place on the altar of *self*, so that the very things that hide God from us, serve to increase still more the real and insurmountable difficulty, which consists in our devotion to *self*. The love of God, placed in the heart, overcomes this difficulty; it destroys the separation from God, it places the affections upon their proper objects, and brings the soul back to true worship. Being made free by love to God, the chains which bound it to the 'beggarly elements of this world,' are broken. That which is loved reflects itself into the soul, and imprints upon it the holy character that is seen in God. Thus the regenerating interest proposed by Christianity, purifies the soul, restores in it the divine image, and makes it a partaker of the divine nature."

Now then, to what source shall the soul look for this regenerating interest? "Christianity proposes the means of arriving" at this interest, "at this love. It is found where guilty man would never have dared to hope, in the love of God for man." The revelation of this is summed up in one fact,—the coming of Jesus Christ into this world, and his voluntary death for sinners. In the salvation by his propitiatory sacrifice, is found the principle of regenerating love. *There* is unveiled the magnificent and touching picture of that work which the Son of God accomplished upon earth, eighteen hundred years ago.

It is on the ground of this singular fact, this consecrated work, that the New Testament constantly makes its appeal to our love.

Considered in itself, and independent of experience, the plan adopted by Christianity possesses the highest excellence. It is fitted to arrest at once all our faculties. It offers a most exalted subject to our *intellect*, it displays a glorious perspective to our *imagination*, it exalts our *moral sensibility*, and to each of these faculties it presents inexhaustible aliment. "Its influence does not admit of limit, it will not be circumscribed in its existence, nor in its duration; it will no more admit of metes and bounds, than the work of holiness itself, or the love, which is manifested to perfect it. The accomplishment of the glorious mystery partakes of the immensity of the author. The work appertains at once to Heaven and to earth. It is bounded only by its subjects, God and man; it comprehends eternity. The infinite, which the immortal spirit seeks, is found in the expiation, in Him who accomplished it, in the love by which it was accomplished, in the glorious end of the sacrifice. Indeed it is all divine; immensity and eternity envelope the whole subject of the reconciliation of man to his Maker.

This love, once established in the soul, will be found essentially active or practical. How can it be otherwise? For it has the threefold character of filling the soul with transport, in view of its loved object; of consecrating the soul to that object; and of directing it to the doing of all things dear to that object. The immediate consequence of the love then, will be obedience; and the effect of obedience, when inspired by love, will be to strengthen and increase the love.

If we here stop, for a moment, to contemplate the regenerating power created by the gospel, we cannot but be struck by its admirable harmony with all the elements of our nature. Christianity has chosen, as the means of regeneration, the only sentiment that really charms the heart. "Love succeeds only, by detaching the man from that which is the foundation of his present nature, leading him to go off from self, and out from self, that he may be absorbed in an interest that does not by nature belong to him. There is in this love an element, inexpressible indeed, but profoundly assured to him who loves, which uproots self to transport us out of ourselves; which identifies us with the object of our love, which imprints upon us its own being, which attaches itself to the very principle of all moral life, renews it, and produces in it a real revolution, which changes the man, and gives to him a new existence!"

Love has furthermore this excellence, that it uses, without abusing, our liberty. The man who loves, recognizes an influence, but the influence is in himself, for the love has become a part of his own being, and he is no more a slave when he follows his affections, than when he follows his intellect.

It is still another mark of wisdom thus to confide the regeneration of man to a sentiment. The intellect, essentially skeptical in morals, could not apprehend the principle involved in moral distinctions. Sentiment alone can perceive and appreciate things pertaining to sentiment. The true power of the moral being, is also its true light.

We further admire, how, in the work of regeneration, every thing is associated which constitutes our moral dignity; for "all those sentiments, which elevate man above the beings that people the mere visible creation, as gratitude, confidence, hope, admiration, are attracted by love." And love awakens all these sentiments, without awaking pride along with them; because love draws from itself its own power and being; and constantly renews all these emotions, as gratitude, confidence, hope, admiration, etc. in the recollection of the awful state of misery from which God has freed the soul.

To conclude; the regenerating element provides for our felicity, by placing a boundary to the vain anticipations in which our life is wasted, since it satisfies both the demand of the soul for activity, and the demand for repose. This is indeed a wonderful union, and one of which this power alone is capable; activity in order, interest in quietude, this eternal problem of the human soul, LOVE HAS SOLVED.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

By the Translator.

Some objection may, perhaps, be made against the translation of the preceding article, because of its apparent obscurity in some important places. But it was found impossible to use other language without recasting the whole thoughts, and that at the expense of hiding the author's meaning under his English dress. The article too is short and incom-

plete. But for these reasons it may be the more acceptable to many, as it does not occupy a long time in reading; and may suggest some thoughts, which they may better pursue for themselves, than another could for them.

The suggestions on the philosophy of religion, are worthy of special examination at this time. The philosophy of religion has very generally among us, been interpreted to mean explanations of the causes and reasons of various religious truths, in relation to objections made by the intellect, or by wickedness. Thus one person has had one method of explaining the origin of sin, another has had another method; one has taken one view of the ground of moral agency, another has explained it in a different manner; and so of repentance, regeneration, etc. and each brings his philosophy to explain and defend his own opinions. Thus the philosophy of religion is regarded as something deeper and more recondite than religion itself; and concerning which there may be various, if not opposite opinions. And many, if not most, of the religious controversies, that are agitating the community, have their origin in different views of philosophy, as the writers allege; and the struggle seems to be, who shall be able to gain the most adherents to his system of explaining religious truths. The jostling together of such opinions, or rather such notions, looks very like a battle in chaos, where a trusty blade could not exist; or on 'cloud-land,' where one mist can be overcome only by the prevalence of a still greater mist.

The philosophy of religion, in the article under consideration, assumes the existence of God, such as he is manifested to be in his word and works. To these sources it goes to inquire for the spiritual relations in which he is manifest to us; and in the discovery of those relations, and in the assertion of their reality, its province is founded, and its boundary is defined. These relations are spiritual, and as such they are eternal, not in themselves to be changed by time, place, or circumstance. They are developed to us in various ways; now indicated by the consciousness of our own minds, now manifest in creation, now exhibited in some fact or occurrence in the history of religion, and now taught by enunciation in words more or less absolute, as the occasion for the expression of the truth might demand. By every step in which the mind advances in knowledge, it comes to a closer acquaintance with the spiritual world, and a more

perfect view of God. And when the objects presented by the eye of faith, have come to be such, that "white-handed hope" lays hold of them as substance, and they are regarded as unquestionable and fore-tokening evidence of things that are unseen, the philosophy of religion is exhausted. Yes, is exhausted; except as the same habit of mind, guided by like faith, may expatiate upon other works, and other manifestations of the same inexhaustible, but not changeable Spirit; and then the philosophy of religion may be said to be changed into the life of religion. Thus the study of the Old Testament, conducted philosophically, is the study of ideas,—of the spiritual truths that are manifest in the facts and history there detailed, as exhibiting the medium of the Eternal Mind. And when once these ideas are apprehended, they may be used by us, as rays of light to be thrown upon any dark spot in the dispensations of Providence, that we may read therein also the will and the wisdom of our Heavenly Father. Thus the study of prophecy, philosophically considered, is not merely, nor mainly, the study of the accomplishment of certain foretold events as occurrences, but the study of those ideas or spiritual truths, which in their necessary developement in such a world as this, will always bring about the same general results. And these may be learned with altogether more accuracy, from the study of the Bible, than is commonly imagined. Thus too the study of types, in the Old Testament, is but the examination of facts or occurrences, as exhibiting the same spiritual truth that was more fully manifest in the subsequent history of the dispensations of God. And the system of interpretation, that goes under the name of *double sense*, could be held by no thinking mind, except on the assumption, that ideas and spiritual truths are eternal, and now appear in this event, and will soon appear in another. Probably, too, the "Science of Correspondences" is indebted to all the hold it has upon any sane mind, to the same source; as are doubtless the suggestions lately thrown out concerning a new science, to be called the "Science of Analogy." In this manner, the philosophy of religion leads us to contemplate and treasure up the ideas or spiritual truths, that are shadowed forth in the facts and history of revelation, as eternal, immutable, and real; and not to doubtful speculation concerning the grounds on which our relations to God depend, or the reason why we should acknowledge those relations.

It is well said, in the preceding article, that "as there are the metaphysics of geometry and of all other sciences, so there are the metaphysics of religion." The word metaphysics has become much abused by its application to those "doubtful disputations" to which allusion has been made, as existing among us, under the name of disputes about the philosophy of religion. Metaphysics, as any student may learn, means *things alone*, or *things beside or beyond physics*; and as such all religion, considered as spiritual truths, or as spiritual relations, is, and of necessity must be, *metaphysical*. And, as such, those misunderstand the very nature of religion, who set themselves to the laborious work of showing *how* these spiritual relations come to be to what they are. If they are spiritual, the grounds of their being such are not within our reach; and metaphysics affirms them to be what they are. To attempt to show *how* spiritual relations happen to be what they are, is to attempt to conceive of spiritual things according to the understanding, which is educated to comprehend only material and physical relations, or these relations only as developements and symbols of spiritual things. The very attempt to explain or comprehend spiritual truths by our understanding, is an attempt to place spiritual things in an impossible condition. It is the same kind of absurdity in religion, that it would be in mathematics to attempt to show *how* the relations of mathematics come to be what they are. A mathematician could not be more strangely or absurdly employed in attempting to show *how* or *why* Kepler's law, "that the radius vector passes over equal areas in equal times," is what it is, or *why* the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, than a theologian would be in seriously attempting to show *how* or *why* sin occurs, in order to explain or account for it; *how* or *why* a man should repent, to explain his duty to repent. Sin, as sin, is inconceivable, is unimaginable, except as involving the duty of repentance; and being in a state of sin, repentance *unto life* is inconceivable, is unimaginable, without a life-giving power.

The difficulty on these subjects arises from attempting to express *spiritual* ideas, in forms of speech drawn from the relations of *time*. Correct ideas of sin, repentance, regeneration, and kindred topics, are obtained by contemplating them in relation to **RIGHT AND WRONG**, and not in relation to time, *before and after*. And yet how constantly are men tasking their minds to find out what is the antecedent sensibility or affection or inclination, to the sin or repentance or regeneration which is appa-

rent; as though a spiritual relation, acknowledged or violated, was the consequence of some physical act or condition. A forgetfulness of this always leads the mind into difficulty, and forces it to endless discussion, which yields nothing satisfactory. It brings up such questions as the following: "How can I repent *before* I believe, and how can I believe *while* impenitent? How can I pray *before* I have the aid of the Holy Spirit, and how can I have that aid *before* I pray for it? How can I be converted *before* I have done any thing towards my conversion, and how can I do any thing towards it, *while* I am unconverted and of course sinful?" Such questions can never be answered; "because they depend on the application of our notions of *time* to *spiritual* ideas. The difficulty would be more glaring, but exactly of the same kind, if the inquirer should ask for the *length*, or the *breadth*, or the *weight* of repentance. In answer to such questions you might say, figuratively, it must be *long* and *broad* enough to cover all your sins, and *heavy* enough to turn the scale against them; and possibly, such language might *suggest* useful thoughts to some hearer; but if taken as an exact and adequate expression of the spiritual idea, it must of necessity introduce confusion."*

It will be said, however, that many persons demand that the causes, and grounds, and reasons of the accusations and requisitions of the Bible should be stated to them, and will not be satisfied with the mere enunciation of spiritual truth. Very true. But where do they demand that the cause shall be pleaded? At the bar of their intellect; and they demand too that it shall be justified in the view of the intellect. Now this can never be done, because sin is not an intellectual aberration, nor is repentance an intellectual sorrow; and if spiritual truths cannot be admitted on the ground that they are certified by consciousness to the ending of strife, the case is hopeless. To assume any other ground, is to "darken counsel by words without knowledge." The philosophy of religion does indeed give conscience the ascendancy in all her inquiries, and in all her decisions. She does so, because she knows that it is with the moral man, and not with the intellectual man, that she has mainly to do. The decisions of conscience, she takes to be final and imperative, just as in another department, the mathematics, philosophy takes the decisions of the intellect to be so.

* Vt. Chron. Aug. 3, 1832.

The manner in which M. Diodati philosophizes on religion, is worthy of more particular notice. He regards regeneration as "a fact, of which the Holy Spirit is the author; it is so asserted in the gospel, and without departing from that fixed position, he examines the fact, as a phenomenon." *How* the influence of the Holy Spirit is exerted he does not ask; *why* the fact is necessary, or whether it be, or be not, consistent with our ability, he does not inquire, but *so it is*.

The state of the fact, as it relates to the will, is presented in a very happy manner. It is in the will, or by the will, that the "principle of activity," the "primordial element," becomes manifest. This is free and spontaneous, but is not the will itself; it is that without which the will is not attributable to any thing as existence. It is free and spontaneous, but not voluntary; that is, it is not free and spontaneous *because* it has or may have volition. Spontaneity, but not volition, belongs to the idea of the "principle of activity." But what is *spontaneity*? I will explain. I wish to think, and I think. But does it not happen sometimes, that I think without having wished to think? Take the thought unawares, without having wished to think, and you will find thought free and spontaneous, but without your volition. This is spontaneity. It is the function of the principle of thought to think; whether you will or not, thought is developed. Will not to think, if you please. It is not possible, the very attempt is a development of thought. Thus thought is often spontaneous, in distinction from being voluntary.

Love also is spontaneous; but it is not the result of a volition. It is the "primordial element" coalescing in spirit with the loved object before the soul. No man loves by a volition to love; and no man possesses more delightful freedom, than in loving.

Now, in examining regeneration as a phenomenon, the fact of spontaneity, as distinct from volition, has not been so generally marked as it should have been, or the conception never would have entered any man's mind, that we could regenerate (to say nothing of the philological absurdity) ourselves by a volition, or a desperate effort at volition; or that regeneration was, in any sense, the act of one's own will. If it was, it would be *will-full*, full of the *moi*, the self, which is the seed-sin in the ground plot of human existence. The work before us does not, however, leave the matter at this point. It shows the province of the will in this phenomenon. The "principle of activity" is not manifest as moral, except in the will, and therefore it is to be

approached by us only in that power. "The education of the will is the perfection of our moral being." But the will itself, or the will as the *self*, the *moi*, is perverted and enfeebled. Where then shall be found that image, that prototype, which the "moral instinct," the conscience, demands? "In the will of God, the model and rule of the human will may be found." And seeking it any where else, or by any thing else, is seeking it as the *moi* dictates, which is only another form of sin; so that the will is directed *at once* to God, for its education. And what is God? God is LOVE. As seen in the face of Jesus Christ, God is LOVE. Thus the *moi* is brought, in the will, directly before the light and the life that is in Christ Jesus, which breaks forth in a whole atmosphere of love. If spontaneity takes place, and the soul coalesces with the love now manifest, it is regenerated into the possession of the love that is like God; and henceforth this becomes to it light, life, and guidance.

This is stating the fact as it occurs. No one, in examining his own religious experience, finds that by an effort at willing, he becomes a new man. But every one has found that he is freely and delightfully drawn to God, as Charnock often illustrates it, like the iron to the magnet, by a sweet, kind, coalescing influence. The will has its duty for which it knows itself to be responsible, and that is, to keep spiritual and eternal things before the mind, especially the revelation of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The conscience, as an abiding testimony for God, pronounces imperatively, that the will ought to do this, that it is held responsible for this. And if done, whose conscience will permit him to doubt of the result? Whose conscience *can* doubt of the result? Whoever did thus employ his will, and failed to find the law of life opening in his soul, and expanding itself through the inner man? Not one; no, not one!

We shall, however, deceive ourselves, if we suppose that the ministry will promote regeneration, by preaching upon spontaneity. That would be as foreign to the purpose, as to preach upon volition, independent holiness, or free agency. Love must be preached, not spontaneity or volition; love, not a lecture about love as an affection, but by presenting for our contemplation the object to be loved, in the form love has assumed. In a word, by preaching Jesus Christ as the way in which God's love is commended to us. For the soul to keep before itself the eternal sun of love, the will must ever keep Jesus Christ before the mind, as God manifest in the flesh. Herein may spiritual truths

be seen ; and herein will their power to draw, to subdue, to elevate the soul, be manifest. It was because this form of manifestation is so essential to a right knowledge of them, that the apostles so continually preached Jesus Christ. In him these truths might be seen, and without him they could not be understood. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." By suffering itself to be drawn away from this position, to consider regeneration as a volition, or a something the nature of which was comprehensible by examining the operation of our minds, the ministry has lost in spirituality, and the church has been fed, not so much with the "bread of life which came down from heaven," as with the husks, which a heartless intellect has provided. The complaint already heard, with more or less distinctness, from almost all parts of the land, in relation to the thousands lately united to the churches, is, that there is great want of spirituality and doctrinal knowledge. Not knowledge of doctrines, in the shape of propositions and larger catechisms, for that has been felt to be, in some respects, an injury ; but a knowledge of the integral elements of the christian life, that in which hope stands, in which faith grows and extends itself, and in which charity is the all pervading element and the fore-tokening evidence of the blessedness that is to come. The causes of these complaints are manifest to an attentive observer, who has been at any pains to inform himself respecting the peculiar shape in which the ministry has presented divine truth, and the very singular speculations that have, to a considerable extent, been indulged, and the still more surprising short-sightedness, which has led so many to count on immediate and astounding effects, as the criterion of truth and usefulness. The remedy for these and many other evils, will be found when "vain speculations" shall be abandoned, and the ministry, like strong-minded and simple-hearted believers, shall give their powers to the illustration and enforcement of "Christ crucified," as the great fact of the gospel, designed by Him, who "knew what was in man," to be the regenerating and conservative principle of our race.

ART. III. SKETCHES OF IDUMEA AND ITS PRESENT
INHABITANTS.

From the Travels of Burckhardt and Legh.

With an Historical Introduction.

By the Editor.

FIRST ARTICLE.

I. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.¹

The land of Idumea, or of Edom, which is so often mentioned in the Scriptures as the country of the descendants of Esau, has been until recently so imperfectly known, that even its situation and boundaries have usually been laid down, upon the best maps, a hundred miles or more out of their true position. The region was first visited in modern times by Burckhardt, and afterwards by Mr Legh and his companions; and it is supposed that the remarkable results of their researches, presented in connexion with what is known of the country from ancient sources, cannot but be acceptable to the biblical student, as a contribution for illustrating an interesting and hitherto obscure

¹ The works consulted in the preparation of this Introduction, are principally the following:

RELANDI *Palaestina*, passim. This is still the store-house for every thing which relates to the classical illustration of sacred geography.

CELLARIUS *Notitiae Orbis Antiqui*, ed. Schwartz, Lips. 1732. Tom. II. p. 577 sq.

EUSEBII *Onomasticon*, etc. ed. Clericus, Amstel. 1704. fol.

W. A. BACHENE, *Historische und Geographische Beschreibung von Palästina*. Aus dem Holländischen. Cleve u. Leipz. 1766. Theil I. Bd. 2. § 234. p. 48 sq.

GESENIUS, *Commentar über Jesaja*, zu c. 16: 1. c. 34, 35.

ROSENMUELLER, *Handbuch der biblischen Alterthumskunde*. Biblische Geographie, Bd. III. p. 65 sq. Leipz. 1828. This is on the whole the most satisfactory account of Idumea, though far from complete.

MANNERT, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*. Th. VI. Bd. I. Arabien etc. 2ter Auflage, Leipz. 1831. p. 129 sq. 143.

Other writers occasionally consulted, are referred to in the notes; as also the sources examined, like Josephus, etc.

portion of sacred geography. The sketches too which are given by these travellers, of the manners and modes of life prevailing among the present inhabitants, and particularly among the Bedouin Arabs, are probably applicable with very little variation, to the nomadic tribes of ancient days; and they picture to us with equal truth and vivacity, not only the present Bedouins, but also the bands of the Amalekites, Moabites, Midianites, and others, who wandered over those regions in the periods of Jewish history.

§ 1. *General Situation and Extent of Idumea or Edom.*

The general position, extent, and character of the land of Edom, has already been pointed out, in the eighth number of the present work, in an article on the Wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert. To that article the reader is referred, as also to the accompanying map;² and therefore, it will here be necessary to make only a very general statement. It will be recollected that the Jordan runs every where through a valley, in most places narrow, and shut in by parallel ranges of mountains. These mountains in two places expand so as to form circular or rather elliptical basins of considerable extent; of which the northern is occupied by the lake of Tiberias; and the southern by the Dead sea, in which the Jordan now terminates. South of the Dead sea, however, the same ranges of mountains again approach and continue parallel to each other, enclosing between them a deep and broad valley of sand, called towards the north El Ghor and towards the south El Araba, which extends in a direction nearly S. S. W. to the eastern or Elanitic gulf of the Red sea, at Akaba. This valley is obviously a continuation of the valley of the Jordan; through which, in all probability, in very ancient times, before the Dead sea was formed on the plains of Sodom, that river discharged its waters into the Elanitic gulf. The length of this valley, between the two seas, is about 95 minutes of latitude, from about lat. $31^{\circ} 5'$, to lat. $29^{\circ} 30'$ north, or about 110 English miles in a direct line. The mountains which skirt the valley of the Jordan, on either side, from the lake of Tiberias to Akaba, are known in Scripture by various names in different parts. On the west, next to the lake of Tiberias, they constitute the mountains of Gilboa; then the mountains of Ephraim; then those of Judah, which include the range west

² See *Bibl. Repos.* Vol II. p. 775, 776, 777 sq.

of the Dead sea to the southern border of Palestine. South of this, the mountains on the west of the Ghor, which are narrow and only serve to separate the Ghor from the vast desert of Paran, have no specific name in Scripture; at least, none which we can certainly determine. On the east, the mountains south of the lake of Tiberias are those of Gilead and Bashan; then those of Reuben, etc. then those of Moab around the eastern side of the Dead sea. The mountainous tract south of the Dead sea, on the eastern side of the Ghor, which is much broader and higher than that on the western side, and extends to Akaba, is, without doubt, the Mount Seir of the Scriptures, the country of the Edomites. At the present day the northern part of it, from a *wady* not far from Kerek to the wide valley El Ghoeyr which descends from the eastern desert into the Ghor, is known by the name of *Djebal*, i. e. *mountains*; manifestly the *Gebal* of the Hebrews and the *Gebalene* of the Romans.³ The next portion, extending to the Wady Gharendel, is called *Djebel Shera*, which is supposed by many to be the same name as *Mount Seir*, though this is doubtful. In this portion are situated the ruins of the ancient Petra, the renowned capital of Idumea. Farther south, the continuation of the chain to the waters of the Elanitic gulf, is called *Djebel Hesma*. Eastward of this mountainous tract, which seems in general not to be more than from eight to twelve miles broad, lies the vast and stony plain of the Arabian desert. The mountains, as seen from the Ghor, appear to have a very considerable elevation; but as seen from the eastern plain, they look only like low hills; the desert being upon a much higher level than the Ghor. This great valley also seems to have a rapid slope towards the south; for the eastern mountains apparently increase in height towards the south, those of Hesma being higher than any of the others farther north; while as seen from the eastern plain they all appear to continue of the same altitude.⁴ Ruppell estimates the height of the mountains of Hesma near Akaba, at 3000 French feet (about 3250 English feet) above the sea.⁵

That this tract of country was the seat of the children of Esau, seems scarcely to admit of question, since the researches of Burckhardt and Legh have brought to light its geographical

³ Ps. 83: 7 or 8. So Eusebius, *Onomast. Art.* Ἰδουμαία.

⁴ Burckhardt's *Travels in Syria*, etc. p. 435.

⁵ *Reisen*, p. 180.

features, and the names by which its divisions and towns are still known, corresponding in so many particulars to the notices which are given in Scripture, and in ancient profane writers.⁶ We shall go more into detail on these points in the sequel. It is only proper to add here, that it is not necessary to regard the Edomites as wholly confined to this region. It is not improbable that they also had possession, at least occasional, of the mountains and parts of the desert west of the Ghor; as we know that at a later period they subdued the southern part of Palestine, as far as Hebron; and also made excursions through or around the land of Moab, and became masters of Bozrah.

On all the best maps up to the time of Burckhardt, Mount Seir and the country of Edom are laid down as situated directly south of Palestine, between the extremity of the Dead sea and Egypt; where we now know that there exists nothing but a wide and pathless desert. Had Burckhardt accomplished nothing but his researches in these regions, his journey would still have been worth all the labour and cost expended in it; although his discoveries thus shed their strongest light upon subjects, which were not comprehended in the plan or purpose either of himself or his employers.⁷

§ 2. *Name, Settlement, and earliest History of Idumea.*

The original name of the country inhabited by the Edomites was *Mount Seir*. It is first mentioned in Gen. 14: 6, where Chedorlaomer and his confederates are said to have smitten "the Horites in their Mount Seir." These Horites, as the name signifies, (Heb. חֲרִי from חֹר a *hole, cave*,) were dwellers in caves; a description of people who were afterwards called by the Greeks *Troglodytes*, *Τρωγλοδυται*, a word of the same signification as Horites, derived from *τρώγλη* a *cave*. The appellation was in this case obviously drawn from the habits of the people; for Jerome says that "the whole of the southern part of Idumea, from Eleutheropolis to Petra and Aila, was full of caverns which were used as dwellings;"⁸ and Josephus also

⁶ See particularly the remarks on the situation of Kadesh, in Vol. II. p. 791, of this work.

⁷ See some remarks on the character of Burckhardt as a traveller, in Vol. II. p. 597, of this work.

⁸ Comm. in Obad. vs. 1. "Ornis australis regio Idumæorum de

mentions a valley in the region west of the Ghor, called Pharan, which was full of such caves.⁹ We shall also see in the sequel, that even Petra, the capital city, was in a great measure composed of similar habitations; so that in all probability, (as Jerome affirms,) the Idumeans in every age were in fact *Troglodytes*, or dwellers in caves; though not usually called by this name as a specific designation.¹⁰

At a later period, Esau, the elder son of Jacob, who was also called Edom, Gen. 25: 30. 36: 8, removed into this region from the face of his brother Jacob, Gen. 36: 6—9, and took possession of it as a country which the Lord had destined for the residence of his posterity, Deut. 2: 5. Gen. 32: 3. His father Isaac had described to him this land in his prophetic blessing, Gen. 27: 39, 40, "Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." How literally this prophecy was fulfilled, we shall see in tracing the further history of the Edomites in the next section. From this country Esau came to meet Jacob, on his return from Mesopotamia, at the ford of the Jabbok, Gen. 32: 3, 22. 33: 1, 16.

For a long period afterwards, and so late indeed as the time of Ezekiel, (35: 2, 3, 7,) this land still continued to be known occasionally by the name of *Mount Seir*; though *Edom* was now the more common appellation. The name *Seir*, שַׁעִיר, means strictly *hairy*, and hence, as applied to a country, may signify *rough, mountainous*. It is therefore synonymous with *Esau*, עֵשָׂו, which also signifies *hairy*; and who is described as a *hairy man*, Gen. 25: 25. 27: 11. This circumstance seems to have misled Josephus, to regard Esau and Seir as

Eleutheropoli usque ad Petram et Ailam (haec est possessio Esau) in specubus habitatiunculis habet, et propter nimios calores solis quia meridiana provincia est, subterraneis tuguriis utitur." Jerome is here speaking of the Idumea of a far later age, which included the southern part of Palestine.

⁹ Bell. Jud. IV. 9. 4. Comp. Bibl. Repos. Vol. II. p. 790.

¹⁰ See HILLER'S *Onomasticon* V. T. p. 506. C. B. MICHAELIS *Diss. de antiquiss. Idumaeor. historia*, § 12 sq. in Pott and Ruperti's *Sylloge Commentt. theologicar.* P. VI. J. D. MICHAELIS *Commentt. de Troglodytis Seiritis*, in his *Syntagma Commentatt.* P. I. p. 194.

the name of one and the same person.¹¹ But according to Gen. 36: 20, Seir was the ancestor of the Horites, and lived undoubtedly at an earlier period than Esau. It is however not improbable, that the region was thus named *the rough*, rather from its character, than from any of its primeval settlers. It is usually affirmed, that the present name of *Djebel Shera*, which is appropriated only to the middle portion of this range of mountains, extending between the Wadys El Ghoeyr and Gharendel, is derived from the ancient name of *Seir*; but this is on good grounds called in question by Gesenius;¹² since the present Arabic name has a different signification; and we find also Mount Seir described as being adjacent to the southern border of Palestine, a position which could hardly be attributed to the modern *Shera*.

The name *Idumea*, *Ἰδουμαία*, is merely the Greek mode of pronouncing *Edom*; or rather, according to Josephus, it is a softer and more elegant pronunciation of what would properly be written *Ἰδῶμα*.¹³ The Hebrew Scriptures speak of this land only under the names of Mount Seir and Edom;¹⁴ although the English version has sometimes substituted Idumea for these, e. g. Is. 34: 5, 6. Ez. 35: 15. 36: 5. The Septuagint has more commonly *Ἰδουμαία*, 2 Sam. 8: 14. 2 K. 14: 10; though sometimes also *Ἰδῶμ*, as Num. 33: 7. 1 K. 11: 15. 2 K. 14: 7. The Apocryphal books have only the form *Ἰδουμαία*, 1 Macc. 4: 29, 61. 5: 3. 2 Macc. 10: 16; and this is also found in Mark 3: 8, the only passage where mention is made of

¹¹ Antiq. I. 20. 3. *Ἐπεχώρησον εἰς Σάιραν ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ἐποίητο τὴν διαίταν, προσαγορεύσας τὸ χωρίον ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ τριχώσεως Λαοσίων.*

¹² Notes to Burckhardt's Travels, Germ. ed. p. 1067. "That the biblical *Seir* and the Arabic *Shera* are etymologically related, I would not decidedly affirm; at least they have very different meanings; the first, *hairy*; the second, *region, possession*, [according to the Camoos, also *mountain*, p. 1900.] The name *Seir* had also in the Bible a wider extent, and comprised the whole territory of Edom, including the *Djebel*; whence it could also be named as the southern border of Palestine, Josh. 11: 17. 12: 7."

¹³ Jos. Ant. II. 1. 1.

¹⁴ Jerome says: "Sciendum quod in Ebraeo numquam scribatur *Idumaea*, sed semper *Edom*, quam *Idumaeam* Graeca expressit translatio." Comm. in Ezech. xxv. 12.

this country in the New Testament. The Greek and Roman writers likewise knew only the name *Idumea*; which however they, as well as Josephus, employ in the wider sense of a later age, including under it the southern parts of Palestine, and sometimes Palestine itself, as we shall more fully see hereafter.

Scripture informs us, that the descendants of Esau succeeded the Horites in Mount Seir, "when they had destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead; even as Israel did unto the land of his possession;" Deut. 2: 12, 22. We might from this infer, that the subjugation and expulsion of the Horites was gradual, and that they continued for perhaps a long period to occupy portions of the country, along with the children of Edom; just as the Philistines and Canaanites remained and dwelt for centuries with the Israelites in Palestine, before they were subdued, or became amalgamated with them. This inference is further confirmed by the fact, that with the genealogical tables of the chiefs of the Edomites in Gen. c. 36, and 1 Chr. c. 1, there is also given a similar list of apparently contemporary chiefs of the descendants of Seir. From these genealogies it would appear, that the Horites, as well as the children of Edom, were like the Israelites divided into tribes, and these tribes again subdivided into families;¹⁵ a division that still prevails among the Arabic hordes which at the present day inhabit the same regions. These genealogical tables, both of Edom and Seir, contain the names apparently of the heads of such families; probably only those of the more distinguished individuals who held those stations, and who by their talents and renown acquired influence and power over other families and perhaps whole tribes; just as many a modern Arab *Sheikh* exerts an influence far beyond the sphere of his hereditary domain.¹⁶ Of these Edomite heads of families, the most conspicuous, and indeed the only one whose descendants became known, was *Theman* or *Teman*, a grandson of Esau, Gen. 36: 10, 11, from whom a district of the territory of

¹⁵ Heb. מְשִׁבֵּת, מְשִׁבֵּת. Comp. Josh. 7: 14.

¹⁶ Compare in the sequel, the accounts of Burckhardt and Legh respecting the Sheikh of Kerck. The Hebrew name of these chiefs is מְשִׁבֵּת, which signifies literally *the head or chief of a family*, and should have been translated accordingly in our English version, where we now find the word *dukes*,—a term which can convey only a false impression to the reader. In Zech. 9: 7. 12, 5, 6, the same word is translated *governor*.

the Edomites took its name;¹⁷ and this name was preserved, so late as the time of Eusebius, in a town or village *Theman* situated about five Roman miles from Petra or Sela, and the seat of a Roman garrison.¹⁸ The Temanites enjoyed the reputation of great wisdom; Jer. 49: 7. Baruch 3: 22, 23. It was from this circumstance, perhaps, that the author of the book of Job placed the most important of the attempted refutations of Job's arguments, in the mouth of Eliphaz the Temanite.¹⁹

At a very early period, and during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, the regal form of government appears to have been introduced into Edom, in connexion with the more ancient constitution of tribes and chiefs. In Num. 20: 14, Moses is said to have sent messengers to the *king* of Edom, to ask permission to pass through his territory; and in Gen. 36: 31—39 and 1 Chr. 1: 43—50, we have a list of eight kings who reigned over Edom *before* there was any king in Israel. There is here no necessity for supposing, with Rosenmueller,²⁰ that these were kings only of a part of the country, while the other part remained under its former chiefs; since there is no hint of this in the Scriptures, and indeed nothing which would naturally lead to such a conclusion. The more probable circumstances of the case, as they lie on the surface of Gen. c. 36, would seem to be the following. In verses 15—19, we have an enumeration of the earliest chiefs of the Edomite families and tribes; and in verses 29—30, a similar list of the contemporary chiefs of the Horites. These lists were most probably given by Moses, the author of the Pentateuch. A later writer, perhaps Ezra who is said to have revised and arranged the sacred books, very naturally saw fit to subjoin a catalogue of the rulers who subsequently had dominion in Edom,

¹⁷ Jer. 49: 7, 20. Ez. 25: 13. Obad. 9.

¹⁸ Euseb. *Onomasticon*, Art. *Θαιμάν*. The name *Theman* or *Teman*, Heb. תֵּמָן, signifies *what is on the right hand*; and hence, according to the Hebrew mode of designating the different points of compass, it means also *the south*. When therefore it is said in Hab. 3: 3, that "God came from Teman," this may perhaps refer to the district of Teman above described, which was near to Mount Hor; or it more probably is put as a poetical designation for *the south* in general.

¹⁹ A son of Esau, and the father of Teman, was likewise called Eliphaz, Gen. 36: 10, 11.

²⁰ *Bibl. Geog.* III. p. 69.

not improbably from 1 Chron. 1: 43—50.²¹ But it is no where said, that this regal government supplanted or destroyed the ancient constitution; indeed it would seem rather to have been superadded to the latter; as was at first also the case in Israel, where the elevation of Saul to be king, produced no important change in the general arrangement and government of the individual tribes. Besides, the kings of Edom named in the list were not hereditary, nor was there any single metropolis of the kingdom; but each king is said to have had his own particular city and royal residence. Nay, so far from there having been an hereditary royal line of descent, we find that one at least of these kings was apparently a foreigner, from Rehoboth on the river Euphrates, Gen. 36: 37. Nor is there any necessity for supposing that they all reigned in immediate succession; the phrase “reigned in his stead” implying no more than that one king arose *after* another, whether immediately or not. That they did not immediately succeed each other is here rendered probable by the circumstance, that only *eight* reigns are mentioned as occupying the whole interval from Moses (Num. 20: 14) to Samuel, a period of at least 450 years. Taking all these facts together, viz. that the kingdom was not hereditary, that each king had his own different residence, that one at least was a foreigner, and that they probably did not reign in immediate succession,—it would seem to be an obvious conclusion, that these kings were only distinguished chieftains, whose valour and wisdom raised them to a station of power and authority over the whole nation; but whose acquired rank was not transmitted to their descendants; because their influence, being merely personal, ceased with their lives, and all things then reverted to their former state. At a later period, mention is indeed made of the *king's seed* in Edom, 1 K. 11: 14; but this necessarily implies nothing more than that Hadad, who lived in the time of David, was a relative of the last king of Edom. The list of chiefs subjoined to the catalogue of these kings, Gen. 36: 40—43, would seem

²¹ There is thus no occasion for the supposition of C. B. Michaelis, that this list of the kings of Edom was inserted by Moses *prophetically*. It is obviously one of those few passages in the Pentateuch, which may have been added by a later hand, like Deut. c. 34, and Josh. 24: 29 sq. Comp. Bibl. Repos. Vol. II. p. 703. See the dissertation of Michaelis referred to in note 10 above, § 11, § 22 sq. p. 218.

to comprise those who were contemporary with, or perhaps filled out the various interregnums in, the kingly government. Of these later chiefs, several bore the same names as those in the preceding catalogues.

§ 3. *Subsequent History of the Edomites, until their disappearance as a Nation soon after the Christian Era.*

The feeling of rivalry and jealousy which prevailed between the two patriarchs Esau and Jacob, appears to have extended itself down throughout all their posterity. We have seen that the Edomites refused to the Israelites a passage through their territory; thus compelling them to a long and wearisome march through the whole length of the Ghor and El Araba to the Elanitic gulf, in order to pass around the land of Edom.²² The next distinct notice of them is in 1 Sam. 14: 47, where Saul is said to have carried on a successful war against them. But David among his other wide conquests, first fully subdued the Edomites also, and placed garrisons throughout all their country.²³ Thus was fulfilled the first part of Isaac's prophetic blessing; Gen. 27: 40.

During the reign of Solomon, that prince made Ezion-geber, on the Elanitic gulf, a naval station, whence he despatched fleets to Ophir, and introduced the riches of the east into Palestine, 1 K. 9: 26. Under his reign it would seem, however, that the Edomites attempted a revolt, under Hadad, whom it is said the "Lord stirred up as an adversary to Solomon;" 1 K. 11: 14—22. But this would appear not to have been ultimately successful; for under Jehoshaphat, the fourth in the succession after Solomon, B. C. 914, it is expressly said that "there was then no king in Edom; a deputy was king," 1 K. 22: 47. This could well be no other than a Jewish governor, to whom the title *melek* or king was given, in that broad and unimportant sense in which the word was also used of the petty chiefs of the Canaanites; comp. Josh. 12: 7—24. And when afterwards Jehoshaphat is said to have fought against Moab in alliance with the kings of Israel and Edom, 2 K. 3: 9, 12, 26, nothing more

²² Num. 20: 14 sq. See on this subject the Bibl. Repos. Vol. II. p. 793.

²³ 2 Sam. 8: 14. 1 Chr. 18: 11—13. 1 K. 11: 15. Compare also Ps. 60: 8, 9, and the inscription. Ps. 108: 9, 10.

is probably to be understood than this governor of Edom, or possibly some tributary chief or *Sheikh* of renown, like the modern *Sheikh* of Kerek. Jehoshaphat was still master of the country; and built a fleet at Ezion-geber to be sent to Ophir, which was destroyed by a storm; 1 K. 22: 48. Late in his reign, the Edomites appear to have rebelled and invaded Judea in company with the Moabites, but were unsuccessful in consequence of their mutual dissensions; 2 Chr. 20: 22—25. Some years afterwards, however, under Joram, B. C. 892—884, the Edomites again rebelled and “made a king over themselves;” and although Joram was victorious against them, yet they are said to have revolted against Judah “unto this day;” 2 K. 8: 20—22. 2 Chr. 21: 8—10. It is related, indeed, that Amaziah made war upon them, and even captured Sela or Petra, their capital city, and changed its name to Joktheel, 2 K. 14: 7. 2 Chr. 25: 11, 12, 14; and that Uzziah his successor built Elath, and restored it to Judah, 2 Chr. 26: 2; but these would appear to have been but temporary conquests; for under Ahaz they made inroads upon Judea and carried away captives, 2 Chr. 28: 17; and about the same time, Rezin king of Syria expelled the Jews from Elath, of which the Edomites (according to the proper reading) again took permanent possession; 2 K. 16: 6.²⁴ Edom was now independent of Israel; and thus was fulfilled the second part of Isaac’s prophetic blessing.

From this time forward there are no further notices of the Edomites in the historical books of the Old Testament. But from the various allusions scattered throughout the later prophets, we learn, that while the Jewish state was now on the decline and fast verging to ruin, the Edomites, making use of their newly

²⁴ This passage affords one of the most obvious examples, in which the reading of the *Keri* is to be preferred. It stands thus in the English version: “At that time Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria, and drove the Jews from Elath; and the Syrians [*Keri* Edomites] came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day.” The Heb. *Kethib* is אַרְזִימִים, a form elsewhere unknown; the word for *Syrians* being always אַרְזִימִים. The *Keri*, by the change of a single letter, ר for ר, reads אַרְזִימִים, the usual word for *Edomites*, which is here found in the text of many manuscripts, and which too the Seventy must have read in their copies, since they translate *Ἰδουμαῖοι*. It is also probable that the preceding אַרְזִימִים should be read אַרְזִימִים, since the Syrians never had possession of Elath for any long time; certainly not so long as is implied in the expression “unto this day.”

acquired independence, became the great and successful rivals of the Hebrews, and extended their power and enlarged their territory on every side. Even before the Jewish exile, they had acquired possession of Bozrah in the Haouran, and of Dedan in southern Arabia;²⁵ and Edomites dwelt also in the land of Uz, Lam. 4: 21. They appear also, at this time, to have given full scope to their hereditary ill-will and enmity against the Jews; if we may judge from the expressions of the Hebrew prophets of that age.²⁶ But it was first during the invasion of Judea and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, that the Edomites found full opportunity to take vengeance upon the Israelites for their own former subjugation and slavery. They united themselves with the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar, and assisted with malicious joy in the subversion of the Jewish nation,²⁷ of whose desolated country they hoped to appropriate a great portion to themselves.²⁸ In consequence of this, the national hatred of the Jews against them became inflamed to the highest degree; as is apparent from the expressions of all the prophets who lived after the beginning of the captivity. Indeed, their hostility of feeling towards Edom was even greater, apparently, than against the Babylonians themselves; a circumstance however which may be explained on common psychological principles. When uttering imprecations against Babylon, the prophets rarely omit to couple with that city the name of Edom, as a prominent object of their direst denunciations.²⁹

That however the Edomites, notwithstanding their alliance in this instance with the Chaldeans, escaped the lot of the Jews and other surrounding nations, so as not to be brought under subjection by the proud monarch of Babylon, is not in itself probable; and there would seem indeed to be a direct allusion to such an event and the consequent desolations, in Mal. 1: 2, 3. Josephus

²⁵ Isa. 34: 6. 63: 1. Jer. 49: 7, 8—20. Ezek. 25: 13. Amos 1: 12. See the article *BOZRAH*, by the Editor, in Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, Bost. 1832.

²⁶ See especially Amos 1: 11. Joel 3: 19. Is. 11: 14.

²⁷ Ez. 25: 12—14. 35: 3—5. Obad. vs. 10—16. Ps. 137: 7. Lam. 4: 21.

²⁸ Ez. 35: 10. 36: 5.

²⁹ Ps. 137: 7—9. Obad. 1 sq. Jer. 49: 7 sq. Ez. 25: 12 sq. 32: 29. 35: 5.

also relates, that Nebuchadnezzar made an expedition, in the fifth year after his capture of Jerusalem, through Coele-Syria against the countries of Moab and Ammon, and thence against Egypt; all which he subdued.³⁰ These conquests would naturally, and almost necessarily, imply also the subjugation of Edom. But however this may be, the inhabitants of Edom were at least not carried away captives, like the Jews, into other lands. They maintained themselves in their own country, and even extended themselves into the southern part of Palestine as far as Hebron.³¹ At what time they got possession of this region, is unknown; but it would seem, from the allusions of the prophet Ezekiel referred to in the note, to have been during the Jewish exile. After the return of the Jews, the ancient national hatred again broke out in new contests, so soon as the Jews began under Judas Maccabeus to wage war in behalf of their national faith and existence. Judas gained several victories over the Edomites, and expelled them from Hebron and the adjacent towns;³² but it was John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon Maccabeus, who first subdued them entirely, about B. C. 125. He is said, by Josephus, to have taken Adora and Marissa, cities of Idumea; and to have permitted the inhabitants to remain in their country, on condition of becoming circumcised and obeying the Jewish laws. To all this they assented; and thenceforth adopting the Jewish customs and modes of life, became in a measure incorporated with that nation.³³ Still, they would appear to have been considered by the Jews as a distinct and tributary people; for we find that Antipas, an Idumean, and grandfather of Herod the Great, had been appointed governor of the Idumeans by Alexander Jannaeus (B. C. 101—74); and that Antipater, Herod's father, is likewise always described as an Idumean, who by his wealth and influence obtained from Julius Caesar the government of Judea; of which he entrusted that of Jerusalem and the vicinity to his son Phasaël, and that of Galilee to his younger son Herod, both of whom were afterwards confirmed in their authority by Antony, with the title of tetrarchs.³⁴ The subsequent power of Herod and his successors,

³⁰ *Jos. Ant.* X. 9. 7.

³¹ *Comp.* 1 *Macc.* 5: 65, with *Ez.* 35: 10. 36: 5.

³² 1 *Macc.* 5: 3, 65. 2 *Macc.* 10: 16 sq. 12: 32 sq.

³³ *Jos. Ant.* XIII. 9. 1. *ib.* 15. 4.

³⁴ *Jos. Ant.* XIV. 1. 3. *ib.* 8. 5. *ib.* 9. 2. *ib.* 13. 1.

who as kings long governed Palestine under the Roman sway, is too well known to require illustration here. Suffice it to say, that the Jews never forgot that they were strangers and Idumeans; and always felt themselves subjected to a doubly foreign yoke,—the power of heathen Rome administered by the cruel and capricious tyranny of Idumean despots.³⁵

Only one historical notice more remains of the Idumeans as a distinct people. Just before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, as Josephus relates, a body of twenty thousand Idumeans entered the city at the invitation of the *Zelotae* or Zealots, ostensibly in order to make common cause with them against the Romans; while in fact both parties gave themselves up to deeds of murder and rapine against the peaceful and wealthier citizens.³⁶ Before the actual arrival of Titus, however, these Idumeans retired from the city.³⁷ But there appear to have been five thousand Idumeans, who either remained, or returned to the city before the siege, and at first aided in its defence; but who afterwards entered into a negotiation with Titus to give up the city, on the discovery of which their chiefs were imprisoned, while many of the soldiers deserted to the Romans.³⁸

From this time onward, the Idumeans, as a people, vanish from the pages of history. They probably, like the other nomadic nations adjacent to Palestine, the Moabites, Ammonites, Midianites, Amalekites, etc. became amalgamated with the nomadic Arab tribes, who overpowered them, and who occupy their places to the present day. The anonymous writer of a work on Job, formerly attributed to Origen, asserts, that the name and language of the Idumeans had perished; and that they, like the Ammonites and Moabites, had all become Arabs, and spoke Syriac.³⁹

It must however be borne in mind, that the name *Idumea* is employed by Josephus, in a signification somewhat different from

³⁵ For an account of the family of the Herods, see NOLDIUS *de Vita et Gestis Herodum*, appended to Havercamp's Josephus, Vol. II. A sketch is also given in Reland's *Palaestina*, p. 173 sq. Comp. Calmet's Dict. Art. HEROD and AGRIPPA.

³⁶ JOS. B. J. IV. 4. 5. VII. 8. 1.

³⁷ JOS. B. J. IV. 5. 5. IV. 6. 1.

³⁸ JOS. B. J. IV. 9. 10. V. 6. 1. VI. 8. 2.

³⁹ Origenis Opera, ed. De la Rue, Tom. II. p. 852. C. p. 897. D. Reland's *Palæst.* p. 756.

its ancient meaning in the earlier ages of the Jewish commonwealth. During the Jewish exile, we have seen that the Edomites took possession of the southern parts of Palestine as far as Hebron; and the name of Idumea was also now extended so as to include these regions. Indeed, even under the Maccabees, the southern and central parts of the ancient Idumea were occupied by the Arabs, and Petra had become the capital of an Arabian kingdom, as we shall see more fully in the next section.⁴⁰ Hence the Idumea of Josephus comprises only the northern parts of the ancient Edom, and is made up mostly of the southern half of Palestine, including the city of Hebron⁴¹ and the greater part of the territory of Judah and Simeon. Jerome obviously employs the name in the same or even a greater latitude, in the passage above cited;⁴² for Eleutheropolis lay in the plain of Judah, nearly west from Jerusalem. It is in this later sense that the word is used in Mark 3: 8, where many are said to have come from Jerusalem and *Idumea* to hear Jesus, who was then by the sea of Tiberias.

From all these circumstances, it is easy to account for the fact, that the whole land of Palestine, or the country of the Jews, is often designated in Roman writers as the land of *Idumea*, and the Jews themselves are called *Idumeans*. These writers knew the people and country only as governed by the Herods, an Idumean family; and as a large portion of the land actually bore the name of Idumea, the synecdoche, by which a part was put for the whole, was entirely natural.⁴³

After the destruction of Jerusalem, the name of Idumea no longer appears in history. The original country of Edom was

⁴⁰ Jos. Ant. XIV. 1. 4 sq.

⁴¹ Jos. B. J. IV. 9. 7.

⁴² Note 8 on p. 250 above.

⁴³ Ælian. Hist. Animal. VI. 17. So the Roman poets. Thus Silius Italicus, speaking of Vespasian, III. 216,

"Palmiferamque senex bello domitabit Idumen."

Juvenal, Sat. VIII. 160,

"—Idumaeae Syrophenix incola portae."

Martial also, speaking of Vespasian and Titus, Epigr. II. 2,

"Frater Idumaeos meruit cum Patre triumphos."

Ibid. Epigr. X. 5,

"Frangat Idumaeas tristis victoria palmas."

See Reland's *Palaest.* p. 48. Cellarius l. c. II. p. 578.

VOL. III. No. 10.

now called *Gebalene*, or the *Desert of the South*, etc.⁴⁴ The name of Edom or Idumea is indeed found in later christian writers and commentators; but only with reference to its ancient signification and extent.

§ 3. *Later History of the Successors of the Idumeans, after the Christian Era.*

The twelve sons of Ishmael, whose names are given in Gen. 25: 13—15, became, it is said, "twelve princes according to their nations." Like the sons of Jacob and Esau, they became the chiefs or *Sheikhs* of various tribes and families, dwelling in tents and following the nomadic life, *before, in the presence of*, i. e. to the eastward of their brethren, the descendants of Isaac; Gen. 25: 18. The names of the two eldest sons of Ishmael, *Nebajoth* and *Kedar*, are often mentioned in later times; and the descendants of these two, and especially of Nebajoth, appear to have so far extended themselves, as to include under these appellations almost the whole Ismaelitic race. These two great Ismaelitic or Arabian tribes, are easy to be recognized in the *Nabataei* and *Kedareni*, or *Cedrei*, of the Greeks and Romans; and are mentioned together as designating the whole people of Arabia.⁴⁵ The Nabatheans, or Nabathites, spread themselves over the whole of Arabia Deserta, from the Euphrates to the borders of Palestine and the Elanitic gulf, including at a later period also Arabia Petraea; and they appear also to have inhabited portions of Arabia Felix.⁴⁶ Judas Mac-

⁴⁴ Reland's *Palaest.* p. 70. See also the next section.

⁴⁵ Plin. Hist. Nat. V. 11 or 12. "Hisce Arabes junguntur, ab oriente Canchlaei, a meridie Cedrei, qui deinde ambo Nabataciis." So Isa. 60: 7, "All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee; the rams of Nebajoth shall minister unto thee."

⁴⁶ Jos. Ant. I. 12. 4, Οἱτοὶ παῖδες Ἰσμαήλου πᾶσαν τὴν ἀπ' Εὐφράτου καθήκουσαν πρὸς τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν κατοικοῦσι, Ναβατηὴν ἢ τὴν χώραν ὀνομάσαντες· εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τῶν Ἀράβων ἔθνος, καὶ τὰς φυλὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν καλοῦσι.—Jerome, Quaest. in Gen. xxv. 13, "A Nabajoth omnis regio ab Euphrate usque ad Mare rubrum *Nabathena* usque hodie dicitur, quae pars Arabiae est."—Uranus, ad voc. *Ναβαταίων*· ἔθνος τῶν εὐδαιμόνων Ἀράβων, ἀπὸ Ναβαίου τινος. See Reland's *Palaest.* p. 90 sq. Epiphanius calls their country *Ναβατία*, Adv. Haer. lib. I. p. 142. and *Ναβατιίς*, ib. lib. II. p. 461.

caheus and his brother Jonathan, in an expedition across the Jordan, came after a march of three days to the Nabatheans, who received them in a friendly manner.⁴⁷ Strabo, quoting from Artemidorus, a Greek geographer who flourished about a century before the christian era, describes the Nabatheans as possessing a populous and well watered region on the Elanitic gulf.⁴⁸ These notices correspond with Arabia Petraea, to which also Strabo and Pliny expressly assign the Nabatheans.⁴⁹—The *Kedarenes* seem to have been less known to the Greeks and Romans. They appear to have dwelt in dark coloured tents, like many of the modern Bedouins, Cant. 1: 5; and to have had the same division into tribes and families, Ez. 27: 2. They were rich in herds and flocks, Ez. 27: 2. Is. 60: 7. Jer. 49: 29; and were also skilful archers, Is. 21: 16, 17; comp. Ps. 120: 4, 5. The country inhabited by them is not specified in Scripture; but Stephen of Byzantium reckons them to Arabia Felix; while Theodoret remarks, that in his time, they wandered with their flocks and pitched their tents as far as the vicinity of Babylon.⁵⁰

At what time the Nabatheans gained foothold in Arabia Petraea, and supplanted the Edomites in their ancient possessions and their metropolis Petra, we have no means of ascertaining. It must have been at an early period; for Antigonus, one of Alexander's successors, who died B. C. 301, sent two expeditions from Babylon against the Nabatheans to whom Petra even then belonged; in the first of which the city was captured, and in the second was besieged in vain.⁵¹ No mention is made of any other city as pertaining at that time to the Nabatheans; although they must naturally have had possession of Elath, Ezion-geber, and other

⁴⁷ 1 Macc. 5: 24, 25. Jos. Ant. XII. 8. 3.

⁴⁸ Strabo Lib. XVI. 4. 18. Comp. Diod. Sic. III. 43. II. 48. Reland l. c.

⁴⁹ Strabo XVI. 4. 18, *Πρὸς τὴν Πείραν, τὴν τῶν Ναβαταίων καλουμένων Ἀράβων.*—Plin. H. N. VI. 28 or 33, "Nabataei oppidum includunt Petra nomine in convalle." XII. 17.

⁵⁰ Steph. Byzant. sub voce *Κεδρανῖται.*—Theodoret, Comm. in Ps. cxx. *Οἱ δὲ τοῦτου (τοῦ Κηθάρ) ἀπόγονοι οὐ πόρρω τῆς Βαβυλῶνος μέχρι τήμερον ἐσκήνωνται.*—Reland's *Palaest.* p. 96.

⁵¹ Diod. Sic. XIX. 95. See more under the description of Petra in the next section.

places formerly held by the Edomites. Nor would they seem, from the description of Diodorus, to have had any king, or even a monarchical form of government. They were still essentially nomadic; though they had begun to engage in commercial pursuits, which at a later period they appear to have followed more extensively and to have acquired great wealth and resources. In connexion with all this they became of course less nomadic in their national character, dwelt in cities and towns, and were at length united under a regular government of kings,—the kingdom of Arabia, or Arabia Petraea, as it is called by the writers of that age; the appellation being most probably derived from the name of the capital Petra. This kingdom was of no very wide extent; being bounded, according to Ptolemy, on the E. by the desert, over whose wandering hordes the power of these kings seems not to have been exercised; on the W. by Egypt, thus including the desert of Paran; on the N. by Palestine, or rather the later Idumea, and a corner of the Roman province of Syria; and extending on the S. to the Elanitic gulf. It would thus be not far from 100 miles in extent from N. to S. and perhaps 250 from E. to W.⁵²

A favourite name of these kings of Arabia, was Aretas. So early as the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and before the career of the Maccabees commenced, mention is made in the second book of Maccabees of Aretas king of the Arabians, before whom Jason was accused, about B. C. 166.⁵³ At a later period, Alexander Jannæus was defeated by Obodas, also a king of Arabia, about B. C. 93.⁵⁴ Twelve years later, B. C. 81, Antiochus Dionysius made an incursion into Arabia, but was defeated and slain; and Josephus relates that the inhabitants of Damascus then invited *Aretas*, who would seem to have been the victorious Arabian king, to assume the sovereignty over them as the successor of Antiochus. This he did; and afterwards led an army into Judea.⁵⁵ About twenty years after this, B. C. 61, Hyrcanus, the son of Alexander Jannæus, at the instigation of Antipater, took refuge with Aretas, king of Arabia, from the supposed intrigues and criminal designs of his brother Aristobulus. Aretas received him favourably; and undertook the siege of Jerusalem

⁵² Mannert l. c. p. 129.

⁵³ 2 Macc. 5: 8.

⁵⁴ Jos. Ant. XIII. 13. 5. B. J. I. 4. 4.

⁵⁵ Jos. B. J. I. 4. 7 sq. Ant. XIII. 15. 1 sq.

in his behalf.⁵⁶ Whether this is the same Aretas with the preceding, we have no means of ascertaining.—In the time of Herod the Great, about B. C. 27, the kingdom of Arabia was held by Malchus, with whom another Hyrcanus attempting to take refuge, Herod made it a pretext for putting him to death.⁵⁷ In B. C. 5, we find another Obodas as king of Arabia, a man of indolent habits, who left the whole management of public affairs to a young favourite of the name of Syllaeus.⁵⁸ This latter had demanded of Herod the Great the hand of his sister Salome; but broke off the match in consequence of Herod's making it a condition, that he should conform to the Jewish customs and rites. From this time he appears ever to have been inimical to Herod; and afterwards accused him before Augustus at Rome (B. C. 2) of hostilities and murders in Arabia. But Herod was able to gain a decision in his favour; and Syllaeus was condemned to be punished.⁵⁹ Obodas was at this time dead, and was succeeded by Æneas, who took the name of Aretas, and was confirmed in his kingdom by Augustus.⁶⁰ From this it would appear, that although the kingdom of Arabia had not been actually subdued by the Romans, yet its kings felt themselves in a measure dependent on the will of the Roman sovereign. Indeed, Josephus says expressly, that Augustus had at first intended to bestow the kingdom of Arabia on Herod, rather than give it to Aretas. The expedition of Ælius Gallus, which occurred under Obodas, goes to shew the same thing. Gallus was the friend of Strabo, and governor of Egypt. He was sent by Augustus on an expedition from Egypt into Arabia. After various hindrances and obstacles, arising mainly from the deceit and treachery of the same Syllaeus, he arrived with his forces at Albus Pagus (*Λευκή Κώμη*), the emporium of the Nabatheans, situated on the Red Sea. Here he was kindly received by Obodas and Syllaeus, as allies of the Romans, and remained a whole summer and winter in order to refresh and restore his troops. Hence he marched into the interior, visited the

⁵⁶ Jos. Ant. XIV. 1. 4 sq. B. J. I. 6. 2 sq.

⁵⁷ Jos. Ant. XV. 6. 2.

⁵⁸ Jos. Ant. XVI. 7. 6. Strabo XVI. 24.

⁵⁹ Jos. Ant. l. c. et XVI. 9. 2—4. ib. 10. 8 sq. B. J. I. 28. 6. ib. 29. 3.

⁶⁰ Jos. Ant. XVI. 10. 9.

territory of an Aretas, a relative of Obodas, and returned through Arabia Felix.⁶¹—The next Arabian king of whom we have any notice, is the Aretas mentioned by Paul, 2 Cor. 11: 32. Herod Antipas had espoused the daughter of Aretas; but afterwards repudiated her in order to marry Herodias the wife of his brother Philip,—a step for which he was reproved by John the Baptist.⁶² Aretas, incensed by this conduct, made war upon Herod, and totally defeated his army; a judgment upon Herod, as many of the serious-minded Jews regarded it, for his murder of John. At the entreaty of Herod, the emperor Tiberius gave orders to Vitellius, then proconsul of Syria, to chastise Aretas; but while Vitellius was preparing for such an expedition, and had sent forward some of his light troops, he received intelligence of the death of Tiberius; on which he recalled his troops, dismissed them into winter-quarters, and himself left the province, about A. D. 39. It was most probably at this period, under the weak and dissolute reign of Caligula, that Aretas, taking advantage of this supineness, made an incursion and got possession of Damascus; over which he appointed a governor with the title of *ethnarch*, as related by Paul.⁶³ This fact, however, is not mentioned by any other ancient writer; and under Nero, A. D. 54—67, Damascus again appears on coins as a Roman city. But such inroads and sudden conquests were by no means unusual among those nations; just as it was often the case that the Edomites, and Moabites, and Amalekites seized and held for a time possession of the cities of each other and also of the Jews.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Strabo XVI. 22 sq.—The *Albus Pagus* here spoken of as the emporium of the Nabatheans, would seem to have been either identical with Elath or Ailah, or at least not far distant from that port. Strabo afterwards speaks of it as being the port of Petra, XVI. 24. It is also mentioned by Arrian, *Peripl. Maris Eryth.* p. 6. See Cellarius l. c. II. p. 595.

⁶² Matt. 14: 3. Mark 6: 17.

⁶³ 2 Cor. 11: 32. comp. Acts 9: 24, 25. Jos. Ant. XVIII. 5. 1 sq. Kuinoel on Acts l. c. Vol. IV. p. 353, and Prolegom. p. xxiv.

⁶⁴ E. g. The Moabites held Petra, Isa. 16: 1, 2; comp. Gesenius Comm. in loc. p. 539. So Bozrah belonged to the Edomites, but is mentioned in Jer. 48: 26, as in the possession of the Moabites; see Gesen. on Is. 34: 6. p. 912. Comp. Judg. 3: 13. 10: 9. 1 Sam. 11: 1 sq. 13: 3. 30: 1 sq. etc. Compare also the case of the Aretas mentioned on the preceding page, who reigned for a time in Damascus.

The kingdom of Arabia Petraea continued thus nominally independent until the beginning of the second century, when it was overrun and conquered by Palma, governor of Syria, and annexed to the Roman empire under the reign of Trajan.⁶⁵ An extensive commerce had already been carried on by the people of this region. Strabo relates, probably on the authority of his friend Ælius Gallus above mentioned, that the merchandize of India and Arabia was transported on camels from Albus Pagus to Petra, and thence to Rhinocolura and other places.⁶⁶ But under the Roman dominion, the trade of these regions appears to have widely extended itself, and to have flourished in still greater prosperity; probably from the circumstance that the lawless rapacity of the adjacent nomadic hordes was now kept in check by the Roman power, and particularly by the garrisons which were everywhere established for this specific purpose. The country too was now rendered more accessible, and the passage of merchants and caravans more feasible, by military ways. From Elath or Ailah, one great road had its direction northwards to the rich and central Petra; thence it divided and led on one side to Jerusalem, Gaza, and other ports on the Mediterranean; and on the other side to Damascus. Another road appears to have led directly from Ailah along the Ghor to Jerusalem. Traces of these routes are still visible in many parts; as will be seen in the sequel. These facts are derived not from the testimony of historians; but from the specifications of the celebrated *Tabula Theodosiana vel Peutingeriana*, compiled in the fourth century.⁶⁷ According to this, a line of small fortresses was drawn along the eastern frontier of Arabia Petraea, towards the desert; some of which became the sites of towns and cities, whose names so far as now extant, will be given in the next section. But as the power of Rome fell into decay, the plundering hordes of Arabs would seem again to have acquired the upper hand; they plundered the cities, but did not destroy them; and hence those regions are still full of uninhabited, yet stately and often splendid ruins of ancient wealth and taste and greatness. Even Petra, the rich and impregnable metropolis, was

⁶⁵ Dio Cassius, LXVIII. 14. p. 777, C. ed. Leunclav. Ammianus Marcell. XIV. 8.

⁶⁶ Strabo XVI. 24.

⁶⁷ See a description of this Table in the *Encyclop. Americana* and in *Rees's Cyclop.* Art. PEUTINGER. Comp. Mannert l. c. p. 134 sq.

subjected to the same fate ; and now exists in its almost inaccessible loneliness, only to excite the curiosity of the scholar and the wonder of the traveller, by the singularity of its site, its ruins, and its fortunes.

In the beginning of the fifth century, we find introduced a new division of Judea and the adjacent countries, into *Palaestina Prima, Secunda, et Tertia*. The first comprehended Palestine proper, or Jerusalem and the southern portion of Canaan, and extended northwards to the plain of Esdraelon ; the second contained Scythopolis and the territory farther north, including Antioch, etc. The appellation *Palaestina Tertia*, and also *Palaestina Salutaris*, was applied to the countries on the east and south of the Dead sea, corresponding to the ancient Idumea or Arabia Petraea.⁶⁸ At this time, or indeed a century or two before, the christian religion had spread itself over this whole region, and the names of several episcopal cities have been preserved, besides Petra ; of which, one at least, Kerek, still nominally retains its ancient ecclesiastical importance. The acts and records of councils in the fourth and fifth centuries, have rescued many names, both of bishops and of their sees, from the oblivion in which they must otherwise long since have been engulfed.⁶⁹

The destruction of the Roman sway above described, and the dissolution of those ancient bands of power which linked these regions together as a whole, appear to have taken place long before the rise and subsequent conquests of the Mohammedan dominion ; which again united the Arab hordes into one great community of religious zealots, however distinct they might still remain in every other respect. The territory in question appears to have remained for centuries, much in the same condition as at present, the seat of wandering tribes who were the ancestors of those now called Bedouins ; with here and there a city whose permanent residents yielded allegiance to one tribe or to another, according to circumstances.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ See the authorities in Reland's *Palaest.* p. 205 sq.

⁶⁹ Reland. p. 212 sq.

⁷⁰ About the time of the christian era, the Nabatheans and other wandering tribes of the eastern desert, began to be known to Greek and Roman writers by the name of *Saraceni*, *Saracens*. This name is used by Pliny and Ptolemy in the first and second centuries, in a confined sense ; but is applied by Procopius and Ammianus, in the latter half of the fourth century, to designate all the Arabian tribes

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the crusaders penetrated at different times into this region, and erected several fortresses, which became in the sequel the occasion of various sieges and battles. The country was known to the occidental historians of that age, by the name of *Arabia Tertia*, and also *Syria Sobal*.⁷¹ The first expedition of this kind was made by King Baldwin I, in A. D. 1115. At the head of two hundred knights and four hundred esquires, he advanced as far as to Mount Horeb (Hor); and rebuilt in the vicinity an ancient fortress situated upon a hill, in a pleasant region abounding in corn, wine, and oil. This was the first fortress which the crusaders possessed in the country beyond the Jordan; and the object of Baldwin in rebuilding it, was to obstruct the caravans of the Saracen merchants in their journeys to and from Arabia. This labour was performed in the short space of eighteen days; and he gave to the fortress the name of *Mons Regalis*, by which it continued to be known to occidental writers. The Arabian geographers call it *Shobak* or *Shaubak*.⁷² In the succeeding year, (A. D. 1116,) Baldwin made an excursion with sixty bold knights to the shores of the Elanitic gulf; and abstained from advancing to Mount Sinai only at the prayer of the monks of the convent, who feared that such a

between Palestine and the Euphrates. Procop. *de Bell. Persic.* I. 17, 19. II. 10. Ammian. Marcell. XIV. 4. This continued to be their appellation during the period of the crusades; when Europeans learned to pronounce the name only with a religious horror, which has been handed down in some measure to the present day.—The etymology and meaning of the word *Saracens* are unknown. Pococke says it was not adopted by themselves, but applied to them by other nations; he supposes it to mean, most probably, simply *Orientalis*. *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 33 sq. Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* IV. p. 567. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall, etc.* Book L. Notes 29, 30.

⁷¹ The whole country east of the Jordan appears to have been called at this time *Arabia*. The region around Bostra or Bozrah was called *Arabia Prima*; that around Kerek, *Arabia Secunda*; and that farther south, *Arabia Tertia*, or *Syria Sobal*. Jacob. de Vit. c. 47. c. 28. Wilh. Tyr. XV. 21. See Wilken *Gesch. der Kreuzzüge*, II. p. 616. p. 403.

⁷² Fulcher. Carn. ad a. 1115. c. 42. Wilh. Tyr. XXII. 5. XI. 26. XX. 29. Alb. Aq. XII. 21. Schultens *Ind. Geogr. in Vit. Salad.* sub voc. *Sjaubechum*. Abulfeda *Tab. Syr.* p. 88. See Wilken l. c. II. p. 403. Gesenius' *Notes to Burckhardt's Travels*, Germ. ed. p. 1068.

visit would draw down upon them the vengeance of their Musulman masters.⁷³ The Christians appear also to have obtained possession of Ailah ; which was again taken from them by Saladin, in A. D. 1167.⁷⁴ In A. D. 1182, or not long after, during the reign of king Fulco, a prince of the country who had been cup-bearer to the king, and had received the country east of the Jordan as a fief, built the strong fortress of Kerek, or, as it is also called, Karrak or Krak, adjacent to the city of that name. This fortress became of great importance to the Christians. Its situation in the vicinity of the great route of the caravans of Turkish and Saracen pilgrims and merchants from Damascus and the country on the Euphrates to Arabia, afforded frequent opportunities of obtaining immense booty ; and it greatly obstructed also the intercourse of Saladin between Egypt and his Syrian dominions, by the way of the Red sea and Ailah.⁷⁵ It is therefore no wonder that the Mohammedans made every effort to recover it. In A. D. 1172 an unsuccessful attack was made upon it by Nureddin.⁷⁶ The impetuous and reckless Rainald of Chatillon was for several years governor of this territory, and made repeated incursions into the adjacent regions ; in one of which (A. D. 1182) he seized upon the harbour of Ailah and the fleet collected there ; despatched a portion of the fleet manned by Christians against the coast of Arabia Felix, and with his remaining troops, prosecuted the siege of the citadel of Ailah. He was however defeated in both these objects, and compelled to a shameful flight.⁷⁷ In A. D. 1183, Saladin made a terrific assault upon Kerek, where Rainald was then present ; but was induced to abandon the siege on the approach of Baldwin IV, with an army from Jerusalem.⁷⁸ But he gained possession of the fortress in A. D. 1188, only four years after ;⁷⁹ and at the same time succeeded in subduing Shobak or *Mons Regalis*, after a long siege.⁸⁰

From this time onward there are few if any notices of this

⁷³ Wilken l. c.

⁷⁴ Wilken ib. Bd. III. Th. ii. p. 139.

⁷⁵ Bohaeddin, in Wilken ib. III. ii. p. 236.

⁷⁶ Wilken ib. III. ii. p. 150.

⁷⁷ Wilken ib. III. ii. p. 222.

⁷⁸ Bohaeddin. Vit. Salad. p. 55.
Wilken ib. III. ii. p. 235 sq. 240.

Barhebr. Chron. Syr. p. 392.

⁷⁹ Wilken ib. p. 298. IV. p. 244.

⁸⁰ Wilken ib. IV. p. 244, 247.

whole tract of country; until it was first visited in modern times by Seetzen, and then more fully laid open by the journey of Burckhardt.

§ 4. *Cities and Towns of ancient Idumea.*

Having in the preceding sections gone through with the historical accounts relating to the country of Idumea in general, it only remains here to collect the geographical notices of the various cities and towns whose names have come down to us, either as having been themselves of importance in ancient times, or as serving to connect and identify the ancient and modern sites of places. But before entering upon this, it will be convenient here to bring together the results at which we have arrived, in respect to the name and limits of the land of Idumea.

We have seen that Mount Seir, or the land of Edom or Esau, included originally the mountainous tract on the east side of the great valley El Ghor and El Araba, extending between the Dead sea and the Elanitic gulf of the Red Sea. This is the Edom of the Old Testament. In the later periods of the kingdom of Judah and during the Jewish exile, the Edomites extended their conquests northward, and included Bozrah; and at the return of the Jews, were also in possession of Hebron and all the southern part of Palestine. About the same time, or not long after, they were supplanted in the southern regions of their own country, by the Nabatheans, who had possession of Petra and the adjacent territory, at least earlier than B. C. 300. The Idumea of Josephus, therefore, included only the northern parts of the ancient territory of Edom, and was applied chiefly to the southern portion of Judea; while the Greek and Roman writers of that age, did not hesitate to employ it to designate the whole of Palestine. The former territory of the Edomites was now called *Gabalene*,⁸¹ and constituted the king-

⁸¹ Also *Gabala* and *Gobolitis*. The proofs of the identity of *Gabalene* and the more ancient Idumea, are collected by *Reland, Palaest.* p. 69, 71, 82 sq. A few of the more striking may stand here. *Jos. Ant.* II. 1. 2. Οὗτοι κατοίκησαν τῆς Ἰδομαίας τὴν Γοβολίτιν λεγομένην, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ Ἀμαλίκου κληθεῖσαν Ἀμαλκίτιν πολλὴ γὰρ γενομένη ποτὲ ἢ Ἰδομαῖα, τότε πάσης αὐτῆς ἀπέσωξεν ὄνομα, καὶ τοῖς μέρεσι τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκητόρων προσηγορίας διεφύλαξεν. "These (the sons of Esau) inhabited the region of Idumea [now] called Gobolitis, and also that

dom of Arabia Petraea. It afterwards came under the power of the Romans; and from the beginning of the fifth century was included under the appellation of *Palaestina Tertia vel Salutaris*. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it was comprehended by the crusaders under the general name of *Arabia Tertia*, and was also sometimes called *Syria Sobal*. At present, as we have seen above, the whole mountainous tract between the two seas, from Kerek to Akaba, bears in three chief divisions the names of *Djebal* or *mountains* on the north, *Djebel Shera* in the middle, and *Djebel Hesma* on the south.

In our notices of the ancient cities and towns of this tract of country, we commence with the most northern, and proceed regularly towards the south; reserving however the more minute description of Petra, the metropolis, until the last.

Zoara was identical with the *Zoar* and *Bela* of Gen. 14:2. 19: 22 sq. to which Lot escaped.⁸² Josephus mentions it as belonging to Arabia, and as having been taken by Alexander Jannaeus from the Arabians, i. e. the kingdom of Arabia.⁸³ Eusebius speaks of it, under the names of *Zoar*, *Bala*, and

called *Amalekitis* from *Amalek*; for *Idumea*, which was formerly very extensive, has retained the name of the whole country, and derived appellations for the parts of it from their inhabitants." Eusebius frequently asserts the same; and indeed usually speaks of *Gabalene* and the *Idumea* of the Old Testament, as synonymous; e. g. *Onomast. Art. Ἰδομαῖα*—"Ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἀμφὶ τὴν Πέτραν Γεβαλήνη καλουμένη, i. e. as translated by Jerome; "Est autem circa urbem Petram quae nunc dicitur *Gabalene*." *Art. Ἄλλουδ, χώρα ἡγεμόνων (τῆς Ἰδομαῖας) ἐν τῇ νῦν Γεβαλήνῃ Πέτρα τῇ πόλει παρακειμένη.* Jerome, "*Regio Idumaeorum quae nunc *Gabalene* dicitur, vicina *Petrae* civitatis.*" And especially the following articles: *Γεθεά, ἐν τῇ Ἰδομαίᾳ καὶ νῦν Γεβαλήνῃ καλουμένη,* Jerome: "In *Idumea* terra quae nunc *Gabalene* dicitur." *Art. Σηϊθ, ὄρος γῆς Ἰδώμ, ἐνθα ὤκει Ἡσαὺ ἐν τῇ Γαβαλήνῃ,* Jerome: "Mons in terra *Edom*, in qua habitavit *Esau* in regione *Gabalena*." *Art. Ἰάθερ, χώρα ἡγεμόνων Ἰδώμ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς Γεβαλήνης,* Jerome: "*Jether*, regio principum *Edom* in eadem *Gabalene*." Eusebius wrote in the first half of the fourth century. The testimony of Stephen of Byzantium in the latter part of the fifth century, is to the same effect; see in *Reland* l. c. p. 83.

⁸² It is written in Greek by Josephus and Ptolemy, *Ζώαρα*; by Eusebius, *Ζόαρα*; in the Sept. *Ζόγορα*, Gen. 13: 10, and *Σηγώρ* Gen. 14: 2.

⁸³ Jos. B. J. IV. 8. 4. Ant. XIV. 1. 4.

Segor, as near the southern extremity of the Dead sea on the eastern shore, and as being a Roman garrison; and the testimony of Jerome is to the same effect.⁸⁴ It is also enumerated among the episcopal cities of Palaestina Tertia; and during the crusades it was still known, under the name of *Segor*, as a place of some importance; and was called by the common people *Palmer*.⁸⁵ In more recent times the traces of its site have almost vanished; but the location of the modern Arab village of *Szafye* would seem nearly to correspond to it. This is the principal village of the Ghowārene, a tribe of miserable peasants, who cultivate *dhourra* and tobacco upon the barren plains around this part of the sea, and are subjected to continual exactions from the neighbouring Bedouins. Burckhardt places this village at the embouchure of the Wady el Ahsa, which is in winter the rendezvous of more than ten large tribes of Bedouins; but Burckhardt did not himself visit the spot.⁸⁶ Captains Irby and Mangles place it farther north, at the opening of the Wady el Draah, near the tongue of land which extends into the sea on this side. The Wady el Draah is “a beautiful shady ravine; its banks being clothed in profusion with the palm, acacia, aspin, and oleander, afford a refreshing contrast to the desert appearance of the neighbourhood. Near where the Draah opens from its glen into the plain to the northward, there is very clearly to be perceived an ancient site. Stones that have been used in building, though for the most part unhewn, with bricks and fragments of pottery, are strewed over the uneven surface, for at least *half a mile* quite down to the plain. Captain Mangles noticed a column, and a pretty specimen of antique variegated glass. The hare and the partridge of the desert, or quail,

⁸⁴ Euseb. *Onomast. Arts.* Θαλάσσα ἡ ἄλμυρή, and Λουείθ. So under Βαβλὰ καὶ ἐστὶ ἡ Σίγωρ, νῦν Ζωαρά καλομένη, ἣ καὶ εἰς ἔτι νῦν οἰκεῖται, τῇ γειρᾷ παρακειμένη Θαλάσση, καὶ φρούριόν ἐστὶ στρατιωτῶν. “Babla (Bel.), now called Zoar, that is, Segor, is inhabited to the present day, is adjacent to the Dead sea, and is a garrison of soldiers.”—Jerome ad Euseb. l. c. and ad Isa. c. 15. So too Stephen of Byzantium in the latter part of the fifth century: Ζόαρ ἔστι κόμη μεγάλη ἢ φρούριον ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ, ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀσφάλτιδι. “Zoar is a large village or fortress in Palestine, on the lake Asphaltis.” Reland p. 1064.

⁸⁵ Wilh. Tyr. XXII. 30. Wilken ibid. III. ii. 241. Reland's *Palaest.* p. 213, 223. p. 1064.

⁸⁶ *Travels in Syria etc.* p. 391.

abundant in the thickets, and there were observed frequent tracks of the wild boar.⁸⁷—There can be little doubt that these appearances mark the position of the ancient Zoar or Segor.

Kara was an episcopal city in the diocese of *Rabba Moabitis*. Burckhardt recognizes it in the modern *El Kerr*, the ruins of an ancient place of considerable extent, situated in an extensive plain, but consisting only of heaps of stones.⁸⁸

Phaenon or *Phanon* or *Phynon* is mentioned by Eusebius, as situated between Zoar and Petra. Here were copper mines, wrought by convicts. It was also an episcopal city of Palaestina Salutaris.⁸⁹ Burckhardt finds a resemblance to this name in that of the modern *Tafyle*, a town of about six hundred houses. The situation of this place corresponds well to that of the ancient Phaenon. It has been assumed by some, that this was the *Punon* of the Israelites, Num. 33: 42; but there would seem to be no ground for such a supposition.—According to Eusebius, the *Dedan* of Jer. 25: 23. Ex. 25: 13, lay about four miles north of Phaenon;⁹⁰ but this is generally regarded as uncertain; though other places of Idumea are there mentioned along with Dedan.

Psora we only know to have been a bishopric of Palaestina Tertia. Burckhardt supposes the modern Beszeyra to occupy its site.⁹¹

Thoana or *Thana* is mentioned by Ptolemy, and stands also on the *Tabula Peutinger*. The modern Dhana corresponds well to it.⁹²

Carcaria is said by Eusebius to have been a fortress, one day's journey distant from Petra. This is perhaps, as Burckhardt supposes, the modern castle of *Shobak*, called also *Kerek el Shobak*, the *Mons Regalis* of the crusaders, of which we

⁸⁷ Mod. Traveller in Palest. p. 201. Amer. ed.

⁸⁸ See Burckhardt below, under date of Aug. 7. Reland *Palaest.* p. 226. See also our map of this region in Vol. II. of this work.

⁸⁹ Reland ib. p. 213, 951. Euseb. Art. *Φυνών* (Jer. *Fenon*). Athanasius, in Reland l. c. Cellarius l. c. II. p. 579. Burckhardt under Aug. 8.

⁹⁰ Art. *Δαιδάρ*, Jerome *Dedan*.

⁹¹ Reland p. 218. Burckhardt under Aug. 11.

⁹² Ptol. Geogr. V. 17, *Θοάνα* vel *Θάνα*. Reland p. 463. Burckhardt under Aug. 13. See our map.

have already spoken above. On this point, however, Gesenius expresses doubts.⁹³

Theman has been already described; see pp. 253, 254, above. We recur to it here, only because it is inserted on our map as corresponding to the modern *Maan*, of which there is no probability. Both Gesenius and Rosenmueller regard the latter as being the ancient *Maon* of the Scriptures.⁹⁴

Zodocatha occurs only in the *Notitia Dignitatum Imperii Romani*, where under the head of Palestine and in connexion with Zoar, Havana, etc. mention is also made of *Equites promoti indigenae Zodocathae*. To this corresponds well the modern name of *Szadeke*, where, according to Burckhardt, "is a hill with extensive ruins of an ancient town, consisting of heaps of hewn stones."⁹⁵

Arindela was the seat of a bishop, and is mentioned by Stephen of Byzantium as a city of Palaestina Tertia. No trace of any site corresponding to this name is known; and Burckhardt merely remarks, that the name of the Wady *Gharendal*, to the southward of Wady Mousa, bears a great resemblance to it,—implying a suggestion that the ancient *Arindela* might have been in the vicinity of this valley.⁹⁶ On our map, the English compiler has placed another *Gharendel* to the northward of *Dhana*, and marked it as *Arindela*; but without the least hint of any authority for such a location, either from Burckhardt or any other traveller.

Elath and *Ezion-geber*. These cities lay near each other at the northern extremity of the Elanitic gulf.⁹⁷ The latter is particularly mentioned in the journey of the Israelites from Sinai to Canaan, and became afterwards, under Solomon and his successors, the celebrated port whence the Jews carried on

⁹³ Euseb. *Onomast.* Art. *Καρκία*. Jerome *Carcar*.—See above on p. 269, and Burckhardt under date of Aug. 19. Gesen. Notes to Burck. p. 1068. Germ. ed.

⁹⁴ See pp. 253, 254, above; also p. 277. Burckh. under Aug. 24.

⁹⁵ Reland p. 230. Burckhardt under Aug. 24.

⁹⁶ Reland p. 581, 533. Burckhardt under Aug. 27.

⁹⁷ Jos. Ant. VIII. 6. 4. Josephus here calls *Elath*, *Ελλάνη*, *Elana*, whence the name of the *Elanitic* gulf; elsewhere he calls it *Ἰλλάθ* or *Αλλάθ*, Ant. IX. 12. 1.—The two cities are mentioned together, Deut. 2: 8. 2 Chr. 8: 17.

an extensive commerce with Ophir and the East. The scriptural notices of both are collected above, p. 256. It is not improbable that Elath was in fact a somewhat *later* city, built on a more advantageous site, and that it by degrees supplanted Ezion-geber in importance; at least all historical traces of the latter vanish, after the time when the former appears to have acquired consequence. Josephus remarks that Ezion-geber was afterwards called *Berenice*,⁹⁸ a circumstance not known from any other writer. Possibly the Albus Pagus of Strabo, mentioned above, may have been the same place.⁹⁹ The notices of Elath by the Greek and Roman writers, who knew it under the name of *Elana*, are given most fully by Cellarius.¹⁰⁰ Theodoret calls it *Ἰλάμ*, *Ailam*, and remarks that it was in his time a great emporium; and Jerome confirms this testimony, adding further that it was a Roman garrison, and that its more modern appellation was *Ailah*.¹⁰¹ This was late in the fourth century, at which period the bishops of Ailah held a prominent place in the councils of those days.¹⁰² The occupation of Ailah by the crusaders in the twelfth century, and its subsequent capture by Saladin, have been already mentioned.¹⁰³ Of Ailah at this period, Makrizi the Arabian historian says: "It is from hence that the Hedjaz begins; in former times it was the frontier place of the Greeks; at one mile from it is a triumphal arch of the Caesars. In the time of the Islam it was a fine town, inhabited by the Beni Omega. There were many mosques at Aila, and many Jews lived there; it was taken by

⁹⁸ Jos. Ant. VIII. 6. 4. See Cellarius. II. p. 583.

⁹⁹ See page 265 above.

¹⁰⁰ Vol. II. p. 582 sq.

¹⁰¹ Theodoret. in Jer. c. 49. Ἰλάμ πόλις ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ στομίῳ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς κειμένη θαλάττης. Ἰμπόριον δὲ ἦν τοῦτο πάλαι λαμπρὸν καὶ νῦν οἱ πρὸς Ἰνδοῦς ἀποπλέοντες ἐκείθεν ἀνάγονται. "Aila was a city situated on the mouth [coast] of the Red sea. It was formerly a celebrated emporium; and even now those sailing for India take their departure thence."—Jerome *de Locis*, Art. *Ailath*, corresponding to the *Ἰλάμ* of Euseb. "Ailath in extremis finibus Palaestinae, juncta meridianaе solitudini et mari Rubro; unde ex Aegypto Indiam, et inde ad Aegyptum navigatur." Sedet autem ibi legio Romana cognomento Decima; et olim quidam *Ailat* a veteribus dicitur, nunc vero appellatur *Aila*." Reland p. 554 sq.

¹⁰² Reland p. 556, where several bishops of Ailah are enumerated.

¹⁰³ See page 270 above.

the Franks during the crusades; but in 566 of the Hegira, Salaheddyn [Saladin] transported ships upon camels from Cairo to this place, and recovered it from them. Near Aila was formerly situated a large and handsome town, called Aszyoun," i. e. Ezion-geber.¹⁰⁴—At the present day, only some mounds of rubbish serve to point out the site of Ailah; and these, with the adjacent country, including the *plain* of Elath and the modern castle of Akaba, have been already fully described from the accounts of Burckhardt and Ruppell, in the preceding volume of this work; to which therefore the reader is referred.¹⁰⁵

Maon. There is no ancient *city* of this name mentioned in Idumea, though such an one existed in Judea, near the southern Carmel, and was the dwelling of Nabal, Josh. 15: 55. 1 Sam. 23: 24, 25. 25: 2. But in Judg. 10: 12, a people called the *Maonites*, Heb. מַעֲוִיָּה, are mentioned with the Egyptians, Amorites, Ammonites, Philistines, Zidonians, and Amalekites, as having oppressed the Israelites after the death of Joshua. The same people are again spoken of in 1 Chr. 4: 41, as having occupied a portion of the Jewish territory; but here our English version has translated the name by *habitations*. In 2 Chr. 26: 7, they are again mentioned as the *Mahunims*, Heb. מַחֲוִיָּה, and are joined with the Arabians. As a trace of this ancient people, we may probably regard the city of *Maan*, situated eastward from Wady Mousa, on the great route of the Syrian caravan. It is particularly described by Burckhardt.¹⁰⁶

The preceding are all the ancient places in this region, (Petra excepted,) to which any corresponding traces, either in name or situation, have been discovered in modern times. We subjoin a few others, of which no such traces have as yet been found; no modern traveller having visited the several locations to which they are assigned. They are all mentioned by Ptolemy, and are laid down on the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, whence also they have been transferred to our map.

¹⁰⁴ Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, etc. p. 511.

¹⁰⁵ Bibl. Repos. Vol. II. p. 773 sq. See also Calmet's Dict. Bost. 1832, Art. ELATH.

¹⁰⁶ See Burckhardt under Aug. 24. Abulfeda also speaks of *Maan* as not far distant from *Shobak*; Tab. Syr. p. 14, et *Addenda in Notis* p. 4. Gesen. Notes to Burckhardt, p. 1069.

Havana, the *Αὐαρά* of Ptolemy, of which *Equites sagittarii indigenae* are mentioned in the *Notit. Dignitatum Imp. Rom.* It was on the military way between Aila and Petra.¹⁰⁷

Rasa, Ptol. *Γεράσσα*, not far from Ailah on the military road to Jerusalem.

Gypsaria, Ptol. *Γυψαρία*, north of *Rasa*, on the same route; as are also *Lysa*, Ptol. *Λύσα*; and *Eboda*, Ptol. *Ἐβόδα*.

Elusa, Ptol. *Ἐλουσα*, is assigned by Ptolemy to Idumea west of the Jordan, and Peutinger's Chart places it on the route from Ailah to Jerusalem, S. W. of the southern extremity of the Dead sea. Jerome also speaks of it as situated in the desert of Kadesh. It was the seat of a bishop; and seems to have been a place of considerable importance.¹⁰⁸

Thamaro or *Thamara*, Ptol. *Θαμαρά*, Eusebius mentions as a castle, one day's journey south of Hebron towards Ailah.¹⁰⁹

PETRA. We come at length to the celebrated capital of all this region in ancient times, called from its singular situation *Petra*, i. e. *the rock*, in Heb. *פֶּטְרָה*, *Sela*, which also means *rock*. It would seem to be first mentioned in Scripture in Judg. 1: 36, where "the coast of the Amorites" is described as being from "the *rock*, and upward," Heb. *Sela*. In 2 K. 14: 7, it is said that Amaziah "slew of Edom in the valley of Salt ten thousand, and took *Selah* by war, and called the name of it Joktheel unto this day." Isaiah, in c. 16: 1, alludes to the *lamb* or tribute to be sent to the ruler of the land from *Sela* to the wilderness. These are the only obvious notices of *Petra* contained in Scripture; though some would also understand only the city of *Petra* in Is. 42: 11. The last of these notices cannot be placed less early than about B. C. 700.

About four centuries later, it had passed into the possession of the Nabatheans, and had already become a place of trade. Antigonus, who succeeded Alexander the Great in Babylon, and who died B. C. 301, sent two expeditions against the Nabatheans, directed particularly against *Petra*, as their chief city. In speaking of these expeditions, Diodorus Siculus describes

¹⁰⁷ Reland p. 230.

¹⁰⁸ Reland p. 755 sq. and Jerome as there cited. The names of several bishops are also given by Reland.

¹⁰⁹ Reland p. 1031. Mannert l. c. p. 139.

Petra as being a very strong place, though without walls, situated not far from a celebrated emporium. At the time of the first expedition, under Athenaeus, the Nabatheans were mostly absent at this emporium for the sake of traffic, having left their wealth, with their families, *ἐν τινος πέτρας*, i. e. either upon a certain rock, or more properly, in a certain place called Petra. Athenaeus seized the place by surprize, and found a great quantity of frankincense and myrrh deposited in it, and also five hundred talents of silver. Athenaeus retired immediately; but was afterwards pursued by the Arabians, who falling upon his troops unawares killed not less than eight thousand men.¹¹⁰ The Nabatheans complained to Antigonus, who after a course of deceitful negotiations sent another expedition under his son Demetrius against Petra. Of this the Nabatheans received intelligence, and prepared themselves for an attack, by depositing all their wealth under the protection of a strong garrison in Petra, to which there was but a single approach, made as Diodorus says by hand; and by driving their flocks into the deserts. The consequence was, that the whole design of Demetrius was baffled.¹¹¹ In connexion with these accounts, Diodorus makes no mention of any king of the Nabatheans, nor of any kingly government as existing among them.¹¹²

Strabo, the celebrated geographer, who flourished under the reign of Augustus, thus speaks of the Nabatheans and their capital. "Next beyond Syria, the Nabatheans and Sabeans inhabit Arabia Felix. They made frequent incursions into Syria, before it belonged to the Romans; but now both they and the Syrians obey the Roman power. The metropolis of the Nabatheans is called Petra; because it lies in a situation which in other respects is plain and level, but is surrounded by a circular rock or mountain, which externally is precipitous, but internally affords several fountains, sufficiently copious for a supply of water and for the irrigation of gardens. Beyond this enclosure, the whole region is a desert, and particularly towards

¹¹⁰ Diod. Sic. XIX. 95.

¹¹¹ Diod. Sic. XIX. 95—98. How appropriately Diodorus describes Petra as having but a single way of approach, *ὄψης μίας ἀναβάσεως χειροποιήτου*, will be seen in the descriptions of Burckhardt and Legh.

¹¹² Comp. p. 264 above.

Judea."¹¹³ Petra at this time, as we have seen above, was the capital of the kingdom of Arabia, then governed by Obodas ; and was also a central point for the traffic of those regions, as carried on from the Red sea, to Damascus and Mesopotamia on the one side ; and on the other side, to Gaza, Jerusalem, Sidon, and other places on the coast of the Mediterranean.¹¹⁴ The kingdom was hereditary ; or, at least, the king was always one of the royal family ; and had a prime minister, or vizier, *ἐπίτροπος*, from among his companions, who was styled the king's *brother*. Such would seem to have been the station of Syllaenus, mentioned above. The Stoic philosopher Athenodorus, the friend of Strabo, spent some time in Petra ; and related with admiration, that he had found many Romans and other strangers residing there ; that these often had legal processes with one another and with the inhabitants ; while the latter lived in entire harmony and union, under excellent laws. Strabo then proceeds to give an account of the expedition of his friend Ælius Gallus into these regions, of which we have already spoken.¹¹⁵

Similar to this, but more definite and exact, is the testimony of Pliny in the first century. "The Nabatheans inhabit the city called Petra, situated in a valley or amphitheatre less than two thousand paces in amplitude, surrounded by inaccessible mountains, with a stream flowing through the midst.—Here the two ways meet, which are travelled by those going to Syria and

¹¹³ This whole passage is too important not to be given in the original. It is found in Strabo Lib. XVI. 4. 21. *Πρώτοι δ' ἐπὶ τῆς Συρίας Ναβαταῖοι καὶ Σαβαῖοι τὴν εἰδαίμονα Ἀραβίαν γέμονται, καὶ πολλάκις κατέτρεχον αὐτῆς, πρὶν ἢ Ῥωμαίων γενέσθαι· νῦν δὲ κἀκίνοι Ῥωμαίοις εἰσὶν ὑπήκοοι καὶ Σύροι. Μητρόπολις δὲ τῶν Ναβαταίων ἐστὶν ἡ Πέτρα καλομένη· κείτῃ γὰρ ἐπὶ χωρίον τᾶλλα ὄμαλῶ καὶ ἐπιπέδῳ, κύκλῳ δὲ πέτρα φρουρούμενον, τὰ μὲν ἐκτὸς κρημονῆ ἀποτόμου, τὰ δ' ἐκτὸς πηγᾶς ἀφθόρονος ἔχοντος εἰς τε ὑδρείαν καὶ κηπίαν. Ἐξω δὲ τοῦ περιβόλου χώρα ἔρημος ἢ πλείστη, καὶ μάλιστα ἢ πρὸς Ἰουδαίαν.—* In this extract, moreover, we find a confirmation of the fact stated on p. 265 above, viz. that the kings of Arabia, although they had not been actually subdued by the Roman arms, were yet in a measure dependent upon, and subservient to, the Roman power.

¹¹⁴ Strabo XVI. 4. 24. Compare pp. 265, 267, above.

¹¹⁵ Strabo XVI. 4. 21 sq. Compare p. 265 above.

Palmyra, and by those coming from Gaza.¹¹⁶ About the same time too, Petra is often mentioned by Josephus, as the capital of the kingdom of Arabia Petraea, in all his notices of that kingdom and its connexion with Jewish affairs.¹¹⁷ With that kingdom it passed under the immediate sway of the Romans during the reign of Trajan. His successor, Adrian, appears to have given the city his own name; at least coins are extant, which were probably struck there, bearing the inscription *Ἀδριανῆ Πέτρα Μητρόπολις*.¹¹⁸ But the circumstance is mentioned by no ancient writer.—In the succeeding centuries, Petra appears in the Acts of Councils, and in all the ecclesiastical *Notitiæ*, as the principal episcopal see of Palaestina Tertia, and is sometimes expressly noted as the ecclesiastical metropolis. Of the bishops of Petra, Germanus was present at the council of Seleucia, A. D. 359; and Theodorus at the council of Jerusalem, A. D. 536.¹¹⁹ In the *Notitiæ* collected during the crusades, the see of Petra is no longer found.¹²⁰ The place appears then to have been, as now, in ruins; and already to have borne in Arabic the name of *Wady Mousa*, which the crusaders properly translated by *Vallis Mosis*.¹²¹

In the earlier authors the name of Petra is every where written *ἡ Πέτρα*; in the later ones and in the Acts of Councils, we find it in the Plural, *αἱ Πέτραι*.¹²² According to Josephus, the an-

¹¹⁶ Pliny, H. N. VI. 28 or 32. "Deinde Nabathaci oppidum includunt Petram nomine in convalle, paulo minus II mill. passuum amplitudinis, circumdatum montibus inaccessis amne interfloente.—Huc convenit utrumque bivium, eorum qui et Syriae Palmiram petiere, et eorum qui ab Gaza venerunt."

¹¹⁷ See the references to Josephus on pp. 265, 266, above.

¹¹⁸ Eckhel *Doctrina Numor. vet.* Tom. III. p. 503.

¹¹⁹ Reland, pp. 212, 218. p. 933.

¹²⁰ Reland, p. 219 sq.

¹²¹ Gesenius' Notes to Burckh. p. 1068. "The name *Valley of Moses* is of unknown origin, but occurs in the time of the crusaders, who called it *Vallis Mosis*." This fact I must leave on the credit of Gesenius, who has stated it without citing his authority. I have not been able to find it elsewhere thus mentioned, in the books to which I have access.

¹²² So in Suidas, sub voc. *Γενέθλιος*. This was not unusual in other similar names, as *Πέλλα* and *Πέλλαι*, *Ἄρκα* and *Ἄρκαί*. Reland p. 933.

cient name of the city was *Arkem*, Ἀρχήμη, or *Arekeme*, Ἀρεκέμη,¹²³ which is the Greek form of the Hebrew or Syriac כַּדְשׁ, *Rekem*, with the article prefixed. This was the name of one of the kings of Midian slain by the Israelites, Num. 31: 8, and both Josephus and Eusebius mention him as the founder of this city, which was thus called by his name in the Shemitish languages.¹²⁴ Hence the assertion has often been made by modern writers also, that *Rekem* and *Petra* were identical; but from the statements in the note below, this would seem to be at least problematical; or rather without any good foundation.¹²⁵

The geographical position of *Petra* is assigned by ancient writers with a good degree of distinctness. Diodorus places

¹²³ Jos. Ant. IV. 4. 7. The reading is here Ἀρχήμη, but should doubtless be Ἀρχήμη, both from the parallelism of Ἀρεκέμη, which occurs ib. IV. 7. 1; and of Ἀρχήμη and Πέτρι in Eusebius; as well as on account of the derivation from כַּדְשׁ.

¹²⁴ Jos. Ant. IV. 7. 1. Euseb. *Onomast. Art.* Ἀρχήμη, Πέτρι, Πέτρα.

¹²⁵ The Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan apply the name כַּדְשׁ to *Kadesh*, Gen. 16: 14. 20: 1; but no other ancient writer, except Josephus and Eusebius, speaks of a city *Rekem* in this region. Abulfeda, however, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, mentions a place called *Rakim* or *Rekim*, which in its character would well correspond to *Petra*. *Tab. Syr.* ed. Koehler. p. 11. "Among the more celebrated towns of Syria is also *ar Rakim*, a small town near the *Belka*, all the houses of which are cut in the living rock, as if they were all of one stone." This is assumed by Schultens, as being the *Rekem* of Josephus and the *Petra* of the Greeks; *Vita Salad. Geogr. Index*, Art. ERRAKIMUM; and also by J. D. Michaelis, in his edition of Castell's *Lex. Syriac.* Art. ܠܪܟܝܡ. But the position of this *Rakim* or *Errakim*, by no means corresponds to that of *Petra*. Abulfeda says it was near the *Belka*, which is the tract opposite Jericho; and he again says, in his *Annal. Muslem.* IV. 4. ed. Reiske, or p. 15 of Schultens' *Excerpt. in Vita Salad.* that it was near to *Carach* (Kerek). Indeed, from this latter passage it appears clearly, that the place lay north of Kerek; for he says that Nureddin came on his way from Damascus to Kerek, to meet Saladin, as far as to *Rakim*, and then returned; Saladin having abandoned the siege of Kerek and withdrawn to Egypt. Just in this region Seetzen found several villages hewn out of the basalt rock, the houses of which were wholly or in great part caves. *Zach's Monatl. Corresp.* XVIII. p. 353. *Comp. Gesen. Comm. zu Jes. 16: 1.* p. 536 marg. note.

the city at the distance of three hundred stadia south of the Dead sea. Strabo says it is three or four days' march from Jericho. Pliny describes it as 600 Roman miles distant from Gaza, and 130 from the Persian gulf; where Cellarius justly suggests, that the two numbers are to be transposed, since they will thus nearly accord with the other accounts.¹²⁶ The *Tabula Peut.* places Petra about eighty Roman miles northward from *Ailah*; and this accords entirely with Burckhardt's statement respecting Wady Mousa, that it is "two long days' journey northeast from Akaba."¹²⁷ However inaccurate the above specifications may be in themselves, they are yet sufficiently definite to lead us to the decisive conclusion, that Petra could not have been situated at any great distance from Wady Mousa; and least of all could it have occupied the site of the modern Kerek.¹²⁸ Indeed, the whole description of Wady Mousa, as given by the travellers whose accounts we are about to copy, coincides so exactly with the site of Petra as described by Strabo and Pliny above, that a doubt can hardly remain of their identity. To all this is still to be added the testimony of Josephus and Eusebius, that Mount Hor, where Aaron died, was in the vicinity of Petra; as even now it rears its head above the lonely vale of Wady Mousa.¹²⁹

At what period Petra yielded to the assaults of the plundering hordes of the desert, and sunk into desolation and ruin, it is impossible to determine. It must probably have fallen some centuries before the crusades; for had it then existed in its former importance, it could hardly have escaped the notice of the christian warriors of those days. Indeed, this region was at that time full of ruined places; and *Mons Regalis* or *Shobak* was only rebuilt by king Baldwin I, on the site of an ancient fortress.¹³⁰ The first notice of Petra in modern times, seems to

¹²⁶ Diod. Sic. XIX. 98. Strabo XVI. 4. 21. Plin. Hist. Nat. VI. 28 or 32. Mannert l. c. p. 137. Cellarius l. c. II. p. 581. Other specifications of distance are also collected by Reland, p. 929, 930.

¹²⁷ See the extract from Burckhardt on the following page.

¹²⁸ This has been assumed in modern times; see p. 286 below.

¹²⁹ Jos. Ant. IV. 4. 7. Euseb. *Onomast.* Art. Ὄρος, ὄρος ἐν ᾧ τελευτᾷ Ἀαρῶν, πλησίον Πέτρας πόλεως. Jerome's Vers. "OR, mons in quo mortuus est Aäron juxta civitatem Petram."

¹³⁰ See p. 269 above.

have been the imperfect accounts received by Seetzen at Jerusalem and Kerek, respecting a place called *Bedra*; from which he rightly conjectured that the ruins of Petra were to be sought in Wady Mousa. An Arab from that region said to him: "Ah! how I always weep, when I behold the ruins of Wady Mousa, and especially those of Faroun!" Seetzen did not himself visit the spot; but his conjecture has been amply verified by Burckhardt, and the English travellers of Mr Legh's company.¹³¹

¹³¹ The following brief summary of Burckhardt's observations upon Wady Mousa, made by himself before writing out the fuller accounts of his published Travels, may properly be given in this connexion. It is extracted from a letter written by him to the Secretary of the African Institution, dated Cairo, Sept. 12, 1812, and prefixed to the volume of his Travels in Nubia, etc. See also Calmet's Dict. Art. CANAAN, p. 237 sq. "At the distance of a two long days' journey northeast from Akaba, is a rivulet and valley in the Djebel Shera, on the east side of the Araba, called Wady Mousa. This place is very interesting for its antiquities and the remains of an ancient city, which I conjecture to be Petra, the capital of Arabia Petraea, a place which, as far as I know, no European traveller has ever visited. In the red sand-stone of which the valley is composed, are upwards of two hundred and fifty sepulchres, entirely cut out of the rock, the greater part of them with Grecian ornaments. There is a mausoleum in the shape of a temple, of colossal dimensions, likewise cut out of the rock, with all its apartments, its vestibule, peristyle, etc. It is a most beautiful specimen of Grecian architecture, and in perfect preservation. There are other mausolea with obelisks, apparently in the Egyptian style, a whole amphitheatre cut out of the rock, with the remains of a palace and of several temples. Upon the summit of the mountain which closes the narrow valley on its western side, is the tomb of Haroun (Aaron). It is held in great veneration by the Arabs. (If I recollect right, there is a passage in Eusebius, in which he says that the tomb of Aaron was situated near Petra.) The information of Pliny and Strabo on the site of Petra, agree with the position of Wady Mousa. I regretted most sensibly that I was not in circumstances that admitted of my observing these antiquities in all their details, but it was necessary for my safety not to inspire the Arabs with suspicions that might probably have impeded the progress of my journey; for I was an unprotected stranger, known to be a townsman, and thus an object of constant curiosity to the Bedouins, who watched all my steps in order to know why I had preferred that road to Egypt, to the shorter one along the Mediterranean coast."

The city of **KEREK** occupies in modern times so important a place in all that has reference to the country east and south of the Dead sea, that a particular notice of it cannot well be omitted here; although it belonged not to the territory of Idumea, but rather to Moab. Still, as it was at the southern extremity of the latter country, and especially as it is at the present day the chief place of the whole region, and the headquarters of all travellers who penetrate into those countries, a description of it most appropriately belongs to an Introduction like the present.

In the Old Testament, besides the proper capital of the Moabites, *Ar*, or *Ar-Moab*, Num. 21: 15, 28. Is. 15: 1; we find mention of another important Moabitish city, קִיר מוֹאֵב, *Kir-Moab*, i. e. *the wall* or rather *fortress of Moab*, Is. 15: 1. This is doubtless the same place which is elsewhere spoken of under the name of another city, קִיר הֶרֶס, *Kir Heres*, Jer. 48: 31, 36; and קִיר הֶרֶסֶת, *Kir Hereseth*, Is. 16: 7. 2 K. 3: 25; i. e. *wall or fortress of brick or pottery*. In this last passage, Jehoram king of Israel, in company with Jehoshaphat king of Judah and the king of Edom, is said to have captured the city and destroyed it, except the walls. From the later notices of the prophets above cited, it would appear to have been rebuilt, and to have become a principal fortress of the country. In Is. 15: 1, the Chaldee translator has rendered קִיר מוֹאֵב by כְּרַכָּא דְּמוֹאֵב, pron. *K'rakka d'Moab*, which passed over into the Greek *Χαράξα* 2 Macc. 12: 17; and also *Χαρακμῶβα* or *Characmoba*, *Χάραξ* or *Charax*, by which name the city was known to the Greek and Roman writers, and is mentioned by Pliny, Ptolemy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Stephen of Byzantium,¹³² as belonging to Arabia Petraea or Palaestina Tertia. In the early centuries of the christian era, *Characmoba* was an important episcopal city, and the names of its bishops appear in the councils of those days; e. g. Demetrius was at the council of Jerusalem, A. D. 536.¹³³ This ancient name, as well as the city itself, is easily to be recognized in the modern *Kerek*, *Karak*, or *K'rak*, of the Arabs, which also signifies a *fortress*; and is the name of the chief place of the country eastward of the Dead sea, situated nearly due east from its southern extremity. During the period of the crusades, a fortress was built here by the

¹³² Reland, p. 705. *Charax Omanorum*, Plin. H. N. VI. 28 or 32.

¹³³ Reland, p. 533. Comp. p. 212, 217.

Christians, which became of great importance and was subjected to several fierce assaults, to which we have already sufficiently alluded.¹³⁴ Abulfeda, in the fourteenth century, describes *Khrakh* or *Kerek* as a small walled city, with a castle, situated on a lofty hill, and so strong that no one could indulge the hope of taking it. In the valley beneath, there are warm baths and gardens.¹³⁵ Some of the historians of the crusades have also given to this city, or rather to the country around it, the appellation of *Petra Deserti*;¹³⁶ and hence doubtless has arisen in modern times the error, by which *Kerek* has sometimes been regarded as corresponding to the ancient *Petra*.¹³⁷

Of modern travellers, Seetzen was the first to visit *Kerek*, but did not proceed any farther south.¹³⁸ He was followed by Burckhardt in 1812, who spent twenty days in the city, and has given a very full description of it. Mr Legh and his companions also passed several days in *Kerek*.

¹³⁴ See p. 270 above.

¹³⁵ Abulfedæ *Tab. Syr.* ed. Koehler. p. 89. Schultens *Vita Salad. Index Geogr. Art. Caracha.*

¹³⁶ Thus William of Tyre says of *Krak*, that it is the chief place of *Arabia Secunda* i. e. *Petræensis*, lib. XXII. c. 2, 5; and in c. 28 he affirms that *Caracha*, i. e. *Krak* or *Kerek*, is the same as *Petra Deserti*. So Schultens *Vit. Salad. Index Geogr. Art. Caracha.* In an ecclesiastical *Notitia* appended by Holstein to the *Ecl. Geogr.* of Sancto Paulo, p. 59, we find Palestine divided into four *sedes*, of which the third is "*Arabia Moabitica, id est Petra Deserti*," which had under it thirteen bishop's sees, one of which is that of *Karach*. This *Notitia* is probably later than the time of the crusades; as it speaks of *Mons Regalis* as a bishopric, having under it the Greek bishop of Mount Sinai. *Reland* p. 222, 223.

¹³⁷ The same causes which occasioned this historical error, probably gave rise to the similar traditional one, by which the present diocese of *Kerek* is called in Arabic *Batra* and in Greek *Πέτρας*, as stated by Burckhardt in his account of *Kerek*. See below, and *Travels* p. 387. *Comp. Calmet's Dict. Art. SELA.*

¹³⁸ The brief account of Seetzen may properly stand here as introductory to those of the other travellers. "Just before *Karrak* (*Kerek*) the wide plain which stretches from *Rabbah*, terminates; on this are scattered only some hills and low mountains, and the country now becomes more mountainous. [Burckhardt travelled from *Rabbah* five hours, and then entered a mountainous district, full of *Wadys*; he reached *Kerek* in six hours from *Rabbah*. *Travels* p. 377.] *Karrak*, formerly a city and the seat of a bishop, lies

We here bring to a conclusion this account of the history and geography of ancient Idumea, introductory to copious extracts from the Travels of Burckhardt and Legh in those regions. The investigation has extended itself to a much greater length, and has demanded a far greater amount of time and labour, than could at first have been foreseen. Still, it has proved very attractive to the writer; and should it afford gratification to the reader, and at the same time serve to cast light on any dark passages of the sacred volume, the writer's purpose will have been accomplished, and his best hopes fulfilled. Should articles of this class appear to be generally acceptable and useful to the readers of this work, we may hereafter proceed to survey in like manner, though less in detail, the regions east of the Jordan and north of Idumea, viz. Moab, Gilead, Auranitis or the Haouran, etc. of whose ancient history little is known to the common reader of the Bible; and which, in modern times, have been visited and explored by Seetzen, Burckhardt, Buckingham, and others. These regions are full of stately and often splendid ruins, the remains of cities which were flourishing and powerful in the time of our Saviour, and which are often alluded to in the New Testament. But the darkness of the middle ages spread a thick veil over them, which it was left for the activity of modern enterprise and research first to rend away.

The extracts from Burckhardt and Legh will be given in our next numbers.

on the summit of a high hill, at the beginning of a deep valley, and is on all sides surrounded by higher mountains. The hill on which it stands is very steep, and in many places perpendicular. The walls of the city have mostly fallen down; and Karrak can now justly lay claim to nothing more than the name of a town or village. The ruined and untenanted castle was formerly one of the most important in these regions. The inhabitants of the town consist of Mohanmedans and Greek Christians. The present bishop of Karrak lives in Jerusalem. Through the Wady Karrak, there is a charming prospect, including a part of the Dead sea and also Jerusalem, which in clear weather may be distinctly seen. The hill on which Karrak lies, is composed of limestone, and a soft white chalk, with many layers of flint, of black, blue, gray, and other colours. In the rocks in the vicinity of the place are very many artificial grottoes. Wheat is sometimes preserved here for ten years in subterraneous caverns." *Zach's Monatl. Corresp.* XVIII. p. 434. *Rosenmueller's Bibl. Geogr.* III. p. 59 seq.

ART. IV. IS THE MANNER OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM PRESCRIBED
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT?

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. at Andover.*

§ 1. *Form and Classical Use of the word βαπτίζω.*

The original etymological root of the verbs βαπτίζω, βάπτω, as also of the nouns βάπτισις, βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, βαπτιστήριον, βαπτιστής, βάπτρια, βαφή, βαφεις, βαφειον, βαφική, βάψιμος, βάψις, and in like manner of the adjectives or verbals

* The immediate occasion of writing the present dissertation, it may not be improper to state, by quotations below from two among the many letters that I have received in relation to the subject of it. It has been impossible for me to give any satisfactory answer, in the way of private letters, to my correspondents making inquiries with regard to the subject of baptism. It would occupy all my time, and be nearly a fruitless labour to attempt it. I hope to be borne with, by that class of the readers of the Biblical Repository who are not deeply interested in a dispute about rites and forms, when I appeal to them and ask them, Whether it is not time, that the stumbling-block so often thrown in the way of Christians respecting the mode of baptism, should be removed, and the churches no longer divided by contentions about it? If so, and if the following pages may have any tendency toward effecting so desirable an end, then such readers, I would hope, will not, all things considered, task me with doing amiss, because I have engaged in the present discussion.

The letters above alluded to, are the following; to which a reply will be found at the close of this discussion.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

Maulmein and Rangoon, May, 1831.

—We beg leave to request your decision on the following questions, concerning which some discrepancy of opinion obtains among the members of our mission:—

1. In translating and publishing the New Testament in the language of Burmah, shall we retain or reject the disputed passage in 1 John 5: 7?

2. Shall we transfer the Greek word βαπτίζω into the Burman language, when it relates to the ordinance of baptism; or translate it by a word significant of immersion, or by a word of some other import?

3. Are the words contained in Acts 19: 5, the words of Paul, or of

βαπτός, βαφικός, βάψιμος,—appears plainly to be the monosyllable *ΒΑΠ*. In all the words derived from this root, there is a similarity of meaning, which shows an intimate connexion between them.

the author; and if there be an ambiguity in the original, how shall we decide, when translating into a language like the Burman, whose idiom positively requires that the question be ascertained?

We remain, Rev. and dear Sir, most respectfully yours,

C. BENNETT, JNO. TAYLOR JONES, A. JUDSON, EUGENIO KINCAID,
J. WADE.

The second letter is *anonymous*; but is evidently from some friend, who appears to have thought seriously on the subject of baptism. It was received last December. I give only those parts which have relation to the *arguments* in the case. They are as follows.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

Dec. 3, 1832.

— Allow me to submit the following remarks to your consideration.

First, we do not obey the command of Christ to be baptized, unless we are *immersed*. You probably will not question the two following propositions: Baptism is nothing but a rite; a rite is nothing but a form. Are not then the following conclusions just, viz. that if we would receive the baptism, we must perform the rite; and that if we would perform the rite, we must observe the form? If these deductions be correct, will it not follow, that if we are immersed, we have observed the form; that if we have observed the form, we have performed the rite; and that if we have performed the rite, we have received the baptism, or in other words have obeyed the Saviour's command to be baptized? If we are *sprinkled*, will it not also follow, that we have not observed the form; that if we have not observed the form, we have not performed the rite; and that if we have not performed the rite, we have not received the baptism, or (in other words) have not obeyed the Saviour's command to be baptized? If a rite be nothing but a form, when we change the form do we not change the rite itself? If we change the rite, though we may adopt another, which we may think will answer the design of the institution as well, do we obey his directions? Are we not, on the contrary, undertaking to alter what we have every reason to believe is best, as he ordered it to be?

It is sometimes said, that if the *feelings* be right, it is no matter about the *form*; but from the reasoning of the preceding paragraph it appears, that while the feelings are right, the form should be observed, if we would obey. This may also be argued from the command to "believe and be baptized." Here are two duties enjoined.

As to the formation of the words, some of them adopt the smooth and others the rough consonant or *mute*, as grammarians call letters of this class, viz. π and ϕ ; sometimes with, and sometimes without, any special variation of meaning. The lead-

The first, to believe; the second, to be immersed. The one relates to the feelings, with which we are to perform the rite; the other relates to the rite, or form enjoined, viz. immersion. The application of water in any other way may be a rite, but it is not *the* rite commanded. He who has believed, has discharged the first duty; but he who has been *sprinkled*, has not discharged the second.

Secondly, the evil of the separation which is produced among Christians, by their different views of baptism, is very great. You doubtless have noticed the hard and angry feelings, which by conversation upon this subject, have been excited in the bosoms of the truly pious. You have lamented the influence of this in prejudicing impenitent men against the Gospel; in delaying the anxious, and in destroying the piety of Christians. You have seen that the evil is great. But who causes it? Evidently he who has departed, in practice, from the form laid down in Scripture. If this form be immersion, then those who practise sprinkling, have departed from the Bible. They have caused the evil; and to them belongs the guilt.

Thirdly, it is desirable that this should be done away. Now how can this best be effected? How, but by every Christian's practising the form laid down in Scripture? Is it not then the duty of every one to learn the form, and having learned it, to adhere to it? If you believe the form to be immersion, ought you not to practise this, hoping that all Christians will do the same?

Perhaps you may say, if I should renounce sprinkling, others would not; and thus the separation would still continue. Suppose it should, yet you have done your duty, and given your influence to truth. If you excuse yourself, by such reasoning, from pursuing this course, the moderate drinker may excuse himself from total abstinence on the same ground.

Fourthly, if we depart in the least from the Bible, either in doctrine or form, we are not safe, we have no stopping-place. The Roman Catholics have departed widely from the Bible in their ceremonies. The forms which they have introduced are numerous. They have destroyed the life of religion among them. These, however, were not introduced all at once. There was one, that was first in order. If however the entrance of this one had been opposed, how different would have been the state of that church! Instead of being corrupt, it would have been pure. We are safe only by adhering closely to the Bible. Is it not then the duty of every Christian, who believes immersion only to be baptism, to practise it?

ing and original meaning of *BATH*, seems to have been *dipping*, *plunging*, *immersing*, *soaking* or *drenching*, in some liquid substance. As kindred to this meaning, and closely united with it, i. e. as an effect resulting from such a cause, the idea of *dyeing*, *colouring*, *tinging*, seems also to have been often associated with the original root, and to have passed into many of its derivatives. For example; *βαπτός* *dipped*, *immersed*, *coloured*; *βάπτω* *to dip*, *plunge*, *dye*, *colour*; *βαφείς* *a dyer*, usually lim-

Fifthly, as those who are not immersed, but adopt a form of man's invention, do not obey the Saviour's command, so they will not (all other things being equal) enjoy the highest seat in heaven. Regeneration is the only qualification necessary to enter there. All who have been born again, will see God. But in heaven, there are different grades [degrees] of happiness. The degree which each will enjoy, will be proportioned to the fidelity of his obedience. To explain more fully my meaning; of two persons, who have in every other respect thought and acted and spoken alike, but the one was *immersed* and obeyed, while the other was *sprinkled* and did not obey; the former must have a higher place in heaven, than the latter. If then he would be as happy as possible in heaven, ought not he who believes immersion only to be baptism, to practise it?

Nothing is more common, than to hear persons say that the observance of the form is not essential. If they mean, it is not essential in order to enter heaven, we grant it. But to enjoy the most happiness there, it is essential; since we cannot obey unless we do it, [i. e. unless we are immersed].

These reasons are communicated briefly; but if you will think of them, you can supply what is wanting. If the denomination to which you belong are in an error in reference to baptism, and are disobeying the Saviour; producing this separation, with its attendant evils; preventing the removal of this separation; rendering itself insecure, by breaking away from the Bible; and are pursuing a course, which will diminish their happiness in heaven; ought not their interests in this respect to suffer, yea, to be destroyed? Ought you not to give [your influence] wholly to the cause of truth? With prayer that you may be led aright, I close.—*An invisible hand.*

These are a specimen of what I often receive, sometimes from those on one side of the question, and sometimes on the other. I have been filled with regret, while reading such letters, that questions of this nature should thus agitate the christian church; but as the matter actually is, I know of no way in which a discussion of it can be well avoided. I have engaged in it with much and sincere reluctance; but if I must engage, and cannot be let off, then at least I ought not to spend my time in beating the air.

M. S.

ited to this signification; βαφή dipping, plunging, immersing, the act of colouring, colouring-stuff or matter, dye; βαφικός what belongs or is appropriate to dipping, immersing, or to colouring, dyeing; βαφική (sc. τέχνη) the art of dyeing; βαφείον a dyer's work-shop; βάψις the act of immersion, or of dyeing; βάψιμος to be immersed (quasi immersable), or to be coloured; all of which shew, that there is a frequent interchange of meaning in the above derived words, and a similarity between them all; and also that the two ideas of immersion and of dyeing or colouring lie at the basis of the words derived from ΒΑΠ, in most of their forms; although, in a few cases, usage has confined some particular words among these derivatives solely to one class of meanings; e. g. βαφεύς a dyer, βαφείον a dyer's shop, βάπτις immersion, submersion, washing, etc. Such a limited usage of a few of these derivative nouns, however, is probably the result merely of convenience and custom, and lies not in the original nature itself of the words thus employed; for as they are obviously from the root ΒΑΠ, so they might be employed, if usage had thus determined, like nearly all its other numerous derivatives, in the twofold sense of dipping or immersing, and of dyeing or colouring.

For the present, I merely state the fact in relation to these several meanings of the root ΒΑΠ and its derivatives. The reader is desired particularly to notice what has been stated, viz. that while most of the nouns derived from ΒΑΠ have a twofold sense, that of immersion and that of dyeing, yet some of them are employed only in one sense exclusively, either that of immersion, or that of dyeing. We shall see, in the sequel, that the verbs βάπτω and βαπτίζω have distinctions of meaning analogous to these,—distinctions which are never confounded by usage; while they both agree in one common and original meaning, viz. that of immersion or plunging.

In the brief view given above, I have supposed the original and literal meaning of the root ΒΑΠ, to be that of dipping or plunging; and accordingly I have arranged this meaning so as to stand first in order. Still, some may be disposed to consider this as not altogether certain. They may perhaps maintain, that the idea of ΒΑΠ was to tinge, dye, or colour; and that the idea of plunging or dipping was derived from this, because, in order to accomplish the work of dyeing, the act of plunging or dipping was necessary. But as the idea of immersing or plunging is common to both the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω,

while that of *dyeing* or *colouring* belongs only to βάπτω; it would seem altogether probable, that the former signification is the more usual and natural one, and therefore more probably the *original* one. Accordingly I have so arranged it in my statement above; but at the same time, it should be understood, that the signification of *dyeing* or *colouring*, as attached to the word βάπτω, and many forms derived from it, is not less certain than the signification of *dipping* or *immersing*. If the reader will keep this in mind, he will be enabled in the sequel easily to solve some cases, concerning which there has been dispute, among those who have defended views that widely differ in regard to the manner in which the rite of baptism should be performed.

In addition to the two fundamental meanings of the word βάπτω as derived from ΒΑΠΤΩ, there are other derived or secondary meanings of the word, which will of course be noted in the sequel, when we come more fully to consider this subject. My present object, and the one first in order, is merely to illustrate, in an intelligible way, the different forms of the respective words. I do this first, in order that we may see whether βάπτω and βαπτίζω are really synonymous, as they have often been asserted to be; or whether they have, in some respects, a real diversity of signification; a question not without importance in regard to the object before us.

It is seldom that any language has two words, which in all respects are synonymous, and are both in common usage at one and the same time. Synonymous words may indeed exist in a language, when a *recent* form of a word is substituted for a more ancient one of the same meaning; or when a word of foreign origin co-exists with one that is indigenous and of the same meaning, as is the case in our own language with regard to a great number of words derived from the Latin, Greek, French, etc. which co-exist with our indigenous Anglo-Saxon words; or lastly, words of different forms and yet synonymous in sense, may exist in a language which has different dialectical variations, such as the ancient Greek exhibited. But do any of these reasons exist in respect to βάπτω and βαπτίζω, so that on account of them we may take these words as in all respects synonymous?

In quite ancient times, we find evidence of some difference being supposed to exist between them. For example, Tertulian says: "Dehinc ter *mergitamur*," Corona Militis c. 3. Je-

rome (advers. Luciferianos) also says, "Nam et multa alia, quae per traditionem in ecclesiis observantur; velut in lavacro ter caput *mergitare*," etc. Now *mergito* is a frequentative form of *mergo*. At the same time, however, these fathers, and others who wrote in Latin, often and commonly use the words *tingo*, *mergo*, *demergo*, in order to express the idea conveyed by βαπτίζω; especially do they employ *tingo* and *mergo*. By these latter words, in fact, do the Latin ecclesiastical writers for the most part render βαπτίζω, when they really translate the word; for oftentimes, like our English Version, they employ the original word itself, *baptizo*, in order to represent the Greek βαπτίζω, merely making it conform to the Latin mode of inflection.

It would appear then, that a feeling existed among some of the Latin fathers, when they rendered βαπτίζω by *mergito*, that βαπτίζω is, in its appropriate sense, what the grammarians and lexicographers call a *frequentative* verb, i. e. one which denotes repetition of the action which it indicates. Nor are they alone in this. Some of the best Greek scholars of the present and past age, have expressed the same opinion in a more definite shape.

Buttmann lays it down as a principle of the Greek language, that a class of verbs in -ίζω, formed from other verbs, have the signification of *frequentatives*, Gramm. § 119. I. 5. 2. Rost lays down the same principle, Gramm. § 94. 2. b. Both appeal, by way of confirming their opinion, to such examples as στένω *to groan* or *sigh*, στενάζω *to sigh* or *groan often* or *much*; αἰτέω *to ask*, αἰτίζω, *to beg*, i. e. *to ask repeatedly*; ἕρπω *to creep*, ἐρπίζω *to creep along*, *to continue creeping*; ῥίπτω *to cast* or *throw*, ῥιπάζω *to throw hither and thither*. In accordance with this, Stephens and Vossius have given their opinions; and the highest authorities of recent date in lexicography, have decided in the same way. Passow, Bretschneider, and Donnegan, all affirm, that βαπτίζω originally and properly means *to dip* or *plunge often* or *repeatedly*.

With all deference to such masters of the Greek language, and with the full acknowledgement that *frequentative* verbs may be, and actually are, formed in the way just stated, I must still doubt, whether the sense of *frequentativeness* belongs essentially to verbs of this prolonged form, which are derived from other verbs of a shorter and more simple form. My meaning is, that although frequentative verbs may be easily and naturally formed in this way; and although this mode of formation accords well

with the genius of the Greek language; yet still, it is rather owing to special usage, in some cases and with regard to particular words, that this prolonged form is employed in this way, than to any absolute general usage or to the nature of the case. Proof will be necessary to sustain such a declaration against such authorities; and I proceed to adduce it.

Thus βλύω *to bubble up, to gush forth*, has a kindred verb βλύζω, of the same meaning; ὀρκόω *to bind by oath, to adjure*, and ὀρκίζω the same; ἀλέγω, *to take care of, to attend to*, ἀλεγιζώ the same, with the exception that ἀλέγω is not only employed in this sense, but also in the sense of *reckoning up, computing*; shades of meaning which do not appear to be attached to ἀλεγιζώ. In like manner ἔθω *to be accustomed, to be wont*, and ἐθίζω in the same sense; ἠθείω *to sift, to strain*, and ἠθίζω the same; καναζώ *to ring, to resound*, καναχίζω the same.

In some of the like examples, there is a slight shade of difference in the meaning of the simple and derived verbs. Ἀλεγιζώ and ἀλέγω above are an instance, to shew that one of the verbs has greater latitude, in actual usage, than the other. So θύω means *to burn incense, to sacrifice, to move violently, to be in a state of fury, to be boisterous*, while θυάζω is usually confined to the meanings of *sacrificing and raving*; βορβορόω means *to cover with mud, to change into mire*, while βορβορίζω means *to resemble mud or mire or dung, to smell of mud*, etc. ἀνθίω *to bloom, to grow up in a flourishing manner*, and ἀνθίζω *to adorn with flowers; to deck with garlands*; πλουτέω *to be rich*, and πλουτίζω *to make rich*; δειπνέω *to sup*, and δειπνίζω *to give a supper to others*, etc.

How natural it is, where two kindred words exist in any language, to give one a direction in practice somewhat different from the other, is abundantly illustrated by the examples just produced.

But still, the attentive and intelligent reader will of course remark for himself, that the variations now before us are not of such a nature as to establish the position, that a *frequentative* sense is attached to verbs in -ζω, derived from other verbs. Gale asserts, that not only these verbs just mentioned, but *infinita alia*, are of the tenor above described; and that “the common criticism,” which makes βαπτίζω a *diminutive* instead of a frequentative, “is nothing but a ridiculous piece of pedantry;” *Refl. on Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bapt.* p. 217. That the opinion which he condemns, has no foundation in truth, I deem to be quite certain. But that the opposite opinion, which makes βαπτίζω a *frequentative*, (if by this it is designed to imply that

it is necessarily so by the laws of formation, or even by actual usage,) is equally destitute of a solid foundation, I feel constrained, on the whole, to believe. The lexicographers who have assigned this meaning to it, appear to have done it on the ground of theoretical principles as to the mode of formation. They have produced no examples in point. And until these are produced, I must abide by the position, that a *frequentative* sense is not necessarily attached to βαπτίζω; and that, if it ever have this sense, it is by a speciality of usage of which I have been able to find no example.

I am unable to determine, from the grammars of Buttman and Rost as cited above, whether they intend to give it as their opinion, that *all* verbs in -ζω, derived from other verbs which are shorter and more simple, have a frequentative sense. They merely assert the fact, that to such verbs belongs such a meaning; without defining any limits, in respect to the principle which they lay down. This is leaving the matter at loose ends; inasmuch as the reader can never determine, by what they say, whether they mean to lay down a universal principle of language, or whether they mean merely to aver, that there are frequentative verbs in the Greek language, which take the form in question.

To the latter proposition I fully and readily accede; of the former, I have already given reasons why we should doubt. Indeed, there is not a single lexicographer, so far as I know, who has been consistent with himself, if he holds to the general principle in question. Even Passow and Bretschneider and Donnegan, "quos facile *principes* nominarem," and who have all attributed to βαπτίζω the sense of a frequentative, have given to many of the verbs in ω and ζω, named above, the very same sense; and have thus shewn, that they do not regard the principle concerning frequentatives, as laid down in the grammars, to be any thing more than one of *partial* application. That it actually applies in real usage to βαπτίζω, none of them have even attempted to prove by examples.

What then is the foundation of such an assertion, in writers of such distinguished knowledge and acuteness, as the grammarians and lexicographers mentioned above? Two reasons, as it seems to me, may be given for it with probability; first, that there are some clear and undoubted cases in which verbs in -ζω have a frequentative sense; as in στένω στενάζω, αἰτέω αἰτέζω, ἔρω ἐριζώ, ὀπτω ὀπτάζω; secondly, that the usage of

the Greek language forms many verbs in $-\zeta\omega$ in such a way, that they denote usual, customary, or often repeated and habitual action; e. g. *Ἑλληνίζω* to speak as a Greek, *βαρβαρίζω* to act or speak as a foreigner, *Σκυθίζω* to act like a Scythian, *Φιλιππίζω* to take part with Philip, etc. The frequency and extent of the two classes of verbs just named, would seem to give some colouring to the assertion, that verbs in $\zeta\omega$, generally, might be considered as a species of *intensive* verbs; but Buttmann himself avers (and very rightly) in another place, that verbs of this ending can be reduced to no definite species, § 119. I. 3. d. Let the reader consult *δικάζω*, *χειμάζω*, *μελίζω*, *θειρίζω*, *λακτιζω*, etc.

On the whole, I am unable to make out for verbs in $\zeta\omega$, any peculiarity of meaning, as appropriate to them only. Not even where they are derived from more simple verbs, does such a difference always, or even more usually, exist. It follows, then, that we are to regard *βαπτίζω*, so far as its mere *form* is concerned, and unless there are special reasons for viewing it differently, as only an example of a *prolonged* and secondary form of a verb; of which there are so many scores of examples in the Greek language, particularly in the Present and Imperfect tenses.

Dismissing then the question of mere *form*, let us now inquire, whether in actual usage *βαπτίζω* has a different meaning from *βάπτω*. In particular, is it distinguished from *βάπτω* by the writers of the New Testament?

The answer to these questions will be fully developed in the sequel. I have already intimated, that *βαπτίζω* is distinguished from *βάπτω* in its meaning. I now add, that it is not, like this latter word, used to designate the idea of *colouring* or *dyeing*; while in some other respects, it seems in classical use, to be nearly or quite synonymous with *βάπτω*. In the New Testament, however, there is one other marked distinction between the use of these verbs. *Βαπτίζω* and its derivatives are exclusively employed, when the rite of baptism is to be designated in any form whatever; and in this case, *βάπτω* seems to be purposely, as well as habitually, excluded.

Let us come now, for the fuller development of this matter, to the more important part of our inquiry under the first head, viz. *What are the classical meanings of βάπτω and βαπτίζω?* In some measure I have been obliged to anticipate the answer to this inquiry, in the statements which I have already made;

but I come now to the exhibition of the *grounds* on which we must rest the positions that have been advanced, and others also which are still to be advanced.

1. Βάπτω and βαπτίζω mean *to dip, plunge, or immerge*, into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. My proof of this position, then, need not necessarily be protracted; but for the sake of ample confirmation, I must beg the reader's patience, while I lay before him, as briefly as may be, the results of an investigation, which seems to leave no room for doubt. Take the following examples from the classics.

Homer, Od. I. 392, *As when a smith DIPS OR PLUNGES (βάπτει) a hatchet or huge pole-ax into cold water, viz. to harden them.*

Pindar, Pyth. II. 139, describes the impotent malice of his enemies, by representing himself to be like the cork upon a net in the sea, which does not sink: *As when a net is cast into the sea, the cork swims above, so am I UNPLUNGED (ἀβάπτιστος);* on which the Greek scholiast, in commenting, says: "As the cork *ὀ δύνει, does not sink*, so I am *ἀβάπτιστος, unplunged, not immersed*. . . The cork remains *ἀβάπτιστος*, and swims on the surface of the sea, being of a nature which is *ἀβάπτιστος*; in like manner I am *ἀβάπτιστος*." In the beginning of this explanation, the scholiast says: "Like the cork of a net in the sea, *ὀ βαπτίζομαι, I am not plunged or sunk*." The frequent repetition of the same words and sentiment, in this scholion, shews, in all probability, that it is compiled from different annotators upon the text. But the sense of βαπτίζω in all, is too clear to admit of any doubt.

Aristotle, de Color. c. 4, says: *By reason of heat and moisture, the colours enter into the pores of things DIPPED INTO THEM (τῶν βαπτομένων).* De Anima, III. c. 12. *If a man DIPS (βάπτει) any thing into wax, it is moved so far as it is dipped.* Hist. Animal. VIII. c. 2, speaking of certain fish, he says: *They cannot endure great changes, such as that, in the summer time, THEY SHOULD PLUNGE (βάπτωσι) into cold water.* Ibid. c. 29, he speaks of giving diseased elephants *warm water to drink, and DIPPING (βάπτοντες) hay into honey* for them.

Aristophanes, in his comedy of *the Clouds*, Act. I. Sc. 2, represents Socrates as gravely computing how many times the distance between two of its legs, a flea could spring at one leap; and in order to ascertain this, the philosopher *first melted a piece of wax, and then taking the flea, he DIPPED OR PLUNGED (ἐνέβαψε) two of its feet into it, etc.*

Heraclides Ponticus, a disciple of Aristotle, Allegor. p. 495, says: *When a piece of iron is taken red hot from the fire, and PLUNGED*

in the water (*ὑδατι βαπτίζεται*), the heat, being quenched by the peculiar nature of the water, ceases.

Herodotus, in Euterpe, speaking of an Egyptian who happens to touch a swine, says: *Going to the river [Nile], he DIPS himself (ἐβαψε ἑωυτόν) with his clothes.*

Aratus, in his Phaenomen. v. 650, speaks of the constellation Cepheus, as DIPPING (*βάπτων*) his head or upper part into the sea. In v. 858 he says: *If the sun DIP (βάπτει) himself cloudless into the western flood.* Again, in v. 951, *If the crow has DIPPED (ἐβάψατο) his head into the river, etc.*

Xenophon, Anab. II. 2. 4, describes the Greeks and their enemies as sacrificing a goat, a bull, a wolf, and a ram, and DIPPING (*βάπτοντες*) into a shield [filled with their blood], the Greeks the sword, the Barbarians the spear, in order to make a treaty that could not be broken.

Plutarch, Parallela Graec. Rom. p. 545, speaking of the stratagem of a Roman general, in order to ensure victory, says: *He set up a trophy, on which, DIPPING his hand into blood (εἰς τὸ αἷμα . . . βαπτίσας), he wrote this inscription, etc.* In Vol. VI. p. 680 (edit. Reiske) he speaks of iron PLUNGED (*βαπτόμενον*), viz. into water, in order to harden it. Ibid. p. 633, PLUNGE (*βαπτισόν*) yourself into the sea. Vol. X. p. 118, Then PLUNGING (*βαπτίζων*) himself into the lake Copais.

Lucian, Vol. I. p. 139, represents Timon, the man-hater, as saying: *If a winter's flood should carry away any one, and he, stretching out his hands, should beg for help, I would press down the head of such an one when SINKING (βαπτίζοντα), so that he could not rise up again.*

Diodorus Siculus, edit. Heyne IV. p. 118, *Whose ship being SUNK OR MERGED (βαπτισθείσης).* Some other editions read *βυθισθείσης, plunged into the deep*, which is a good gloss.

Plato, De Republica IV. p. 637, represents dyers, who wish to make a permanent colour, as first choosing out wool, sorting and working it over, and then (*βάπτονσι*) THEY PLUNGE IT, viz. into the dye-stuff.

Epictetus, III. p. 69, ed. Schwiagh. in a fragment of his work says: *As you would not wish, sailing in a large ship adorned and abounding with gold, TO BE SUNK OR IMMERSSED (βαπτίξοσθαί), so etc.*

Hippocrates, p. 532, edit. Basil. *Shall I not laugh at the man, who SINKS (βαπτισόντα) his ship by overloading it, and then complains of the sea for ingulfing it with its cargo?* On p. 50, TO DIP (*βαπτειν*) the probes in some emollient. P. 51, DIPPING (*βαψασα*) the rag in ointment, etc. P. 104, Cakes DIPPED (*ἐμβαπτόμενοι*) into sour wine. P. 145, DIPPING (*βάπτων*) sponges in

warm water. And in the same way, in all parts of his book, in instances almost without number.

Strabo, Lib. VI. p. 421, speaking of a lake near Agrigentum, says: *Things that elsewhere cannot float, DO NOT SINK* (μη βαπτίζεσθαι) *in the water of this lake, but swim in the manner of wood.* XII. p. 809, *If one shoots an arrow into the channel* [of a certain rivulet in Cappadocia], *the force of the water resists it so much, that it will scarcely PLUNGE IN* (βαπτίζεσθαι). XIV. p. 982, *They* [the soldiers] *marched a whole day through the water, PLUNGED IN* (βαπτιζομένων) *up to the waist.* XVI. p. 1108, *The bitumen floats on the top* [of the lake Sirbon], *because of the nature of the water, which admits of no diving, nor can any one who enters it PLUNGE IN* (βαπτίζεσθαι), *but is borne up.*

Polybius, III. 72, *The foot soldiers passed through* [the water] *scarcely IMMERSED to the paps.* See also V. 47.

Josephus, Ant. IX. 10, speaking of the ship in which Jonah was, says, μέλλοντος βαπτίζεσθαι τοῦ σκάφους, *the ship being about to SINK.* In the History of his own Life, speaking of a voyage to Rome, during which the ship that carried him foundered in the Adriatic, he says: *Our ship being IMMERSED or SINKING* (βαπτισθέντος) *in the midst of the Adriatic.* Speaking of Aristobulus as having been drowned by command of Herod, Bell. Jud. I, he says: *The boy was sent to Jericho, and there, agreeably to command, being IMMERSED in a pond* (βαπτιζομένος ἐν κολυμβήθρα), *he perished.* Bell. Jud. II, *As they* [the sailors] *swam away from a SINKING ship* (βαπτιζομένης νεώς). Bell. Jud. III, *The wave being raised very high, OVERWHELMED or IMMERSED them* (ἐβάπτισε.)

It were easy to enlarge this list of testimonies to usage; but the reader will not desire it. He may see many examples in Carson's recent publication on baptism; which I did not see, until after the present dissertation was written. It is impossible to doubt that the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω have, in the Greek classical writers, the sense of *dip, plunge, immerge, sink,* etc. But there are variations from this usual and prevailing signification; i. e. shades of meaning kindred to this (as happens in respect to most words), some literal and some figurative, which demand of course our special notice.

2. The verb βάπτω means *to plunge or thrust* into any thing that is solid, but permeable; *to plunge in* so as to cover or enclose the thing plunged.

Some place here the example in Sophocles, Ajax v. 95, rendering it: *Thou hast PLUNGED deep* (ἐβαψας εὖ) *thy sword INTO the Gre-*

cian army; but here πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατῷ, seems not to admit of this construction, as it means *with*, or *by means of*, the Grecian army. See under No. 6, in the sequel.

Lycophron, Cassand. v. 1121, representing Orestes as about to punish Clytemnestra for murder, says: *The child . . . shall with his own hand PLUNGE (βάψει) his sword into the viper's bowels.*

Philippus, in Jacobs' Anthol. says: *He THRUST (ἔβαψε) his whole chin into the belly of the ram.*

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. V. 15, says: *The one THRUST (βάσας) his spear between the other's ribs, who at the same instant [thrust his] into his belly.*

Euripides, Phœniss. 1593, *Taking his sounding scimitar from the dead, he PLUNGED it (ἔβαψε) into the flesh.*

So far as I have observed, the verb βάπτω is exclusively employed in all such cases.

3. The verb βάπτω only is employed, in order to convey the meaning, *to dip out*, *to dip up*, by plunging a vessel into a liquid and drawing it up.

Euripides, Hec. 607 sq. *But go, you old maid-servant, take a vessel, [and] DIPPING it (βάψασα), bring some sea-water hither.* On this the scholiast remarks, that βάπτειν means *to let down into the water or any liquid.*

Theocritus, Idyll. V. 126, *Every morning, instead of water, the maid shall DIP OUT (βάψαι) a cup of honey.* Idyll. XIII. 46, *The lad directed his large pitcher towards the water, hastening to DIP it (βάψαι).*

Hermolaus, *He DIPPED (ἔβαψε) his pitcher in the water*; cited in Gale's *Ref. on Wall*, p. 121.

Lycophron, Cassand. 1365, *DIPPING UP (βάψαντες) pleasure with foreign buckets.*

Aristotle, Quæst. Mechan. c. 27, *One must DIP (βάψαι) viz. the bucket, and then draw it up.*

Euripides, Hippol. 123, *Bubbling water DIPPED UP (βάψαν) with pitchers.*

Callimachus, Hymn. in Lavacr. Pallad. 45, *To day, ye bearers of water, DIP UP NONE (μὴ βάπτετε), viz. dip up none from the river Inachus; as the context shews.*

Nicander, as quoted by Spanheim in his note on the above passage, says: *αὐτὴν ἄλα βάπτε, DRAW UP the sea-water itself.* On this the scholiast remarks, that βάπτε stands for ἀντλεῖ, γέμιζε, *draw up, fill.*

4. The verb βάπτω only, (and its derivatives in point of form,) signifies *to tinge, dye, or colour.*

Thus in the *Batrachom.* of Homer, v. 218, speaking of one of

the champions which was slain, the poet says: *He fell, without even looking upwards, and the lake WAS TINGED (ἐβάπτετο) with blood.*

Aristophanes, Plut. Act. II. Sc. 5, *Do not adorn yourself with garments of variegated appearance, COLOURED (βαπτῶν adj.) at a great expense.*—In Aves p. 526, the poet speaks of ὄρνις βαπτός, a COLOURED bird. In Acharn. Act. I. Sc. 1, he makes one of his bullies say: *Lest I TINGE you with a Sardinian hue, σὲ βάψω βάμμα Σαρδινιακόν*, i. e. beat you until you are all besmeared with blood; in other words, until you become of a red colour.

Aristotle, De Color. c. 4. ad fin. *The colour of things DYED (τῶν βαπτομένων), is changed by the aforesaid causes.*

Lucian, I. p. 39, *He was present at the exhibition, having on a garment COLOURED (βαπτόν);* in opposition to the usual custom of the Athenians, who wore white garments on the occasion here alluded to.

Herodotus, Lib. VII. 67, *The Sarangae adorn themselves with garments that are COLOURED (βεβαμμένα).*

Plutarch, VI. p. 680, *Then perceiving that his beard was COLOURED (βαπτόμενον), and his head.*

Diodorus Siculus, Tom. III. p. 315, *They [the Gauls] wear singular garments, coats DYED (βαπτοίς), and flowered with various colours, etc.* Tom. II. p. 149, *The physiologists, reasoning from these things, shew, that native warmth has TINGED (ἐβαψεν) the above variety of the growth of the things before mentioned;* he refers to the variety of colours in various precious stones, birds, etc.

Marcus Antoninus, Lib. V. § 16, *For the soul is TINCTURED (βάπτεται) by the thought; TINGE it (βάπτε), then, by accustoming yourself to such thoughts, etc.*

Plato, De Repub. IV. p. 637, *The DYERS (οἱ βαφεῖς) when they are desirous TO DYE (βάψαι) wool, so as to make it purple... and whatever may be DYED (βαφῆ) in this manner, the thing DYED (τὸ βαφέν) becomes strongly tintured.*—*If any one DYE (βαπτῆ) other colours, etc.*—*That they may receive the laws in the best manner, as a DYE (βαφῆν), that their opinion may be durable... And those streams cannot wash out THE DYE (βαφῆν), although they are very efficient to wash out, etc.*

Helladius, in Jacob's Anthol. III. p. 145,

*Βάπτων πάντα, βαφεῦ, καὶ χροματίους μεταβάλλων,
Καὶ πενίην βάψας, πλούσιος ἐξεδόνης.*

DYER, who TINGEST all things, and dost change them by thy colours, thou hast TINGED poverty also, and now appearest to be rich. The epigram was made upon a dyer, who, although once poor, had become rich. The conceit of the poet is singular enough; but the manner in which βάπτω and its kindred forms are used, cannot be mistaken.

Josephus, Ant. III. 6. 1, *Some* ΔΥΞΕΙ (βεβαμμένας) *with hyacinth, and some with purple.*

No doubt then can remain, that the word βάπτω means to *tinge*, or *colour*; and in this respect it seems plainly to differ from βαπτίζω. I find no instance in which the latter is employed in this way. There may be some, which have escaped the extensive search that I have made. But until I see them produced, I must believe that the sense of *tinging* is appropriated only to βάπτω, and to its kindred words in respect to form. I am aware that Passow assigns to βαπτιστής the meaning of *baptizer, plunger, and dyer*; but of the last meaning I must now doubt, until some examples are produced. All other words kindred to βαπτιστής, (kindred in form, as coming from βαπτίζω,) are destitute of such a sense as that of *dyeing or colouring*, according to Passow's own statement.

If the conclusion just stated be correct, then we can see that there exists the like difference between the actual usage of βάπτω and βαπτίζω, as exists between many other verbs which have the same relation in respect to form, and where the ending in -ζω has not the sense of a *frequentative*. The reader by looking back to the statement made above (p. 294 sq.) in relation to this subject, may now satisfy himself still further, that βαπτίζω is *not* a frequentative. I have found no instance, in which this sense is apparent, so far as the nature of the verb itself is concerned.

5. The word βαπτίζω means to *overwhelm*, literally and figuratively, in a variety of ways.

Aristotle, De Mirabil. Ausc. speaks of a saying among the Phenicians, that there were certain places, beyond the pillars of Hercules, *which, when it is ebb-tide, are not overflowed* (μη βαπτίζεσθαι), *but at full-tide are overflowed* (κατακλύζεσθαι); which word is here used, as an equivalent for βαπτίζεσθαι.

Evenus, XV. in Jacobs' Anthol. I. p. 99, says: *If* [Bacchus] *breathe strongly, it hinders love*, i. e. if a man becomes thoroughly intoxicated, it hinders the gratification of amorous passions; *for he* [Bacchus] *overwhelms* (βαπτίζει) *with a sleep near to death*. Here is the metaphorical sense of the word. And so in most of the following examples.

Heliodorus, Æthiop. Lib. IV. p. 192, *When midnight has overwhelmed* (ἐβαπτίζον) *the city with sleep*. Lib. II. 3, *OVERWHELMED* (δεβαπτισμένον) *by misfortune*. See also IV. 20. V. 16.

Clemens Alex. Pæd. II. p. 182, *By intoxication OVERWHELMED* (βαπτίζομενος) *unto sleep*.

Plato, *Conviv.* p. 176, *I myself am one of those who were DRENCHED or OVERWHELMED (βεβαπτισμένων) yesterday, viz. with wine.* In another place: *Having OVERWHELMED (βαπτίσασα) Alexander with much wine.* Euthydem. p. 277, ed. Heindorf, *A youth OVERWHELMED (βαπτιζόμενον), viz. with questions.*

Lucian, *Tom. III.* p. 81, *He is like one dizzy and OVERWHELMED (βεβαπτισμένῳ), viz. with wine; used like our vulgar word fuddled.*

Josephus, *Ant. X.* 9. 4, *Seeing him in this condition and OVERWHELMED (βεβαπτισμένον) by excessive drinking into shamelessness and sleep.*

Philo Judaeus, *Vol. II.* p. 478, *I know some, who, when they easily become intoxicated, before they are entirely OVERWHELMED (πρὶν τελέως βαπτισθῆναι), viz. with wine.*

Diodorus Siculus, *Tom. I.* p. 107, *Most of the land animals that are intercepted by the river [Nile], perish, being OVERWHELMED (βαπτιζόμενα); here used in the literal sense.* *Tom. VII.* p. 191, *The river, borne along by a more violent current, OVERWHELMED (ἐβαπτίσσε) many; the literal signification.* *Tom. I.* p. 129, *And because they [the nobles] have a supply by these means [presents], they do not OVERWHELM their subjects with taxes.* Figurative.

Justin Martyr, *Dialog. cum Tryphone,* p. 313, *βεβαπτισμένος ἀμαρτίας, OVERWHELMED with sins.*

Plutarch, *Tom VI.* p. 30, *The soul is nourished by moderate labours, but is OVERWHELMED (βαπτιζεται) by excessive ones.* In his *Moralia, Tom. III.* p. 1504, he speaks of Galba as *ἀγλήμασι βεβαπτισμένον, OVERWHELMED with debts.* In *Opp. VIII.* p. 345, he says: *υἰὸ τῶν πραγμάτων βαπτιζόμενος, OVERWHELMED with business.*

Chrysostom, as quoted by Suicer, *Thes. Ecc. I.* p. 623, *Ἐπὶ μέθης βαπτισθῆναι, to be OVERWHELMED with wine;—OVERWHELMED (βαπτιζόμενος) with innumerable cares;—having the mind OVERWHELMED (βεβαπτισμένον) with a multitude of cares; OVERWHELMED (βαπτιζόμενοι) on all sides by the many waves of business;—IMMERGED (βεβαπτισμένος) in malignity.—Justin Martyr: OVERWHELMED (βαπτισθεὶς) by drunkenness.*

It were easy to increase the number of examples; but these are enough to exhibit both the literal and metaphorical sense of the word. The reader will observe, that in all these examples, the word *βαπτίζω* (and not *βάπτω*) is employed; which, with the usage in Nos. 2, 3, 4, is a conclusive argument against supposing that these two words are in all respects synonymous. Usage, as it plainly appears from all these examples, employs *βάπτω* exclusively in some shades of meaning; *βαπτίζω* in oth-

ers; and both in designating the original and generic idea of the root *BAII*, as exhibited in No 1.

6. *Βάπτω* is also employed in the sense *to smear, to bathe*, by the application of liquid to the surface, etc.

Sophocles, *Ajax* v. 95, *ἔβαψας εἴ, thou hast well BATHED or SMEARED thy sword, with the Grecian army*, viz. by plunging it into the Grecian soldiers. The construction *πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατῷ* does not seem very well to admit of any other sense, inasmuch as the object *into* which any thing is plunged, is usually put by classic writers, in the Acc. with *εἰς*, after the verb *βάπτω*. *Πρὸς* as above, signifies, *by means of, with*, as designating the manner in which the sword was bathed.

Æschylus, *Prometh.* v. 861, *For the wife has deprived each husband of life, BATHING (βάψισα) the sword by slaughter; where bathing the sword means, to make it reek with blood, by plunging it into human bodies.*

Aristophanes, *Ἰππεῖς* Act. I. Sc. 3, speaking of Magnes, an old comic player of Athens, represents him as *Ἀυδίξων, καὶ ψηνίζων, καὶ βαπτόμενος βατραχείοις, using the Lydian music or measure, and making plays, and SMEARING himself with frog-coloured [paints].*

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Vit. Homeri* p. 297, cited by Gale p. 123, comments on the expression of Homer in *Il. XVI. 333*, where the poet represents Ajax as killing Cleobulus, and says: *He struck him across the neck, with his heavy sword, and the whole sword became warm with blood.* Upon this Dionysius remarks: *That the sword was so BATHED (βαπτισθέντος) with blood, that it became heated by it.* This is capable of being rendered, *so dipped in blood*; and so Gale renders it, p. 123. But if this shade of meaning was designed to be conveyed by Dionysius, would he not have written: *βαπτισθέντος οὕτως εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ξίφους κ. τ. λ.?* However, I do not consider the example as altogether certain, but adduce it as a probable one.

7. A shade of meaning kindred to the above, viz. *to wash*, i. e. to cleanse by the use of water, is sometimes attached to the word *βάπτω* in the classics.

Aristophanes, in *Eccles.* *First they WASH (βάπτουσι) the wool in warm water, according to the old custom.* The lexicographers, Suidas and Phavorinus, interpret the word *βάπτουσι* here, by *πλύνουσι, they wash, or wash out*; and Stephens says (ad voc. *πλύνω*), that *βάπτω* is peculiarly spoken of garments, as *λούω* is of the body, and *νίπτω* of the hands and feet.—We shall see in the sequel, that this shade of meaning is not unfrequent in the sacred writers, though seldom, so far as I have been able to discover, to be met with in profane writers.

These, I believe, are all the various shades of meaning, assigned in the classics to βάπτω and βαπτίζω. How little ground there is to represent βαπτίζω as a *frequentative*, the reader must now see, and be able to judge for himself. He will also be able to judge with how little correctness Gale has asserted (p. 217), that “βάπτω and βαπτίζω are *ισοδύναμαι*, i. e. *exactly the same* as to their signification.” Neither the one nor the other of the above representations agrees with fact. In all the derived or secondary meanings of both βάπτω and βαπτίζω, it would seem plain, from the above exhibition of them, that the Greek writers made a diverse and distinct use of the words, never confounding them. Why should lexicographers and critics not have more thoroughly investigated this, before they made representations so little accordant with the state of facts?

I come now to investigate the usage of the sacred records. This we can do with much greater advantage, after the extensive survey of classical usage which has been taken above.

§ 2. Use of βάπτω and βαπτίζω in the Septuagint and Apocrypha. .

1. The verb. βάπτω signifies to plunge, immerse, dip in.

Lev. 11: 32, Every vessel [that is unclean], shall be PLUNGED (βαφήσεται) into water; Heb. הוּבָא, shall be brought or introduced. 4: 6, And the priest shall DIP (βάψει) his finger into the blood; Heb. טָבַל. 9: 9, And he [Aaron] DIPPED (ἐβάψε) his finger into the blood; Heb. טָבַל. 14: 6, And he shall DIP (βάψει) them . . . into the blood; Heb. טָבַל. 14: 51, And he shall DIP (βάψει) it into the blood; Heb. טָבַל.

Num. 19: 18, And the man that is cleansed shall take hyssop, and DIP it (βάψει) into the water; Heb. טָבַל.

Deut. 33: 24, And he shall DIP (βάψει) his foot in oil (ἐν ἐλαιῷ, Heb. בַּשֵּׁן); Heb. corresponding to βάψει, טָבַל.

Josh. 3: 15, The feet of the priests . . . were DIPPED (ἐβάφησαν) into a part of the water of the Jordan; Heb. טָבַל.

Ruth 2: 14, And thou shalt DIP (βάψεις) thy morsel in vinegar, (ἐν τῷ ὄξει, חֲמֵץ); Heb. verb טָבַל.

1 Sam. 14: 27, And he DIPPED (ἐβάψε) it, viz. the end of his sceptre, into a honey comb; Heb. טָבַל.

2 K. 8: 15, He took a mattress, and DIPPED it (ἐβάψε) in water, (ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, Heb. בַּמַּיִם); verb טָבַל.

Job 9: 31, Thou hast PLUNGED me (μὲ ἐβαψας) into the mire, (ἐν ὄυπῳ, חֲפָצִים, into the pit or ditch); Heb. verb טָבַל.

Ps. 67: 23 (68: 24) *That thy foot may be DIPPED* (βαρῆ) *in blood* (ἐν αἵματι, טָבַח); Heb. verb פָּרַח.

In like manner βαπτίζω takes the same signification.

2 K. 5: 14, *And Naaman went down, and PLUNGED HIMSELF* (ἐβαπτίσατο) *seven times into the river Jordan*; Heb. טָבַח. The prophet Elisha had said: λούσαι ἐπτάκις ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, WASH THYSELF seven times in the Jordan, 2 K. 5: 10.

These constitute the majority of the examples in the Septuagint, of the words under consideration. The others, which are few in number, I proceed to subjoin.

2. To smear over or moisten by dipping in; in which sense I find βάπτω only employed.

Lev. 4: 17, *And the priest shall SMEAR OVER OR MOISTEN* (βάψει) *his finger, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, by or with the blood of the bullock*; Heb. טָבַח מִן הַדָּם. When then the sense of *plunging into* is directly and fully expressed in Hebrew, it is by using the preposition אַ after the verb טָבַח; e. g. טָבַח בַּדָּם, טָבַח בַּמַּיִם, etc. But נָח is sometimes used (as in the example above) before the noun designating the liquid element made use of; and then the Seventy have imitated this in such a way, that we are constrained to render their version as I have done above. The same is the case in the next example.

Lev. 14: 16, *And he [the priest] shall SMEAR OVER* (βάψει) *his right finger with the oil, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλαίου, Heb. טָבַח מִן הַשֶּׁמֶן.*

Ex. 12: 22, *And MOISTENING OR SMEARING it [the bundle of hyssop] with the blood* (βαψάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος). But here the Hebrew has טָבַח בַּדָּם; and the Seventy, if they had followed their own analogy, would have rendered it, βαψάντες ἐῖς τὸ αἶμα. Inasmuch, however, as they have not so done, it would seem that they meant to give another shade of meaning to the expression.

3. To overwhelm; where βαπτίζω is used. Of this I find but one example; and in that the word is used in a figurative way.

Is. 21: 4, *My iniquity OVERWHELMS me* (μὲ βαπτίζει); where the Hebrew has טָבַח, to terrify, etc.

4. Of the sense of *tinging* or *colouring*, given to βάπτω, I find only one example; and here the reading is various and contested, viz.

Ezek. 23: 15, where the Septuagint reads παρόβαπτα, according to the Roman edition; but other editions read τιάραι βαπταί, *coloured turbans*. Παρόβαπτα means *tinctured, coloured, variegated with colours*. The Hebrew is טְרוּמֵי טְבוּלִים, *redundantes mitris, with turbans or tiaras redundant*, i. e. having ends hanging

down, etc. The word טבולת, a derivate of טבל, appears here to point to the sense of *tinging, tincturing*, which טבל (like the Greek βαπτω) seems once to have had.

5. *To wash, cleanse by water*; where βαπτίζω is used.

Thus it is said of Judith, in c. 12: 7, that *she went out by night, into the valley of Bethulia, and WASHED HERSELF (ἐβαπτίζετο) in the camp, at the fountain of water.*

In Sirach 31: 25, we find the expression βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ, *he who is CLEANSED from a dead [carcase] and toucheth it again, what does he profit by his washing (τιῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ)?* The phrase βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ may be easily explained, by comparing such passages as are to be found in Lev. 11: 25, 28, 31, 39, 40. Num. 19: 18, etc. by which it appears, that a person who touched a dead body was ceremonially defiled, and must wash his clothes and his person in order to become clean.

6. *To moisten, wet, bedew*; where βάπτω is used.

Thus in Dan. 4: 30, it is said, that Nebuchadnezzar was driven from among men, and made to eat grass like the ox, and that *his body was MOISTENED, WET (ἐβάφη) with the dew of heaven.*

Dan. 5: 21, *His body was MOISTENED (ἐβάφη) with the dew of heaven.* The version of this book, it will be recollected, came from the hand of Theodotion, about A. D. 150, a Jew by religion, or at least a Judaizing Christian. Commonly his version agrees with the Septuagint, and it was highly prized by Origen and the ancient Christians in general; so much so, that Origen corrected the faults of the Septuagint by it, and the ancient churches preferred it to that of the Seventy, in respect to the book of Daniel, and received it in the Canon.

These are all the examples of βάπτω or βαπτίζω, which can be found in the Septuagint or Apocrypha, if the Concordance of Tromin is to be trusted. From these the reader will easily see, that some of the classical meanings of these words are not to be found in the books aforesaid; while other meanings, viz. *to wash, to bedew or moisten*, are more clearly and fully exhibited. The examples in Daniel from Theodotion make it plain, that the word βάπτω was occasionally used to designate the application of liquid or moisture to the surface of any thing, in any way whatever; whether by washing, or by gentle affusion as in the case of dew. The example of Judith shews very clearly, that *washing* of the person may be designated by βαπτίζω; for into the fountain in the midst of the camp, it is not probable that she *plunged*. In both the examples in Daniel, the Chaldee (the original is here in this language) is טבט, which, like the

Greek βάπτω, means both *to dip* and *to tinge* or *colour*. The like is the case with the same verb in Syriac and Arabic, as well as in Chaldee; and the Hebrew appears also to have employed the same verb in the like sense, inasmuch as we have בָּטַח , a derivate of it, signifying *coloured garment*, Judg. 5: 30.

I have taken an extensive range, in order to prepare for the investigation of the words in question in the New Testament. But we may now come to the work, under circumstances that will enable us to judge with a greater degree of accuracy and satisfaction than we could possibly have done, if these introductory investigations had been superseded.

§ 3. *Meaning of the words βάπτω, βαπτίζω, and their derivatives in the New Testament, when not applied to the rite of baptism.*

I. Βάπτω.

1. *To dip.*

E. g. Luke 16: 24, *That he may DIP (βάψῃ) the tip of his finger in water, ὕδατος*, the Gen. of instrument, i. e. *that he may wet his finger with water*, which is a rendering that seems to accord more exactly with the syntactical construction of the sentence.

John 13: 26, *It is he, to whom I shall give the morsel or crumb, when I have DIPPED it (βάψας).*

2 *To dye.*

E. g. Rev. 19: 13, *a garment DYED (βεβαμμένον) in blood.*

These are all the examples of βάπτω; and by these it appears, that in no case is this word applied to the rite of baptism, by the writers of the New Testament. Nor are there any words derived from this form, which occur in the New Testament.

We proceed then to consider the other verb.

II. Βαπτίζω.

I shall first examine all the examples of this word and its derivatives, in cases which have no relation to the religious rite of baptism. After this is done, we may come with more advantage to the examination of the meaning, when these words are applied to this rite.

1. *To wash, in the literal sense.*

E. g. Mark 7: 3, 4, *The Pharisees [returning] from the market eat not, except they WASH THEMSELVES, βαπτίζονται*, Mid. voice.

Luke 11: 38, *But the Pharisee, seeing him, wondered that he had not first WASHED HIMSELF (ἐβαπτίσθη) before dinner.* Here

the 1 Aor. Pass. is used in the same way as the 1 Aor. Middle would be employed; as it is oftentimes elsewhere.

In accordance with this sense of βαπτίζω, we find the word βαπτισμός employed.

E. g. Mark 7: 4, THE WASHINGS (βαπτισμούς) of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches (κλινῶν).

Mark 7: 8, THE WASHINGS (βαπτισμούς) of pots and cups.

Heb. 9: 10, Only in meats, and drinks, and divers WASHINGS (βαπτισμοίς).

These are the only examples in the New Testament, where βαπτίζω or any of its derivatives has a *literal* sense; with the exception of those cases in which these words are applied to designate the rite of baptism. Whether these are to be *literally* understood, remains still the object of our inquiry.

2. But βαπτίζω and βάπτισμα have, in a few cases, a *figurative* sense, which deserves a particular consideration. This meaning stands nearly allied to that in No. 5 under our classical head in § 1; or rather, it is, in amount, an idiom of the same nature. The examples are the following.

Luke 12: 50, *I have a baptism to be baptized with (βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι), and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!* That is, I am about to be overwhelmed with sufferings, and I am greatly distressed with the prospect of them. A comparison with the similar classical usage, under No. 5 just mentioned, makes this sense very plain.

Mark 10: 38, 39, *Are ye able to drink of the cup that I must drink, and to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized? καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι;* which words are found also in Matt. 20: 22, 23, of the common editions of the New Testament, but are there marked as spurious by Knapp. The genuineness of them in Mark, however, stands uncontroverted. The sense is evidently the same as that given above, viz. 'Can ye indeed take upon you to undergo, patiently and submissively, sufferings like to mine—sufferings of an overwhelming and dreadful nature?'

So the classic usage: 'To overwhelm with misfortune; to overwhelm with taxes—with wine—with questions—with debt—with excessive labour,' etc. etc. In the like sense I must understand the word in 1 Cor. 15: 29, *Else what shall they do, who are BAPTIZED for the dead? οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ἐπὲς τῶν νεκρῶν;* That is, (for so the course of the apostle's reasoning leads us to understand him,) 'If the dead are not raised—if there be, as some affirm, no resurrection to life, then what becomes of all our multiplied toils and suf-

ferings, which we undergo with reference to a future state and to that world unto which the dead go? Of what avail is it to endure overwhelming sorrows, if there be no resurrection of the dead?"

Such a sense of the word βαπτίζω is so well supported and illustrated by classic usage, that nothing further needs to be said upon it. I will only add, that G. J. Vossius, in his *Disputationes de Baptismo*, Thes. I, attributes such a usage of the word to the custom of the Hebrews, in designating great calamities by the image of overwhelming waters. Had he examined the classic usage of the word, he would have seen no need of this solution. To Hebrews and Greeks both, the idea of *an overwhelming flood* offered a very obvious image to designate great sorrows and afflictions. Both, therefore, employ it. Thus David: "Save me, O God, for the waters are come into my soul! I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me; Ps. 69: 1. Again, Ps. 69: 14, "Let me be delivered . . . out of the deep waters." Ps. 18: 16, "He sent from above, he took me, he drew me out of many waters." Ps. 32: 6, "Surely in the floods of great waters, they shall not come nigh to him." Ps. 42: 7, "Deep calleth unto deep, at the noise of thy waterspouts; all thy waves come over my soul." Inasmuch now, as the more usual idea of βαπτίζω is that of *overwhelming, immersing*, it was very natural to employ it in designating severe calamities and sufferings.

3. There is another *figurative* use of βαπτίζω, allied in some respects to the preceding one, but distinguished from it in the mode of its application. I mean that usage of the word, which employs it to designate the idea of *copious affusion* or *effusion*, in a figurative manner. The basis of this usage is very plainly to be found in the designation by βαπτίζω of the idea of *overwhelming*, i. e. of surrounding on all sides with fluid. *Copious affusion* or *effusion* is kindred to this; and very obviously, the word which designates the preceding idea, may also designate these meanings.

E. g. Matt. 3: 11, *He shall BAPTIZE (βαπτισει) you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*; i. e. he will make a copious effusion of his Spirit upon a part of you; and another part, viz. the finally unbelieving and impenitent, he will surround with flames, or plunge into the flames. Or perhaps *baptizing with fire* may here have reference to the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, when there appeared to the apostles, "cloven tongues as it were of fire, and it [the fire] rested upon every one of them," Acts 2: 3.

In Luke 3: 16, the same expression is again found; and in Mark 1: 8. John 1: 33, and Acts 1: 5. 11: 17, is found the phrase, *He shall BAPTIZE* (βαπτίσει, βαπτίζων) *you with the Holy Spirit*. In 1 Cor. 12: 13 Paul says: *For by one Spirit have we been BAPTIZED* (ἐβαπτίσθημεν) *into one body*; i. e. by the copious effusion of one and the same Spirit, have we been made members of one and the same church. So he afterwards explains it: "We all have been made to drink in one and the same Spirit."

I have now examined all the examples in the New Testament, in which βαπτίζω and its derivatives have a literal or figurative sense, and are not applied to designate the rite of baptism. We come then, at last, after thus opening the way, to the consideration of the main question.

§ 4. *Do βαπτίζω and its derivatives, when applied to designate the RITE OF BAPTISM, necessarily imply that this rite was performed by IMMERSION of the whole person?*

There are different ways in which light may be cast upon the ground of this inquiry.

I. We may contemplate the proper force and signification of the word itself, as determined by the *usus loquendi* in general.

II. We may examine the circumstances which attended the administration of this rite, and see whether they cast any light upon the *manner* of the rite itself.

III. We may investigate the early history of the rite, and see whether it already existed in the Jewish church, at the time when John the Baptist made his appearance; and if so, what was the manner of it among the Jews, and whether John or Jesus made any change in this manner.

IV. We may investigate the subsequent history of the rite, in the early ages of the Christian church, and see what mode of baptizing was practised by the churches in general.

V. When all this is done, and the *mode* is philologically and historically exhibited or established, we may then make the inquiry, whether any particular mode of applying water in baptism is essential to the ordinance, and obligatory upon the churches of Christ at the present day.

§ 5. *General usus loquendi of βαπτίζω.*

I. *What is the proper force and signification of the word, according to the general usus loquendi.*

A review of the preceding examples must lead any one, I

think, to the conclusion, that the predominant usage of the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω, is, to designate the idea of *dipping*, *plunging*, and *overwhelming*, and (in the case of βάπτω) of *tinging* or *dyeing*. But we have already seen in Nos. 6, 7 above respecting classic usage, that βάπτω is employed in the sense of *bathing* the surface of any thing with a fluid, and also of *washing* it. We have also seen, in Nos. 2, 5, 6 of examples from the Septuagint and Apocrypha, that the word βαπτίζω sometimes means to *wash*; and βάπτω to *moisten*, to *wet* or *bedew*. There is then no absolute certainty from usage, that the word βαπτίζω, when applied to designate the *rite of baptism*, means of course to *immerge* or *plunge*. It may mean *washing*; possibly (but not probably) it may mean, *copiously moistening* or *bedewing*; because words coming from the common root *BAIL*, are applied in both these senses, as we have seen above.

But there is another point of philology yet to be examined. This relates to the mode, in which the New Testament writers employ the words that designate the element with which one is baptized. This deserves a serious consideration; and, so far as I know, it has not yet been duly examined.

The Greek classic writers are accustomed, when they designate the idea of *plunging*, *dipping*, *immersing*, etc. into any thing, to put the name of that thing in the Accusative case after βάπτω and βαπτίζω, and to put before this case the preposition εἰς, or some equivalent one. The following are examples.

Lycophron, Cassand. v. 1121, εἰς σπλάγγνα... βάψει ξίφος. The scholiast on Eurip. Hec. 609, says: βαπτειν, ἐστὶ τὸ γαλᾶν τι εἰς ὕδωρ, ἢ εἰς ἕτερόν τι ὑγρόν. Aristoph. Nub. Act. I. Sc. 2, ἐνέβαπεν εἰς τὸν κηρόν. Aristot. De Anim. III. 12, εἰ εἰς κηρόν βάψει τις. Hist. Animal. VIII. 2, εἰς βάπτωσιν εἰς ψυχρόν. Ibid. VIII. 26, εἰς μέλι βάπτουτες. De Repub. VII. 17, εἰς ποταμὸν ἀποβάπτειν. Herodot. Melpom. p. 154, ἔπειτα ἀποβάψαντες ἐς (εἰς) τὴν κύλικα. Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. V, εἰς τὰς πλευρὰς βάψας. Plutarch. Parall. Graec. Rom. p. 545, εἰς τὸ αἷμα τὴν χεῖρα βαπτίσας. Marcus Anton. Lib. III. § 4, βεβαμμένον εἰς βᾶδος, etc. etc.

It were easy to multiply examples. But no possible doubt can arise, that such is common usage in classic Greek. But a review of the instances in which βαπτίζω is employed in the New Testament, presents a construction in general quite different from this. The result of such a review is, that after a par-

ticular examination of all the cases which refer either to the baptism of John or of Jesus and his disciples, I find but a single instance of the construction which is so general in the classics, whenever the element made use of in order to perform the rite of baptism, is named. This is the following :

Mark 1: 9, Ἰησοῦς . . . ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, *Jesus . . . was baptized by John INTO or IN the Jordan* ; following the usual method of the classics.

The other cases where the element is named, are of two kinds.

1. With the Dative and the preposition ἐν ; e. g. Matt. 3: 11, *I baptize you ἐν ὕδατι*, WITH *water* or BY *water*. Mark 1: 8, the same ; and so John 1: 26, 31, 33.

2. With the Dative merely ; e. g. Luke 3: 16, *I baptize you ὕδατι*, WITH *water* or BY *water* ; and so in Acts 1: 5. 11: 16 ; the idiom being peculiar to Luke.

The question very naturally occurs then, Is there any special significance to be attached to these modes of expression by the writers of the New Testament ? Did they intend to avoid a description of the *manner* of the rite, by forms of expression which designate merely the *means*, without marking the *manner* ? What they have done, as to modes of expression, is matter of fact, and therefore certain. What significancy, or whether any, is to be attached to these modes, is a question intimately connected with the object of our inquiry.

My first view of their *manner*, compared with the usual method of expression in the classics, inclined me to the supposition, that there was some special design in their employing the kind of phraseology which they have made use of. I am not confident now, that such is not the case ; yet a review of the whole state of the case, may perhaps lead to doubt, whether we ought to adopt such an opinion in respect to their usage.

1. We have one example apparently of the usual classical mode of expression, as above quoted, viz.

Mark 1: 9, ἐβαπτίσθη . . . εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. *Eis* is indeed found before the Accusative, and this not unfrequently, where it is employed in the like sense with ἐν before the Dative, by the writers of the New Testament ; e. g. Matt. 2: 23, *He dwelt εἰς πόλιν Ναζαρέτ*, AT or IN *the village Nazareth* ; John 21: 4, *He stood εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν*, ON *the shore* or BY *it* ; Acts 8: 40, *Philip was found εἰς Ἀζωτον*, AT *Azotus*. So in the Septuagint, Esth. 1: 5, *The heath-*

en who are found εἰς τὴν πόλιν, AT OR IN the city. In accordance with such examples of εἰς before a name of place, one might say, that in Mark 1: 9, εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην means, AT the river Jordan. So Bretschneider construes ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ, Matt. 3: 6, in his Lexicon, under βαπτίζω. This is clearly a possible construction; but whether it is here the most probable one, I entertain some doubts; because the Jordan naturally designates the element by which the rite of baptism is performed.

That εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, however, may designate no more in Mark 1: 9, than the element with which or by which John performed the rite of baptism, one might argue from such an example as that in John 9: 7, where Jesus says to the blind man, Go wash IN the pool (νίψαι εἰς κολυμβήθραν) of Siloam. Now we know that the word νίπτω (also νίζω) is used almost exclusively for the washing of the face, hands, or feet. So here, the blind man is directed to wash his face or his eyes at the pool, or in the pool, of Siloam. To plunge or immerse, is not necessarily implied by the word νίπτω, although in some cases it may clearly admit of this idea.

Other cases, where εἰς before the Accusative is employed in a like sense with ἐν before the Dative, specially in regard to the place in which any thing is or is done, the reader may find by consulting Mark 2: 1. John 1: 18. Mark 13: 16. Luke 11: 7. Acts 18: 21. Mark 13: 9. In like manner the classic authors not unfrequently employ εἰς before nouns significant of place; Winer's Gramm. Ed. 3, p. 350. And in accordance with the example in John 9: 7, cited above, we may appeal to the expression of Alciphron, III. 43, λουσαμένου εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον, having washed IN the bath or AT the bath.

With so many examples before us, of cases where εἰς and ἐν are assimilated in usage, both in heathen and in sacred writers, it must be somewhat doubtful, whether the solitary example of εἰς after βαπτίζω and before the noun designating the element, which is found in Mark 1: 9, can be much relied on, in order to shew that the New Testament usage agrees with the usual classical one. The only circumstance which weighs much in its favour, so far as the case has yet been developed, is, that the noun which here follows βαπτίζω, may very naturally designate the element by which the rite in question is performed; and so, the usual classical construction may more naturally be allowed. But this again is rendered so dubious by νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν and λουσαμένου εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον, that we can scarcely

come with safety and confidence to a philological conclusion of such a nature.

We are obliged, then, to cast about us, and see if any further light can be thrown upon this usage of the noun (after the verb βαπτίζω), which signifies the element by which the rite is performed. Have the classic writers used not only the Accusative with εἰς, but also the Dative with and without ἐν, and other equivalent constructions?

In answer to this question I will now produce several examples, which shew that the classical writers have expressed themselves in different ways, when employing the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω.

Aristophanes, Eccles. *They dip the wool θερμῶ, IN warm water*; Dative without ἐν. Aristotle, Hist. Anim. VIII. 29, *And dipping it in wine (ἐν οἴνῳ), they drink it*; Dative with ἐν. Heraclides Ponticus, Allegor. p. 495, *ὕδατι βαπτίζεται*. Aratus, Phaenom. v. 650, *βάντων ὠκεανοῖο, baptizing with the ocean*; Genitive without a preposition, used in the same sense as the Dative with ἐν. Ibid. 858, *βάνται ῥόον ἐσπερίοιο bathes himself WITH the western flood, i. e. the sea*; Genitive of instrument. Again, v. 951, *Bathes herself ποταμοῖο, WITH the river*; Genitive of instrument. Strabo, XVI. p. 1117, *Dipped ὄστροις, in the gall of serpents*; Dative without preposition. Plutarch, De Educ. Puer. p. 15, *τοῖς ὑπερβάλλουσι βαπτίζεται, are overwhelmed WITH excessive labours*; Dative of cause. Marcus Antoninus, V. § 16, *βάπτεται ὑπὸ τῶν φαντασιῶν, Genitive of instrument, with a preposition*. Plutarch, Moral. Tom. III. p. 1504, *ὀφλήμασι βεβαπτισμένον, overwhelmed WITH debts*; Dative of cause, without a preposition.

It follows then from these examples, to which many more might easily be added if necessary, that the verbs βάπτω and βαπτίζω admit after them several various methods of construing the noun, which designates the element made use of in the action indicated by the verb. (1) The Accusative case with εἰς before it; which is the usual construction. (2) The Dative with ἐν. (3) The Dative without ἐν. (4) The Genitive with ὑπό, etc. (5) The Genitive without a preposition. And probably it is another variety still, which Sophocles exhibits in his Ajax, v. 96, where he says: *Thou hast well BATHED (ἔβαψας) thy sword πρὸς Ἀργείων στρατόν, WITH the army of the Greeks*.

From such examples, which indeed are somewhat numerous, we may come very fairly to the conclusion, that when a Greek employed the word βάπτω or βαπτίζω, he did not feel constrained to use the Accusative case after it with the preposition εἰς.

He might express himself in various other ways, and still conform to the *usus loquendi*.

But are all these modes of speaking, now exhibited, equivalent to each other? I think not. There is a difference which may be made quite manifest, between saying, *ἔβαψεν εἰς τὸν ποταμόν*, and *ἔβαψεν ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ*, or *βάπτων τῷ ποταμῷ*, *βάπτων ποταμοῦ*, *ἔβάφη ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, etc. In the first case, I understand the writer or speaker as meaning to designate the *manner* of the baptism; *he plunged into the river* means, that he *immersed or submerged himself*, i. e. that he went down or sunk beneath the surface of the water. In all the other cases, the *manner* of the action is no farther designated, than the words *βάπτω* or *βαπτίζω* imply it; but the *means, cause* or *instrument* of baptism is designated, viz. the river, or the waters of the river. *Ἐβάπτισε εἰς τὸν ποταμόν* cannot usually mean less, than that the individual of whom this is affirmed, did actually dive into the water, or was in some way submerged in it; whereas all the other methods of construction do not of necessity imply any more, than that the individual concerned *bathed himself* or *washed himself*, with the element named. This may have been by plunging into it, or in any other way; but the expression, when the Genitive or Dative is used after the verb, either with or without a preposition, does not designate the *manner* of the baptism, but only the kind of element by which this baptism was effected. This results from the nature of the Genitive and Dative cases, and the prepositions with which they are connected, in all the constructions now in question. To this I make the appeal; and those who know enough of the laws of syntax and idiom in Greek, to be qualified to judge, will be able to determine for themselves whether the distinction now made is well founded.

Believing that it is so, I may now bring to the test, the cases of *βαπτίζω* in the New Testament, after which verb the element is designated. As we have already seen, all these are either in the Dative with or without *ἐν*, one only excepted, which seems to be construed after the usual analogy. Setting aside this then, for a moment, we may say, in all other cases in the New Testament, the *mode* of baptism is left undetermined by the original Greek, so far as the language itself is concerned, unless it is necessarily implied by the word *βαπτίζω*; for in all other cases, only the *element by which*, not the *mode in which* baptism is performed, is designated by the sacred writers.

I take this to be sufficiently plain and certain, to the well-instructed philologist; and I apprehend it may now appear plain to others, from the evidence placed before them. Is there then, in the word βαπτίζω itself, a meaning sufficiently definite and exclusive to imply of necessity, that the rite of baptism was performed only by *plunging*? And does the solitary example in Mark 1: 9, add confirmation to the supposition of such a meaning?

It will be remembered, that I am now making the inquiry, how much we may justly conclude *ex vi termini*, i. e. merely from the force of the words concerned, independently of any historical facts that may stand connected with them, and be explanatory of them. For in this case, as in all others, more or less of modification may be admitted in respect to the sense of particular words, as the circumstances, i. e. the facts connected with the case, may require.

The answer to the above questions which I feel philologically compelled to give, is, that the probability that βαπτίζω implies *immersion*, is very considerable, and on the whole a predominant one; but it does not still amount to certainty. Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint shew, that *washing* and *copious affusion* are sometimes signified by this word. Consequently, the rite of baptism may have been performed in one of these ways, although it is designated by the word βαπτίζω. Whether in fact it was so, then, seems to be left for inquiry, from other evidence than that which the word itself necessarily affords.

In respect to Mark 1: 9, ἐβαπτίσθη . . . εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, after what has been said above, and in consideration that this is the only instance of the kind in the New Testament, it cannot be deemed, as it appears to me, quite safe to build with confidence upon it. The expressions, νίψαι εἰς κολυμβήθραν, in John 9: 7, and λουσαμένον εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον (*washed in a bath*) in Alciphron III. 43, shew that the Greek verbs which designate the *washing* of the hands, face, or feet, and also of the body, may and do take the same construction, viz. the Accusative with εἰς after them. In either of these two last cases, *plunging* is not essential to the idea conveyed by the verb, although it is admissible.

On the whole, however, the probability seems to be in favour of the idea of *immersion*, when we argue simply *ex vi termini*, i. e. merely from the force of the words or expressions in themselves considered.

I know not that I can cast any further light on this part of my subject, by pursuing simply philological investigation. However, as this seems to leave us somewhat in a state of uncertainty still, we must have recourse to the other means of inquiry suggested above.

§ 6. *Circumstances attending Baptism.*

II. *Do the circumstances which attend the administration of the rite of baptism, as related in the New Testament, cast any light upon the MANNER of the rite itself?*

1. The Baptism of John.

(a) John is called *βαπτιστης* in the following passages; viz. Matt. 3: 1. 11: 11, 12. 14: 2, 8. 16: 14. 17: 13. Mark 6: 24, 25. 8: 28. Luke 7: 20, 28, 33. 9: 19. But as this appellation determines merely his *office*, and not the manner in which he performed the rite of baptism, it would serve no purpose to pursue an investigation relative to this word; which of course must take its hue from *βαπτίζω*.

(b) I have already remarked, that Bretschneider considers Matt. 3: 6, *All Jerusalem etc. . . were baptized ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, in the Jordan*, as designating the *place where* they were baptized. This he seems to justify by an appeal to Mark 1: 4, *John was baptizing ἐν τῷ ἐρήμῳ, in the desert*. But the difference between the two cases is, that the river Jordan may naturally signify the element *with* which the rite was performed.

I find nothing else in the accounts of the several Evangelists, or in the Acts of the Apostles, respecting the baptism of John, which has not already been discussed under our first inquiry in § 5, excepting the phraseology in Matt. 3: 16, and in Mark 1: 10. It is here related, that Jesus being baptized by John, *ἀνέβη (ἀναβαίτων) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, went up from the water*, viz. from the river Jordan. The question has been raised, whether this means 'Went up out of the water of the river,' i. e. rose up after being plunged into the river, and came out of the water. It becomes necessary therefore to investigate this question.

Several considerations may serve to determine it. (1) The rite of baptism was completed, before John went up from the water. So says Matthew, *βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς*; and Mark also says, that *Jesus was baptized by John in the Jordan*, and then

went up from the water. Both Evangelists say, that the action of going up took place immediately or straightway (εὐθύς, εὐθέως) after the baptism. Now if the rite of baptism was completed, before John emerged from the water, (in case he was immersed,) i. e. if it was completed merely by the act of plunging him under the water, then indeed ἀναβαίνων might possibly be supposed to apply to his emerging from the water. But who will venture to introduce such a conceit as this? (2) Yet if any one should wish to do so, the verb ἀναβαίνω will hardly permit such an interpretation. This verb means to ascend, mount, go up, viz. a ship, a hill, an eminence, a chariot, a tree, a horse, a rostrum, to go up to the capital of a country, to heaven, etc. and as applied to trees and vegetables, to spring up, shoot up, grow up. But as to emerging from the water, I can find no such meaning attached to it. The Greeks have a proper word for this, and one continually employed by the ecclesiastical fathers, in order to designate emerging from the water; and this is ἀναδύω, which means to come up out of the water, the ground, etc. or to emerge from below the horizon, as do the sun, stars, etc. But this verb is never commuted, to my knowledge, with ἀναβαίνω. The usage of each seems to be perfectly distinct; yet I do not deny the possibility of employing ἀναβαίνω in the sense of emerging. I know the want of accuracy in some writers too well to hazard the assertion, that no example of such usage can be found. But if there are such examples they must be very rare. The New Testament surely does not afford them. (3) The preposition ἀπό will not allow such a construction. I have found no example where it is applied to indicate a movement out of a liquid, into the air. Ex would of course be the proper word to indicate such a relation as this. Από denotes either the relation of origin, as sprung from, descended from, etc. or removal in regard to distance, or the relation of cause to effect, the instrument, etc. To designate emerging from any thing that is liquid, I have not found it ever applied.

These concurrent reasons, both of circumstances and *usus loquendi*, make it a clear case, that Jesus retired from the water of the river, by going up its banks. Nothing more can properly be deduced from it.

As there appears to be nothing more of a circumstantial nature, in all the examples cited above where the baptism of John is mentioned, which can cast any light upon the point in question, (ex-

cepting one case that stands connected with the mention of Christian baptism,) I proceed to make inquiry respecting this latter subject.

2. Christian Baptism, as practised by the primitive disciples of Jesus.

This is mentioned or alluded to, in Matt. 3: 14. 28: 19. Mark 16: 11. John 3: 22. 4: 1, 2. Acts 2: 28, 41. 8: 12, 13, 16, 36, 38. 9: 18. 10: 47, 48. 16: 15, 33. 18: 8. 19: 3, 5. 22: 16. Rom. 6: 3 bis. 1 Cor. 1: 14, 15, 16, 17. 12: 13. Gal. 3: 27. The example in Acts 19: 3 may be doubtful. The passages in Eph. 5: 26. Tit. 3: 5, and Heb. 10: 22, also refer to Christian baptism.

The examples in Matthew and Mark afford nothing pertinent to our present object. But in John 3: 22—24, a narration just alluded to above, occurs in connexion with mentioning that Jesus abode in Judea and *baptized* there, which deserves our special attention. The writer, after narrating what has just been stated, goes on to say: *Now John was baptizing in (or at) Enon, near Salim, ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ, for there was MUCH WATER there, or (more literally), there were MANY WATERS there.* The question is, Whether John baptized at Enon near Salim, because the waters were there abundant and deep, so as to afford convenient means of immersion; or whether the writer means merely to say, that John made choice of Enon, because there was an abundant supply of water there for the accommodation of those who visited him, for the sake of being baptized and of hearing the powerful addresses which he made to the Jews. The former statement makes the *much water* or *many waters* necessary, or at least convenient and desirable, for the purposes of the baptismal rite; the latter for supplying the wants of the multitudes who attended to the preaching of John.

It has always seemed to me a very singular mode of expression, if the sacred writer meant to designate the former idea, to say *ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ.* Why not say, because the water *was deep, or abundant, simply?* A single brook, of very small capacity, but still a living stream, might, with scooping out a small place in the sand, answer most abundantly all the purposes of baptism, in case it were performed by immersion; and answer them just as well as *many waters* could do. But on the other hand, a single brook would not suffice for the accommodation of the great multitudes who flocked to John. The sacred writer tells us, that “there went out to him, Jerusalem, and

all Judea, and all the neighbouring region of Jordan," Matt. 3: 5; and that they were baptized by him. Of course there must have been a great multitude of people. Nothing could be more natural than for John to choose a place that was watered by many streams, where all could be accommodated.

The circumstances of the case, then, would seem to favour that interpretation, which refers the mention of *many waters* to the wants of the people who flocked to hear John.

But let us see, now, what the idiom of the language demands. The following passages serve to illustrate this idiom.

In Matt. 3: 16. Mark 1: 10, ὕδατος (*water*) designates the river Jordan; as we might very naturally suppose. In Acts 8: 36—39, it is left uncertain by the text, whether a stream or fountain of water is there meant; for ὕδωρ may designate either. In Rev. 8: 11, τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων, *a third part of the waters*, refers both to the rivers and fountains of water that had just been mentioned; and so ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων again in the same verse. In Rev. 17: 1, the angel says to John: "I will shew thee the punishment of the great harlot, who sitteth on *many waters*," i. e. many streams or rivers of water, not merely a large quantity of water. In 17: 15 the same phrase and idea is repeated. In Rev. 22: 1, we find the expression ποταμὸν ὑδατος ζωῆς, *river of the water of life*, which in Rev. 22: 17 is referred to and called ὕδωρ ζωῆς, *water of life*. In Rev. 1: 15. 14: 2. 19: 6, we have the expression φωνὴ ὑδάτων πολλῶν, *the voice of many waters*; which, in two of the passages, is followed by the expression, *as the voice of thunder*, i. e. a noise exceedingly loud. Now it is the waves of the sea, probably, to which the writer here alludes; for there were no cataracts in Palestine that would have supplied him with an apposite idea. But these waves of the sea are successive, and (so to speak) different and broken masses of water; not one continuous mass, deep and abundant. The simple idea of depth and abundance would not give birth to the conception of *roaring* waters. It is the movement, the division, the succession, and the motion, which form the ground of this idea.

Of the Evangelists, only Matthew and Mark use ὕδωρ in the plural. Matthew employs it four times; viz. 14: 28, 29. 8: 32. 17: 15. In the three former instances it designates the *waters* (as we say) in the lake or sea of Tiberias; in the latter it probably means different or various streams or fountains of water. In this last sense, Mark employs it, in the only example in which the plural is used in his Gospel; viz. in 9: 22. No other example of the plural occurs until we come to the Apocalypse. Here, as we have seen, the waters or waves of the ocean are designated by the

plural in 1: 15. 14: 2. 19: 6. In Rev. 7: 17. 8: 10, 11 bis. 11: 6. 14: 7. 16: 4, 5. 17: 1, 15, *fountains and streams* (plural) of water are designated by *ῥοα*.

No example then can be brought in the New Testament of the application of *ῥοα* to designate merely *quantity* of water, simply considered as *deep* and *abounding*. It is either the vast waters of a sea or lake, as agitated by the winds and broken into waves, or the multiplied waters of numerous springs and fountains, which are here designated by the *plural* of the word in question.

That *ῥοα* is sometimes employed to designate *a stream* or *river*, is clear, moreover, from the Septuagint use of the word.

E. g. Ex. 7: 15, "Behold he (Pharaoh) will go out ἐπὶ τὸ ῥοα, *to the water*, i. e. the river, for so the next clause explains it; *and thou shalt meet him on the brink τοῦ ποταμοῦ, of the river*. In Ex. 8: 20, the same phrase, in the same sense, is again repeated. So in Lev. 14: 5, 6, 50—52, mention is made of a bird to be killed ἐφ' ῥοα ζῶντι, *over living water*, i. e. over a running stream or brook; although the meaning of living water may be, that of a *spring* or *fountain*, which continually sends forth fresh water; as it is in Gen. 26: 19. Jer. 2: 13. The first, however, is what I should deem to be the most probable sense here. Num. 24: 6, *As cedars παρ' ῥοα, by the waters*, i. e. rivers, or water-courses, which is here the most probable idea; comp. Ps. 1: 3, "He shall be as a tree planted יָרֵם בְּעֵבֶר הַמַּיִם *by the water-courses*."—2 Chron. 32: 30, *And he [Hezekiah] stopped up the issue τοῦ ὕδατος Γειῶν, of the water-course or sluice Gihon*. Is. 18: 2, *Who sendest . . . epistles of papyrus over the water, ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος*, i. e. upon the face or surface of the river Nile.

Indeed, there can be no doubt of such a usage of the word *ῥοα*, whenever occasion calls for it. The simple question then is, whether the occasion does call for it, in John 3: 22—24.

Grotius, and after him Kuinoel, thinks that *ῥοα πολλά* designates such a *copiousness of water*, as was sufficient for the purposes of immersion. Beza, on the other hand, one of the most acute judges of Greek idiom, says that "by the appellation *ῥοα* is meant *many rivulets* (multi rivi);" and he appeals to *ῥοα* in Matt. 3: 16, in confirmation of this. He might have carried the appeal much farther, if he had been at the pains of consulting his Concordance. Even in Homer, Od. XIII. 109, *ῥοα* occurs as designating great or flowing streams.

I do not deny, that in the Septuagint, for example, *ῥοα* and *ῥοαί* are sometimes promiscuously used, without any percepti-

ble difference of meaning. In most cases, however, this is not the fact; but the plural *ῥοατα* is used to designate *great bodies of water or numerous bodies or streams* of it; e. g. in Gen. 1: 10, 20, 21, 22. Ex. 2: 19. 8: 6. 15: 27. 20: 4, and often so elsewhere. The promiscuous use, in some cases, of *ῥοωρ* and *ῥοατα* in the version of the Seventy, seems to be the result of imitating the Hebrew; for the Hebrew has only a plural form (מַיִם) to designate the element of water.

Why should the epithet *πολλά* be added to *ῥοατα*, in John 3: 22—24, if merely deep water, or a quantity of water sufficient for immersing was intended? The natural and primary meaning of *πόλυς*, is *many* in opposition to *few*. It has merely a secondary meaning, especially so when in the *plural* number, if at any time it designates largeness of quantity, intensity of degree, etc.

On the whole, I cannot divest myself of the impression, that there seems to be something extravagant in the supposition, that not only the plural *ῥοατα*, which naturally designates a large quantity or many streams of water, but also *πολλά* should be employed, in order to designate a quantity of water sufficient for baptizing by immersion; when any small rivulet would furnish abundant means for such a purpose. I cannot avoid the belief, therefore, that *ῥοατα πολλά* is designed, as Beza says, to designate *many streams or rivulets*. John chose a place abounding in these, when he removed from the banks of the Jordan, in order that the multitudes who flocked to him might be accommodated.

The passage which my present purpose leads me next to examine, is in Acts 8: 36—39. Philip expounded to the Ethiopian eunuch the Scriptures respecting the Messiah, and he was moved to belief in that Saviour who was preached to him. As Philip and his new disciple journeyed on together, they came, says the sacred writer, *ἐπὶ τι ῥοωρ* to a certain water. What kind of water? A rivulet, river, spring, pool, or what? If the answer be, *a brook or river*, then the sense put upon *ῥοατα πολλά* in the paragraph above, is of course conceded; i. e. it is conceded that such a sense may be given to *ῥοατα*, as has here been assigned to it. If the answer be, *to a spring, fountain; or pool of water*, then again it is conceded, that *ῥοωρ* designates something besides the mere *element* of water. The use of *τι* here of necessity implies, that *ῥοωρ* must be either a stream, or a fountain, or a pool of water.

I acknowledge myself unable to determine, with any good degree of certainty, which of these is meant. Yet I think the probability to be, that it was a *fountain* of water. I draw this conclusion rather from the geography of the country, than from the mere principles of philology. There is, indeed, a river with branches, between Jerusalem and Gaza; yet it runs not through the desert, but through the inhabited country; for rivers in the East, make habitable places. There is another river *south* of Gaza. But the place where Philip met the eunuch was the *desert* between Jerusalem and this place, Acts 8: 27. I must therefore think the $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\omega\sigma$, in Acts 8: 36, to be a *spring* or *pool of water*.

Such a collection of water is usually, of course, in some valley or ravine. Hence it is said in v. 38, *They went down εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*, to the water, as some would render it, or INTO the water, as others insist it should be translated. Does εἰς in this case, admit of either sense? And which is to be preferred?

That εἰς with the verb *καταβαίνω* (which is used in Acts 8: 38) often means *going down to a place*, is quite certain; e. g. John 2: 12, *Jesus went down to (εἰς) Capernaum*; Acts 7: 15, *Jacob went down to (εἰς) Egypt*; Acts 14: 25, *They went down to (εἰς) Attalia*; Acts 16: 8, *They went down to (εἰς) Troas*; Acts 18: 22, *He went down to (εἰς) Antioch*; Acts 25: 6, *Going down to (εἰς) Cesarea*; comp. Luke 10: 30. 18: 14. Acts 8: 26, et al. So common indeed is the meaning of εἰς, when it designates direction to a place or towards it, that Bretschneider has given this as its first and leading signification. But I have confined my examples to its connexion with *καταβαίνω*.

On the other hand, I find but one passage in the New Testament, where it seems to mean *into*, when used with the verb *καταβαίνω*. This is in Rom. 10: 7, *Who shall go down εἰς ἄβυσσον, into the abyss*. Even here the sense to is good. And in fact, when one analyzes the idea of *καταβαίνω*, *going down, descending*, he finds that it indicates the action performed *before* reaching a place, the approximation to it by descent, real or supposed, and not the entering into it. *Ἐισέρχομαι* is the appropriate word for *entering into*; or rather (in distinction from *καταβαίνω*) *ἐμβαίνω* is the appropriate word, to signify *entrance into* any place or thing. Hence I must conclude, on the whole, that although in several of the above cases of *καταβαίνω* with εἰς, we may translate εἰς by *into* and still make good sense in

English; yet the real and appropriate signification of this phraseology in the New Testament seems plainly to be, *going down to a place*. *Καταβαίνω* designates the action performed in order to arrive there by descending, in any sense; and not the action of entering into the place to which one has gone down; although this may sometimes be included by popular diction.

I must come then to the conclusion, that *κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*, in Acts 8: 38, does neither necessarily nor probably mean, *they descended into the water*. This conclusion is rendered nearly certain, by the exact counterpart or antithesis of this expression, which is found in v. 39, where, after the baptism, it is said, *ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος*, *they went up from the water*. We have seen (p. 320), that *ἀναβαίνω* is never employed in the sense of *emerging from a liquid substance*. The preposition *ἐκ*, here, would agree well with this idea, although it by no means of necessity implies it; but *ἀναβαίνω* forbids us thus to construe it. As then *to go up FROM the water*, is to ascend the bank of a stream, pool, or fountain; so *to go down TO the water*, is to go down the bank of such stream, fountain, or pool, and to come to the water. Whether the person, thus *going down εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*, enters *into* it or not, must be designated in some other way than by this expression, which of itself leaves the matter in uncertainty.

I have another remark to make on *κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*, *they BOTH went down to the water*. This is, that if *κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ* is meant to designate the action of *plunging or being immersed into the water*, as a part of the rite of baptism, then was Philip baptized as well as the eunuch; for the sacred writer says, that *BOTH went into the water*. Here then must have been a rebaptism of Philip; and what is at least singular, he must have baptized *himself*, as well as the eunuch.

All these considerations together shew, that the *going down to the water*, and the *going up from the water*, constituted no part of the rite of baptism itself; for Philip did the one and the other just as truly as the eunuch. As then neither the language allows us to construe the passage as signifying *immersion and emersion*, nor the circumstances permit us to interpret the passage thus, we have no good and sufficient grounds here to consider this example as making any determination with respect to the mode of the baptismal rite.

I come next to the examination of those passages, which have so often been adduced and relied upon, in the controversy re-

specting the original mode of baptism, and which are contained in Rom. 6: 3, 4, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death? We then have been buried with him by baptism into his death; so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, in like manner we also should walk in newness of life;" also Col. 2: 12, "Being buried with him by baptism; with whom also ye have been raised up (or have arisen) by faith, through the power of God, who raised him from the dead."

I might refer the reader to what I have written upon these verses in my Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. But as the present disquisition may come into the hands of some who do not possess that work, I deem it proper to transfer to this place what I have there said, and also to make some additions to the remarks thus transferred. The Commentary is as follows.

Verse 3. *Ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.* The sense of this depends on the meaning of the formula *βαπτίζεω εἰς τίνα*—or *βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τινός.* (a) In regard to *βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, the noun *ὄνομα* is, no doubt, to be regarded as *expletive*; as *עַבְד* in Hebrew often is. So in the Jewish formula of baptizing proselytes; if the proselyte was a servant, the master, at his baptism, made a declaration whether he intended to make the servant free as a proselyte, or to have him still remain a servant. This declaration was made thus: *טַבַּל בְּשֵׁם בֶּן חֹרֵיין*, *he is baptized into the name of freemen*; or *טַבַּל בְּשֵׁם עֶבֶד*, *he is baptized into the name of a servant.* So Matt. 28: 19, *Baptized εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, which is the same as *baptized εἰς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.* Accordingly we find *ὄνομα* omitted in our text, as also in 1 Cor. 10: 2. Gal. 3: 27; it is used in Acts 8: 16. 19: 5. 1 Cor. 1: 13, 15.

(b) The sense of the *whole formula* is more difficult to be ascertained. Most commentators, after Vitringa (Obs. Sac. III. 22), explain *εἰς* as meaning *INTO the acknowledgement of*; with an implication of *affiance, subjection, discipleship, etc.* But the formula in 1 Cor. 12: 13, *πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν*, seems not to accord with such an explanation. Here *εἰς* plainly means, *participation*; i. e. by baptism we come to belong *to one body*, to participate in one body, to be members of one body. In like manner, we may say, by baptism we come to belong, (in a special and peculiar sense, no doubt), to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; to Moses, 1 Cor. 10: 2; to Paul, 1 Cor. 1: 13. In this way all the passages may be construed alike, and the sense in all will be good. The idea is, for substance, that 'by baptism we become consecrated to

any person or thing, appropriated (as it were) to any person or thing, so as to belong to him or to it, in a manner peculiar and involving a special relation, and consequent special duties and obligations.

This sense is such an one as fits the passage under examination. Thus interpreted it would mean: 'As many of us as have become devoted to Christ by baptism; as many as have been consecrated to Christ by baptism; or been laid under peculiar obligations, or taken upon them a peculiar relation to him, by being baptized.'

Εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν, we have been baptized into his death, i. e. we have, as it were, been made partakers of his death by baptism; we have come under a special relation to his death; we have engaged to die unto sin, as he died for it; we have a communion or participation in death to sin; comp. Rom. 6: 6. Gal. 2: 19. *The being baptized into his death* is, therefore, an internal, moral, spiritual thing; of which the external rite of baptism is only a symbol; for the relation symbolized by baptism, is in its own nature *spiritual and moral*. *The participation in the death of Christ*, of which Paul here speaks, is surely something more than what is external; it is of a *moral or spiritual* nature, of which the external rite is merely a symbol.

Verse 4. *Συνετάφημεν οὐν κ. τ. λ. we have been buried with him*, then, by baptism into his death, i. e. we are (by being baptized into his death) buried as he was, *συνετάφημεν*, where *σύν* means *like*, in like manner with; comp, v. 6; also Rom. 8: 17. Col. 3: 1, where any other sense of *σύν* is out of question; 2 Tim. 2: 11, to which the same remark will apply.

Most commentators have maintained, that *συνετάφημεν* has here a necessary reference to the mode of *literal* baptism, which, they say, was by *immersion*; and this, they think, affords ground for the employment of the image used by the apostle, because *immersion* (under water) may be compared to *burial* (under the earth). It is difficult, perhaps, to procure a patient re-hearing for this subject, so long regarded by some as being out of fair dispute. Nevertheless, as my own conviction is not, after protracted and repeated examinations, accordant here with that of commentators in general, I feel constrained briefly to state my reasons.

(a) The first is, that in the verse before us there is a plain *antithesis*; one so plain that it is impossible to overlook it. If now *συνετάφημεν* is to be interpreted in a *physical* way, i. e. as meaning baptism in a physical sense, where is the corresponding *physical* idea, in the opposite part of the antithesis or comparison? Plainly there is no such *physical* idea or reference in the other part of the antithesis. The *resurrection* there spoken of, is entirely a *moral, spiritual* one; for it is one which Christians have already experienced, during the present life; as may be fully seen by comparing vs. 5, 11,

below. I take it for granted, that after ἡμεῖς in v. 4, ἐγερόμενοι is implied; since the nature of the comparison, the preceding ὡς ἠγέσθη Χριστός, and v. 5, make this entirely plain.

If we turn now to the passage in Col. 2: 12, (which is altogether parallel with the verse under examination, and has very often been agitated by polemic writers on the subject of baptism,) we shall there find more conclusive reason still, to argue as above respecting the nature of the *antithesis* presented. "We have been buried with [Christ] by *baptism*." What now is the *opposite* of this? What is the kind of *resurrection* from this grave in which Christians have been buried? The apostle tells us: "We have risen with him [Christ], by faith wrought by the power of God (τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ), who raised him [Christ] from the dead." Here, there is a *resurrection by faith*, i. e. a *spiritual, moral* one. Why then should we look for a *physical* meaning in the antithesis? If one part of the antithesis is to be construed in a manner entirely *moral* or *spiritual*, why should we not construe the other in the like manner? To understand *συνετάφημεν*, then, of a *literal burial under water*, is to understand it in a manner which the laws of interpretation appear to forbid.

(b) Nothing can be plainer, than that the word *συνετάφημεν*, in Rom. 6: 4, is equivalent in sense to the word *ἀπεθάνομεν* in v. 8. It seems to be adopted merely for the sake of rendering more striking the image of a *resurrection*, which the apostle employs in the other part of the antithesis. A *resurrection from the grave* is a natural phrase, when one is speaking with respect to the subject of a *resurrection*; see John 5: 28, 29; comp. Dan. 12: 2. In accordance with this statement, the context does most plainly speak, both in respect to Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12. For in respect to Rom. 6: 4, the apostle goes on in the very next verse, (as is usual with him), to present the same idea which is contained in v. 4, in a different costume. Verse 5 (which is a mere epexegetis of v. 4) says: *If we have been homogeneous (σύμμετροι, like, of the same kind) with Christ in his death, then shall we be in his resurrection.* The same idea and explanation is repeated in v. 8—*ἀπεθάνομεν—συνζήσομεν*, and the whole is summarily explained in v. 11, *So reckon ye yourselves to be νεκρούς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ.*

Exactly in the same manner has the apostle gone on to explain *συνταφέντες* in Col. 2: 12. In v. 13 he adds: *You νεκρούς in your offences . . . συνεξωποίησε, has he [God] made alive with him [Christ], having forgiven us all our offences."*

There can be no real ground for question, then, that by *συνετάφημεν*, in both cases, is meant neither more nor less than by *ἀπεθάνομεν, νεκροί*, &c. The epexegetis added in both cases, seems to make this quite plain.

The only reason, then, which I can find, why *συνετάφημεν* is preferred in Rom. 6: 4, and in Col. 2: 12, is, as has been suggested above, that the language may be a fuller antithesis of the word *resurrection*, which is employed in the corresponding part of the comparison. "You who were [dead] buried with Christ," gives energy to the expression.

(c) But my principal difficulty in respect to the usual exegesis of *συνετάφημεν* is, that the image or figure of *immersion, baptism*, is, so far as I know, nowhere else in Scripture employed as a symbol of *burial in the grave*. Nor can I think that it is a very natural symbol of burial. The obvious import of *washing with water*, or immersing in water, is, that it is symbolical of purity, cleansing, purification. But how will this aptly signify *burying in the grave*, the place of corruption, loathsomeness, and destruction?

For these reasons, I feel inclined to doubt the usual exegesis of the passage before us, and to believe that the apostle had in view only a burying which is *moral and spiritual*; for the same reasons that he had a *moral and spiritual* (not a physical) resurrection in view, in the corresponding part of the antithesis.

Indeed what else but a *moral burying* can be meant, when the apostle goes on to say: *We are buried with him* [not by baptism only, but] *by baptism INTO HIS DEATH*? Of course it will not be contended, that a literal *physical* burying is here meant, but only a *moral* one. And although the words, *into his death*, are not inserted in Col. 2: 12; yet, as the following verse there shews, they are plainly implied. In fact it is plain, that reference is here made to *baptism*, because, when the rite was performed, the Christian promised to renounce sin and to mortify all his evil desires, and thus to die unto sin that he might live unto God. I cannot see, therefore, that there is any more necessary reference here to the *modus* of baptism, than there is to the *modus* of the resurrection. The one may as well be maintained as the other.

I am aware, however, that one may say: 'I admit that the burial with Christ has a *moral* sense, and only such an one; but then the language in which this idea is conveyed (*συνετάφημεν*), is evidently borrowed from the custom of immersion.' In reply to this, I would refer to the considerations under (c) above. The possibility of this usage I admit; but to shew that the image is natural, and obvious, and that it is a part of Scripture usage elsewhere, is what seems important, in order to produce entire satisfaction to the mind of a philological inquirer. At any rate, I cannot at present think the case to be clear enough to entitle any one to employ this passage with confidence, in a contest respecting the mode of baptism.

In now reviewing the whole of these remarks, I am not able to perceive that they are for substance incorrect. The more I

reflect on the subject, the more I am persuaded, that the essential part of the idea which is conveyed by *συνετάφημεν*, consists in this, viz. that when the Christian is *baptized into the death of Christ*, Rom. 6: 4, he is considered as "putting off the old man with his lusts," as "crucifying him," as renouncing the world and his former sinful course, and engaging to live a new life. Accordingly in Rom. vi. the apostle presents at large the idea, that as Christ died *for* sin when he suffered on the cross, so his followers must die *to* it, i. e. renounce it, when they become his disciples. But they openly and solemnly profess to be so, when they are admitted by baptism to make a public profession of the Christian religion. Now as he died and was buried in a *physical* sense, for or on account of sin; so we die and are buried in a *moral* or *spiritual* sense, when we solemnly profess and engage to hate sin and renounce it, as we do in baptism. And it seems to me, that the specific reason why the apostle makes use of *συνετάφημεν* is, that it is a stronger antithesis to the word *συνηρέθητε* (ye have been raised up), which he employs in the context. I must repeat again, that I find nothing in all the ritual use of water, as an emblem of purification and consecration to God, which seems to prepare the way for the use of baptism by immersion as a symbol of Christ's literal death and burial; or rather as bearing a resemblance to this. And this is so strongly impressed on my mind, that I must see more evidence than I now do, that Paul meant to make a comparison between literal burial and literal baptism, before I can attach any weight to the argument attempted from Rom. 6: 3, 4, and Col. 2: 12, in the controversy about the mode of baptism. The impression is strong upon my mind, that the gist of the true comparison lies in *the being baptized INTO THE DEATH OF CHRIST*; not in *being baptized* only.

When the apostle says, then, in Col. 2: 12, *συνταφέντες αὐτῶ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι*, I understand him as employing *ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι* in the Dative in order to signify the *occasion, means*, etc. in like manner as the Dative is elsewhere used in a similar way. Thus when it is said: *He shall baptize you ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ὕδατι*, or *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* simply, e. g. Matt. 3: 11. Mark 1: 8. Luke 3: 16. John 1: 33. Acts 1: 5. 11: 16; or when it is said: *We have all been baptized into one body, BY ONE SPIRIT, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι*; the meaning cannot be that we have been plunged or immersed into one Spirit or into one fire, but that by means of these we have been spiritually baptized, or that the

Spirit has been copiously poured out upon Christians. So *being buried with Christ by baptism*, i. e. by baptism into his death, cannot be shewn to mean, of necessity, any thing more, than that by the rite of baptism Christians profess to die and be buried, in a moral or spiritual sense, and as to the old man who with his lusts is to be crucified or put to death.

I have now examined all the passages, on which reliance has been principally had, in order to shew from circumstances and allusions, in what mode the rite of baptism was originally performed in the Christian church. If there may be some doubt remaining in the mind of the reader, whether I have allowed them to speak fairly and fully, I can only say, that I have not purposely either kept back any evidence in regard to the subject, of which I am in possession, or willingly magnified any view or statement for the sake of favouring any particular sentiment; for I am not at all concerned in what way the result of this inquiry may come out, in respect to the *original mode* of baptism. The *external* mode of an *external* rite, never can, with my present views of Christianity, become to me a matter of any peculiar interest, in any other point of view than merely that of a historical fact. My full belief is, that since "God is a Spirit," he seeks worshippers "in spirit and in truth;" and that where the *heart* is given to him, the manner of external rites can never be essential. These may concern the *costume* of the church; but never her glorious person.

I have still an inquiry to make under our present head, and one which seems to be important, so far as it concerns our investigation with respect to facts. It is this: Are there not some circumstances related or implied, in the passages respecting Christian baptism, which seem to render the idea *improbable* that immersion was generally, or at least universally practised?

Let us examine the narrative in Acts II. On the day of Pentecost, Acts 2: 1, the disciples were assembled in one place, and the Holy Spirit was poured out upon them in a miraculous manner, and they began to speak in foreign languages. This attracted great multitudes to hear them; and these Peter addressed in a powerful manner, setting forth the claims of Jesus, and exhibiting the guilt of their unbelief and their enmity to the Saviour. Under this address, three thousand of the audience "were pricked in the heart," and made anxious for their salvation. On the very same day on which all this happened, these three thousand, it would seem, were all baptized and add-

ed to the Christian church ; Acts 2: 40, 51. The question apposite to our purpose is : *Where and how were they baptized ?*

Was it in the brooks or streams near Jerusalem ? I cannot find this to be probable. The feast of Pentecost, being fifty days after the passover, Lev. 25: 15, must fall into the latter part of the month of May, and after the Jewish harvest. In Palestine, this is usually a time of drought, or at least of great scarcity of rain. The brook Kidron, on the east of Jerusalem, was not a perennial stream ; and the brooks on the south of the city, from the fountain of Shiloh or Gihon, were not adequate, without some special preparation, for the purposes of baptism by immersion ; as one must be prone to think, from the representations respecting them. Nothing can be more natural, moreover, than the supposition, that if the apostles baptized the three thousand in either of the streams around Jerusalem, it would have been mentioned ; just as it is said of John, that he baptized in the Jordan. No such mention, however, is made.

We must conclude, then, that if baptism by immersion was practised on this occasion, it must have been in baths or washing places. I do not say that this was impossible, for every one acquainted with the Jewish rites must know, that they made much use of ablutions ; and therefore they would provide many conveniences for them. But let it be remembered, in respect to the present occasion, that a great many of the three thousand were foreigners. How many belonged to the city of Jerusalem, we cannot tell. But we may ask : Did the apostles baptize, without individual confession and profession, like that of the eunuch, insisted upon by Philip ? We can hardly deem this probable. Supposing then, that these were required, and that the apostles resorted to private baths in order to baptize, would one day, or rather, some three quarters of a day, suffice to perform such a work ? On the supposition that only the apostles baptized ; and granting, moreover, that Peter ended his sermon at nine o'clock in the morning ("the *third* hour of the day"), whereas he only began it then ; the consequence would be, that for the remaining nine hours of the day, = 540 minutes, each apostle must have baptized, on an average, one in about two minutes, inasmuch as each would have had two hundred and fifty baptisms to perform, if they were equally divided. However, I concede that there are some points here, which are left undetermined, and which may serve to aid those who differ from me, in replying to these remarks. It is true that we do

not know, that baptism was performed by the apostles only ; nor that all the three thousand were baptized before the going down of the sun. The work may have extended into the evening ; and so, many being engaged in it, and more time being given, there was a possibility that the work in question should be performed, although immersion was practised.

But are these circumstances probable ones, which have just been mentioned ? There is nothing in the record that would naturally lead us to suppose so ; and we are left at liberty to deny them, with as much probability as any one can assert them ; I must think, on the whole, with somewhat more. We shall perhaps see further reason for this opinion in the sequel.

In Acts 10: 47, Peter says, in respect to Cornelius and those with him who believed on Christ : “ Can any one *forbid water*, that these should be baptized ? ” *μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ κωλύσαι δύναται τις ;* Observe that the idea, in this case, seems almost of necessity to be : ‘ Can any one forbid, that *water should be brought in*, and these persons baptized ? ’ He does not say : Can any one forbid the bath, or the river, i. e. the use of these, by which these persons should be baptized ; but the intimation seems to be, that they were to be baptized on the spot, and that water was to be brought in for this purpose. I admit that another meaning is not necessarily excluded, which would accord with the practice of immersion ; but I am persuaded, that the more easy and natural interpretation is such as I have now given.

I have the same persuasion respecting the baptism of the jailor recorded in Acts 16: 33. Here it is said, that the jailor, after the earthquake and other occurrences, and when brought under deep convictions of sin, took Paul and Silas, at midnight, and *washed them from their stripes*, i. e. washed off the blood which flowed from the wounds made by their stripes ; and *straightway*, (*παροχθῆμα forthwith*,) *he was baptized*, and ALL HIS. Where was this done ? At the jail or in the jail, where he met Paul and Silas ; at any rate within the precincts of the prison ; for *after* the whole transaction was completed, he brought Paul and Silas to his house and gave them refreshments ; Acts 16: 34. If it be said, that there was probably a bath in the jail, and that the jailer and his household were baptized in it ; I answer, that such accommodations in the prisons of ancient days, are at least very improbable. Who does not know, that mercy or convenience in a prison is a thing of modern times—the work or result of Christian beneficence, not of

Pagan compassion. Still, the possibility of this cannot be denied. But the *probability* is surely not very great, when we reflect, that neither here nor in the instance recorded in Acts 10: 47, is any intimation given of a resort to the bath, in order to perform the rite of baptism. One may naturally conclude, therefore, that the water brought in to wash the stripes of Paul and Silas, also answered the purpose of baptizing him who furnished it.

In Acts 22: 16, Paul relates the words of Ananias to him, before he was baptized, and after he had for some days been under most distressing conviction of sin. They are these: *Arise, βάπτισαι, baptize thyself* (Middle voice), i. e. receive baptism, *καὶ ἀπόλουσαι, and wash away thy sins*. Here the words *βάπτισαι* and *ἀπόλουσαι* appear to be treated as in a manner equivalent to each other; and the natural conclusion would seem to be, that *washing* or *washing off*, was the manner of the baptism on this occasion. Still, I acknowledge that this is not a necessary conclusion; for bathing or immersion would produce the effect of *washing off*.

But there is a passage in 1 Cor. 10: 2, which seems of necessity to imply, that *immersion* is not essential to the idea of baptism. It runs thus: *All were BAPTIZED into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea*. This refers, of course, to the period and the transactions when the children of Israel passed through the Red Sea, and eluded the pursuit of Pharaoh and his host. But how were they baptized, on this occasion, in the cloud and in the sea? The reader will be enabled to judge for himself, by examining well the following passage, which records the history of that occasion.

Ex. 14: 19—22, “And the angel of God which went before the camp of Israel, removed, and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face and stood behind them: And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all the night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them, on their right hand, and on their left.”

Here then was the cloud, which first stood before them, and then behind them; and here were the waters of the Red Sea,

like a wall on their right hand and on their left. Yet neither the cloud nor the waters touched them. "They went through the midst of the sea upon *dry ground*." Yet they were *baptized in the cloud and in the sea*. The reason and ground of such an expression must be, so far as I can discern, a surrounding of the Israelites on different sides, by the cloud and by the sea, although neither the cloud nor the sea touched them. It is therefore a kind of figurative mode of expression, derived from the idea, that baptizing is surrounding with a fluid. But whether this be by immersion, affusion, suffusion, or washing, would not seem to be decided. The suggestion has sometimes been made, that the Israelites were *sprinkled* by the cloud and by the sea, and this was the baptism which Paul meant to designate. But the cloud on this occasion, was not a cloud of rain; nor do we find any intimation that the waters of the Red Sea sprinkled the children of Israel at this time. So much is true, viz. that they were not *immersed*. Yet, as the language must evidently be figurative in some good degree, and not literal, I do not see how, on the whole, we can make less of it, than to suppose, that it has a tacit reference to the idea of *surrounding* in some way or other.

That *washing* was at least one method, and perhaps even the more ordinary one of practising baptism, may be thought to find some support in such passages as the following; viz. Eph. 5: 26, where Christ is spoken of, as having loved the church, and given himself for it, that he might sanctify it, *having cleansed it BY THE WASHING of water*, etc. Here the word used for *washing* is *λουτῶν*, which some render *bath*. Literally and originally the word, according to the laws of derivation, must signify: (1) The *means of washing*; inasmuch as it comes from *λούω*, to wash, in particular to wash one's person, in whole or in part, e. g. to bathe, to wash off the blood from a wound, etc. But in this sense, i. e. as the *means of washing*, *bath*, *bathing-place*, etc. it is applied, by Homer, only in the plural number. (2) It means the *act of washing*, *washing off*, *cleansing*, etc. In the singular number it occurs first in Hesiod, and is employed to signify *washing*, etc. as just stated. Passow has exhibited its appropriate usage. The reader will see, in this case, that the idea of *washing* is connected with the idea of *cleansing*; and that the reference is clearly made to baptism. But the *modus* of this washing is no farther determined, than that it is so as to

cleanse. This, indeed, is consistent with immersion, bathing, or simple washing; and of course it may be said to leave the subject undetermined.

In Titus 3: 5 we have a similar passage. *He saved us διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*, by THE WASHING of regeneration, i. e. by that purification or cleansing which regeneration confers. The reference, however, although the language is figurative, is beyond all doubt to the rite of baptism, which was emblematic of purification by the Spirit. Still the word *λουτροῦ*, *washing*, or (if you please) *laver*, will not absolutely determine the method in which the water was applied. If it means *bath*, then we can hardly argue the practice of *total* immersion from it, as baths are not usually adapted to such a purpose.

In Heb. 10: 22, the apostle speaks of Christians as drawing near to God with a true heart and full faith, *being sprinkled or cleansed (ἐξοψαντισμένοι) as to their hearts from an evil conscience, and WASHED (λελουμένοι) as to their body with pure water*. That he refers to the rite of baptism here, seems hardly to admit of any doubt. The idea of *washing* or *cleansing* is expressed by *λελουμένοι*; but still, the mode of effecting this, whether by immersion, bathing, or washing, does not seem to be necessarily determined; for any one of these would effect a *cleansing* of the body. Yet the more natural understanding of the passage in this, as in the two preceding instances, would seem to be a *washing* with water.

I have now examined all those passages in the New Testament, in which the circumstances related or implied would seem to have a bearing on the question before us, viz. *Whether the mode of baptism is determined by the sacred writers?* I am unable to find in them any thing which appears to settle this question. I find none, I am quite ready to concede, which seem absolutely to determine that immersion was not practised. But are there not some, which have been cited above, that serve to render it improbable that immersion was always practised, to say the least? I can only say, that such is my persuasion. The reader has the evidence before him, and can judge for himself. He will indulge me, I hope, in the same liberty. I do consider it as quite plain, that none of the circumstantial evidence, thus far, proves immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism, or even that of John. Indeed, I consider this point so far made out, that I can hardly suppress the conviction, that if any one maintains the contrary, it must be either because

he is unable rightly to estimate the nature or power of the Greek language ; or because he is influenced in some measure by party-feeling ; or else because he has looked at the subject in only a partial manner, without examining it fully and thoroughly.

Thus much for the evidence derivable from the *circumstances* attending the baptisms mentioned in the New Testament. But were not these, in all probability, conformed in *mode* to baptisms already extant among the Jews? This leads us to another distinct head of inquiry.

§ 7. Jewish Proselyte-Baptism.

III. *Was baptism as an initiatory rite, practised in the Jewish church, antecedently to the time when Christian baptism commenced?*

This is a subject replete with difficulty, in some respects ; because we have not adequate means of casting upon it all the light which is desirable. I begin with the ceremonies prescribed by the Mosaic law, in respect to the sacred use of water in ablutions, and inquire, whether there is any thing in them, which will render one mode of Christian baptism more probable than another. We find, then, the following results.

1. That *washing the clothes only*, is one of the ceremonial rites of purification. The first direction of this nature we find in Ex. 19: 10—14. It was made in relation to a preparation for the giving of the law at mount Sinai ; and of course, on a most solemn and interesting occasion. Other similar directions, on a variety of occasions, and for the like purpose of purification, the reader will find, by consulting Lev. 11: 28, 40. 13: 34, 54, 58. 14: 47. 15: 17. Num. 8: 7, 21. 19: 10, 21. We shall see in the sequel, that this is a different rite from that of washing the person.

2. That *washing the person* is also enjoined, by way of purification. Aaron and his sons were washed with water, when entering on the priest's office ; Ex. 29: 4. 30: 19—21. 40: 12. Lev. 8: 6. 16: 4, 24. On other occasions also, when they contracted any pollution they were commanded to wash ; Lev. 22: 6. In all these and the like cases, the Hebrew verb is רָחַץ ; which corresponds to the Greek λούω.

3. That *both the clothes and person were to be washed*, on a great variety of occasions, for the sake of purification. E. g. Lev.

14: 8, 9. 15: 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22, 27. 16: 26, 28. 17: 15. Num. 19: 7, 8, 19.

4. That *sprinkling* was used most frequently of all, by way of purification and consecration. Especially was the sprinkling of *blood* practised for this purpose; e. g. Ex. 24: 6—8. 29: 20, 21. Lev. 1: 5, 11. 3: 2, 8, 13. 4: 6, 17. 5: 9. 7: 2. 8: 19, 24, 30. 9: 12, 18. 14: 7, 51. 16: 14, 15, 19. Num. 18: 17. 19: 4.—Also the sprinkling of *oil*; e. g. Lev. 8: 11. 14: 16, 27.—Also the sprinkling of the *water* of purification or separation; e. g. Num. 8: 7. 19: 13, 18, 20, 21.

5. That *affusion* was also used, in the rites of purification. E. g. Lev. 14: 18, 29, of oil to be poured on the head of him who was to be cleansed. So the priests were bedewed with oil, when consecrated to their office.

6. That *smearing over* was also a rite of purification. E. g. with oil; Lev. 14: 17, 28; of blood, Lev. 14: 25. 16: 18.

The statement just made, is the result of an examination, extended through the whole of the ceremonial laws of Moses. It is quite possible that some individual instances may have escaped my notice, in such a protracted examination; but this can in no way affect the result of the examples now produced. Do all or any of these examples cast any light upon the Christian rite of baptism?

We may answer this question by saying, that they serve, at least, to shew that there is no trace of any such rite as baptism, prescribed by the Jewish ceremonial law, as an *initiatory* rite, i. e. as one which was essential in order to make a profession of the Jewish religion. It is true, indeed, that Aaron and his sons were washed with water, when about to be inducted into the priest's office; see Ex. 29: 4. Lev. 8: 6. But it is equally true, that this was only one of very numerous rites of induction to that office. The reader will find them all described at full length, in Ex. c. 29, and Lev. c. 8.

It appears quite plain, that the washing of the priests, as preparatory to their entering upon their office, was in no other sense initiatory, than as a means of ceremonial purification, and an emblem of that purity of heart which was essential to a proper discharge of the duties of their office. This rite, therefore, was not different, as to its essential meaning or intention, from the like rite as practised by others, for the sake of ceremonial purification. Indeed, I can see no difference as to the object which was to be attained, between washing the clothes, the person, or

the clothes and the person both. It seems to be the fact, however, that washing of the *person only*, was a ceremony confined to the order of the priests; as may be seen by consulting the passages under No. 2 above. But at Mount Sinai, all the people were required to wash their clothes, Ex. 19: 10—14; and so on diverse other occasions, as may be seen by the references under No. 1. On a variety of occasions, likewise, all who had contracted certain kinds of pollution, were required both to “wash their clothes and bathe themselves in water.” The word *bathe*, in all the cases appealed to under No. 3 where it is used, corresponds to the Hebrew *רָחַץ*, *to wash*. Why our translators have rendered the word *wash* in one case, and *bathe* in another, it is difficult to see. Neither *washing* nor *bathing* appear to be the same as *plunging* or *immersing*; for neither the word *טָבַל*, *to merge, immerse*, nor the word *הִטְטֵף*, *to overwhelm, inundate*, is used in reference to these ceremonial washings.

As this is a point of some importance, I must dwell for a moment upon it. The word *טָבַל*, *dip, immerse*, is used in Lev. 4: 6. 14: 16. 9: 9, in respect to the priest's *dipping his finger* into blood or oil, in order to sprinkle them before the Lord. So also in Lev. 4: 17, and in a similar way as to the dipping of various things into blood, in order to sprinkle it, in Lev. 14: 6, 51. Ex. 12: 22. So of dipping a bundle of hyssop into water, in order to sprinkle it, Num. 19: 18. In all these cases, it is evident at first view, that the dipping of the finger, the hyssop, etc. is merely preparatory to a rite to be performed, and is in no case of itself a proper rite.

All the other examples of *טָבַל* in the Hebrew Scriptures, are very few; and I refer to them here, in order that any one who chooses may consult them: Ruth 2: 14. Deut. 33: 24. Ezek. 33: 15, *טָבַל לְיָם*, *dyed, coloured*; 1 Sam. 14: 28. Job 9: 81. 2 K. 5: 14, which is the only example respecting immersion of the whole person, and refers to Naaman's dipping himself seven times in the river Jordan; 2 K. 8: 15. Gen. 37: 31. Joshua 3: 15, which respects the dipping of the priests' feet, who bore the ark, in the brim of the river Jordan.

As to the other word *הִטְטֵף*, it properly means to *inundate, to overflow, overwhelm, etc.* The only examples of its occurrence in the Mosaic law, are in Lev. 6: 28, respecting a brazen pot; Lev. 15: 12 respecting a vessel of wood; and Lev. 15: 11, respecting the hands of a person. In these three cases, our English version renders the word *הִטְטֵף* by *rinsed*, which implies

immersion. But in no case is the word applied to the whole person, or to the clothes of any individual.

We find, then, no example among all the Levitical washings or ablutions, where immersion of the person is required. The word *וָיַחַד*, which is almost uniformly employed, and which our translators have rendered *wash* and *bathe*, does not imply *immersion*. It may, indeed, admit the idea of immersion, because a washing or abluion may be effected in this way; but on the other hand, the meaning of the verb is equally well answered, without immersion.

Washing the clothes, then, or washing the person, or both the person and clothes; or sprinkling of blood, oil, water; affusion of oil, or smearing with oil or blood; were all the rites which had relation to liquid substances, so far as they were concerned with application to person or dress. From none of these, can any example be drawn, to shew or even illustrate the necessity of *total immersion*, as an initiatory rite under the Christian dispensation.

Is there, then, any thing in the ancient law which enjoins *baptism*, on either the Jew or the Gentile proselyte, when becoming a member of the Hebrew community or church? I cannot find a word to this purpose in the Scriptures. In the original institution of the rite of circumcision, Gen. 17: 9—14, this rite and this only is demanded, as the ceremonial of entrance among the Jewish community. The same requisition is made, both of the native Hebrew and of any foreigner who comes under his control. So again in Ex. 12: 48, 49, it is expressly enjoined, that the *stranger* shall be circumcised, in order to keep the feast of the passover; and it is at the same time declared, that "one law shall be to him that is home-born, and to the stranger." In all this, there is not even a reference to any abluion whatever.

Ablution, then, was not an original condition of membership of the church, under the ancient dispensation. It was obligatory, as we have seen, in many forms, upon those who were already members of it, *but not to their becoming so*.

In later times, then, than the giving of the law in the wilderness, must the practice of baptizing proselytes have sprung up. It was an idea very natural to a Jew, that a man who passed over from a heathen state to the Hebrew church, was unclean of course in his heathen state, and needed to be purified. Hence the abluion so common among the Jews, in order to be-

come ceremonially pure, might very easily be extended to him. And one can hardly doubt, that in consequence of such analogical reasoning, baptism came at length to be considered by the Jews, as essential to the due introduction of a Gentile to their church.

But did such a custom exist among the Jews, antecedently to the ministry of John the Baptist and of Jesus? A question long and variously disputed, and which seems, as yet, hardly to be settled to the satisfaction of all. The impression, however, has become widely extended in the Christian church, that such was the fact; and inasmuch as it is conceded that proselyte-baptism was usually by *immersion*, it becomes necessary to our purpose, to examine into this subject.

The reader should be advertised, however, that there is by no means a general agreement among the learned, in regard to this question. While the majority of the older writers have adopted the opinion of Selden, Lightfoot, Danz, Buxtorf, Schoettgen, Wetstein, and others, that the baptism of proselytes was common when John the Baptist made his appearance as a public teacher; others of no small ability and reputation have denied strenuously that there is any satisfactory evidence of this. Among these are Ernesti, Bauer, Paulus, De Wette, and (in a modified way) E. G. Bengel, of recent times; also John Owen, Wernsdorf, Zeltner, Carpzov, and others, among the older writers. Most of these writers I have consulted; a great part of them, however, do but repeat what had been already said by some leading author. The substantial part of the case, I shall now endeavour to lay before the reader.

1. There can be no doubt, that among the Jews of later times, probably from some time in the latter part of the third century downwards, the baptism of proselytes has been generally regarded as a constituent part of the rite of initiation into the Jewish community, when a Gentile convert was to be introduced.

Maimonides, in the twelfth century, speaks very fully and positively as to such a practice; and he extends it to the Hebrews, as well as to others. "By three things," says he, "Israel was introduced to the covenant; by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. Circumcision was in Egypt; as it is said, No uncircumcised person shall eat of the passover. Baptism was in the desert, before the giving of the law; as it is said, Thou shalt sanctify them to day and to morrow, and they shall wash their clothes," etc. *Issure Biah*, cap. 13. Here he has mistaken

the *washing of the clothes* for the immersion of the whole person; a palpable mistake, as may be seen by comparing the cases of ablution already cited above.—Again; “Whenever any Gentile wishes to be received into the covenant of Israel, and associated with them, . . . circumcision, baptism, and voluntary offering, are required. If the person be a female, then only baptism and offering.” *Ibid.*

Danz, in two dissertations on this subject, printed in Meuschen's *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, has cited examples in abundance, to shew that such is and has been the general opinion of the Jewish Rabbins. In fact it has become among them even a trite maxim, אין גר עד שימול וטבול, *there is no proselyte, until he is circumcised and baptized.*

Yet all this being conceded, as to the opinion of Rabbins earlier and later, it makes but little to our purpose. One has only to look into the Gospels, or into the Mishna, in order to find conclusive evidence that the Jews have added unnumbered ceremonies to their ancient law. Whether they hold these to be binding or otherwise, is a matter of no consequence to our present purpose. Our present inquiry respects only the *antiquity* of the usage in question; and on this point, all the overwhelming mass of quotations produced in the pedantic and tedious dissertations of Danz, give little or no satisfaction.

The oldest source of Jewish Rabbinical traditions, next after the works of Josephus and Philo, the New Testament, and the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, is the Mishna, i. e. *repetition* or oral law, second law, collected by Rabbi Judah Haqqodesh, i. e. the Holy, about A. D. 220. From this work which contains such an almost infinite number of Jewish superstitions, usages, and rites, I have as yet seen but one passage produced, which seems to have any direct bearing upon our question. It runs thus :

גר שנהגייר פסחי ביה שמאי אומרים טובל ואוכל אה פסחי לערב וביה הלל אומרים הפורש מן הערלה כפורש מן הקבר; i. e. *as to a proselyte, who becomes a proselyte on the evening of the passover, the followers of Shammai say, Let him be baptized (טבול) and let him eat the passover in the evening; but the disciples of Hillel say, He who separates himself from the prepuce, separates himself from a sepulchre; Tract. Pesahhim, c. VIII. §8.*

De Wette, in commenting on this, says, that טובל is here equivalent to *lavatus*, washed; *Opusc. Theol. p. 62.* It

may be so; for the Heb. טָבַל, like the Greek βάπτω and βαπτίζω, might mean *to wash, to bathe*, etc. But inasmuch as this word is not employed in any part of the Mosaic institutes, in respect to the ablutions there specified; and as the compiler of the Mishna must have been intimately acquainted with the ritual part of these institutes; I can hardly believe, on the whole, that the word טָבַל has such a meaning in this place. It more probably means, *baptized, immersed*.

Accordingly, in the Jerusalem Talmud, Tract. Pesah. p. 36. c. 2, in the way of allusion to the passage of the Mishna just quoted, and in explanation of it, Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob, is represented as saying, that some Roman soldiers, who kept guard at Jerusalem, ate of the passover, *being baptized (טָבַל) on the evening of the passover*. De Wette (Opusc. p. 63) construes this passage in the same way as he does that of the Mishna above recited. But Bauer allows it to be a case of proselyte-baptism; Gottensdienst. Verfassung, II. p. 389.

The Jerusalem Talmud, it will be remembered, was composed during the latter part of the third century, some fifty or sixty years, (the time is not exactly known,) after the Mishna was reduced to writing. I cannot resist the impression, therefore, that the custom of baptizing proselytes before they were admitted to the passover, was at least distinctly known among the Jews of the third century. Indeed, it is difficult to see how we can avoid the conclusion, that such a custom was older than the third century. The Mishna, certainly for the most part, only reduces to writing what was before extant in traditions orally preserved. It is probable, then, that the custom in a greater or less extent of baptizing proselytes, must have existed in the second century, and possibly still earlier.

Let it be noted, however, that the very passage in the Mishna, quoted above, shews that the ancient Jews were not agreed in relation to the effect produced by baptizing proselytes, before their admission to the passover; in other words, they were not agreed as to its being a sufficient *initiatory* rite even when circumcision accompanied it. The disciples of Shammai affirm, that when a circumcised proselyte is baptized he ought to be admitted to the passover; but those of Hillel maintain, that circumcision when recent is not a sufficient expurgation, not even when baptism follows it; for such seems plainly to be the meaning of the words, *he who separates himself from the prepuce, separates himself from a sepulchre*; i. e. he has need still of

such repeated lustrations as one must practise, who has been polluted by a dead body in the grave.

According to Jewish tradition, Hillel and Shammai lived in the time of Augustus Caesar and Herod the Great, i. e. they flourished about forty years before the birth of Christ. They were the heads of two sects among the Pharisees, and became bitterly opposed to each other in almost every thing where there was any room for difference of opinion. But Hillel appears to have acquired a great ascendancy over Shammai in the opinion of the Rabbins. In the Talmud it is related of him (Succa, fol. 28. 1), that "Hillel had eighty disciples in his old age, of whom thirty were worthy of the presence of the divine Majesty; thirty others, that the sun should stop in its course, as it did for Joshua the son of Nun; the other twenty were of more moderate capacity; the greatest among them being Jonathan Ben Uzziel [the famous Chaldee Paraphrast], and the least, Rabbi Jochanan ben Zacchai" [a celebrated Rabbin]. I insert this merely to shew what views the Jews entertained of Hillel; while little is said in the way of boasting with respect to Shammai.

I do not take it for granted, however, that Hillel and Shammai did themselves agitate the disputed question about baptism. Doubtless many subjects of dispute *originated* among their followers; and this may have been the case in regard to the question about proselyte-baptism; for the words of the Mishna would not disagree at all with such an exposition. I understand the Mishnical author as meaning to say, that the two famous sects of Hillel and Shammai disputed on the subject of baptizing proselytes, at the time when he was writing. Of how long standing this dispute had been, I do not see that we can gather from the words of the Mishna.

The authority of the more dominant party, then, at the time when the Mishna was written, decided that baptism was not a complete initiatory rite, even after circumcision. But the opinion of the party adverse to them appears at last to have become the prevailing one; as we shall see in the sequel.

It would seem to follow, from what has now been laid before the reader, that the practice of baptizing proselytes was at least known among the Jews in the second century; or if we are to credit the testimony of the Jerusalem Talmud, still earlier. But inasmuch as the evidence before us may appear, perhaps, to leave this matter somewhat in doubt, we may now very naturally ask: Is there any other source of evidence to which we can ap-

peal? What have Philo, and Josephus, and the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, said or hinted, relative to the baptism of proselytes?

The answer to this question, so important to our present purpose, is, *Nothing*; at least nothing which serves at all to confirm the idea that the practice in question was extant, or at any rate notorious, at the time when these authors composed their works. All of them lived not far from the commencement of the Christian era; Philo somewhat before; Josephus somewhat after; and Onkelos and Jonathan about the same periods. I know the age of these two Chaldee translators has been questioned, and set down to a period much later, by Eichhorn and some others; but it is now generally admitted, that they may fairly be ranked among writers who lived at, or very near, the commencement of the Christian era.

In all these writers, so far as their works have yet been examined, there appears a deep and universal silence on the subject of baptizing proselytes; a thing quite unaccountable, in case such baptism were usual at that period. Nay, there is one passage in Josephus, which seems to afford strong ground of suspicion that the rite in question was unknown, at a period not long antecedent to the time of the apostles. This author is relating the history of John Hyrcanus, high priest and king of the Jews, a zealous Pharisee, and one who, according to Josephus, was favoured with divine revelations. He says that Hyrcanus (about 126 A. C.) took certain cities from the Idumaeans, "and he commanded, after subduing all the Idumaeans, that they should remain in their country, if they would circumcise themselves and conform to the Jewish customs. Then they, through love of their country, underwent circumcision, and submitted to the other modes of living which were Jewish; and from that time they became Jews." Ant. XIII. 9. 1. ib. 15. 4.

Now as Hyrcanus was a most zealous Pharisee, and as the Pharisees in all probability first began the practice of baptizing proselytes, it would seem quite strange that nothing should be done on this occasion, with respect to the baptism of a whole nation; or, at least, that nothing should be said by Josephus respecting it, in case he regarded it as essential to the reception of foreigners among his own people. I am aware that we cannot always argue from the silence of writers, against the existence of this or that practice; but this would seem to be one of the cases,

in which silence speaks strongly against the probability of the practice in question, at that period.

We add, moreover, to what has now been exhibited, that Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, has let fall no expression from which any thing can be deduced, in regard to the practice by the Jews of the rite under consideration.

We come now to later testimonies, and such as cannot be of any great weight in determining the question relative to the antiquity of proselyte baptism. I shall therefore relate them in as succinct a manner, as is consistent with perspicuity.

In the Babylonish Talmud, Cod. Jevamoth, fol. 46, the following passage occurs. "As to a proselyte, who is circumcised but not baptized, what of him? Rabbi Eliezer says: 'Behold, he is a proselyte; for thus we find it concerning our fathers, that they were circumcised but not baptized.' But as to one who is baptized, and is not circumcised, what of him? Rabbi Joshua says: 'Behold he is a proselyte; for thus we find it respecting maid-servants, who were baptized but not circumcised.' But the Wise Men say: 'Is he baptized, but not circumcised; or is he circumcised, but not baptized; he is not a proselyte until he is circumcised and baptized.'"

I translate from Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 266. The Talmud of Babylon is a work of a late period, being a compilation made by the Babylonish Jews, during the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. Here, then, is a narration which respects the opinion of Eliezer the son of Hyrcanus and Joshua the son of Hananiah, who are said to have lived near the time when the temple was destroyed. Not improbably, then, this dispute was like to that mentioned in the Mishna, on which I have already commented.

Setting aside now the great uncertainty which attends almost all ancient chronological matters in the Talmud, and supposing the two Rabbins here mentioned to have lived at or near the time when the temple was destroyed, it would follow only, that about this time the practice of baptizing proselytes was in existence, but was a matter of dispute and difference of opinion; which in this respect accords with the tenor of the passage already quoted from the Mishna. The *Wise Men*, to whom the Talmud appeals, seem plainly to be the later Rabbins, and probably those who lived at the period when the passages were written, which we are now examining.

A few other citations only, from the same Talmud, will be necessary; as all which can be required is, that confirmation should

be given to the idea, that the authors of the Talmud in question were familiarly acquainted with proselyte-baptism.

Wetstein has collected a larger mass of these testimonies than I have elsewhere found, except in Danz; and in him they are much less select, and often little or nothing to the purpose. From those of Wetstein, I select the following, as being abundantly sufficient for my purpose.

In his Nov. Test. ad Matt. 3: 6, they stand thus: Talm. Babylon. Tract. Ketabhoth, fol. 11. 1, "Rabbi Hanina said: Let them baptize a little child who is a proselyte, according to the opinion of the Elders." Tract. Jebamoth, Talmud Hierosol. fol. 8. 4, "Rabbi Hezekiah said: Behold, he finds an infant cast away, and baptizes it in the name of a servant." But this case is somewhat uncertain, as the baptism may not have been altogether of a religious nature. Talmud. Hieros. Berakhoth, fol. 6: 3, "In the days of Rabbi Joshua the son of Levi, they endeavoured to root out this immersion (baptism), for the sake of the women of Galilee, eo quod illae prae frigore sterilescent." Talm. Bab. Cherithuth fol. 9. 1, "Rab says: How was it that the fathers did not enter into the covenant, except by circumcision, baptism, and the sprinkling of blood?" Ibid. in Avoda Sara, fol. 57. 1, "Rabbi Simi the son of Chaia [says]: He who provides for himself Gentile servants, who are circumcised but not baptized; or the sons of female-servants, who are circumcised but not baptized; sputum et vestigium eorum in platea est immundum. . . . Proselytes do not enter into the covenant except by these three things, circumcision, baptism, and peace-offering. Ibid. fol. 59. 5, et Jebamoth 46. 1, "Rabbi Jochanan: Never shall any one be deemed a proselyte, until he is baptized as well as circumcised; for before he is baptized he is regarded as a foreigner." Jebamoth fol. 46. 2, "Rabbi Joseph says: If any one comes saying, I am circumcised but not baptized, let them see that he is baptized. Rabbi Judah says: Baptism is the principal thing."

These, and several others of the same tenor, not only from the Talmud but from other Rabbinical works such as Bereshith Rabba, etc. the reader will find, in a Latin translation, in Wetstein as above cited; he will also find some of them, and many others, usually accompanied by the original Hebrew and Chaldee, in the work of Danz before alluded to, and contained in Meuschen's *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*.

I have not thought it of sufficient importance to transcribe the originals here; for the amount of all the testimonies from the Talmud, especially the Babylonish Talmud, and the other works of the Rabbins, can be but of small importance, in deter-

mining the question concerning the antiquity of proselyte-baptism. I concede the point most fully and freely to all who may desire it, that after the third century, if not sooner, this baptism began to be very general among the Jews; and has been so ever since. Danz has given evidence enough of this, in his chaotic mass of quotations; and so have Lightfoot, Selden, Wetstein, and many others.

But Wetstein has quoted one passage from the Mishna, which, if correct, may be thought to be of importance to our subject; inasmuch as the Mishna is the earliest of the Rabbinical writings on which we can place any dependence. Wetstein (Nov. Test. I. p. 260) quotes thus: "*Semachoth, Misna vii. Si non vult fieri proselyta; sed si vult proselyta fieri, baptizat eam, et libertatem illi donat, et statim est licita.*" I have looked in vain for this passage in the Mishna; for there is not such a title to any of its treatises, as Wetstein here names. I do not deny that the passage exists in the Mishna; but if it does, it must be found in some other way than through the medium of Wetstein. Even if it exists there, it would be difficult to shew, that by the baptism in question, is meant a proselyte-baptism of initiation.

The reader has before him the substance of the testimony in respect to the antiquity of the baptism of proselytes, so far as it has been developed from Rabbinic sources. Appeals, however, have been made to two passages in heathen writers, of which some notice must here be taken.

Tacitus, who died about A. D. 100, speaking of certain persons (Hist. V. 5) says: "*Transgressi in morem Judaeorum, idem usurpant, nec quidquam prius imbuuntur, quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam, etc.*" i. e. *Going over to the Jewish manner of life, they practise the same thing; nor are they IMBUED with any thing sooner than to despise the gods, to renounce their country, etc.* Or this last phrase may be thus translated: *Nor are they IMBUED, before they despise the gods, renounce their country, etc.* In the preceding sentence Tacitus speaks of circumcision as practised by the Jews, that they may be distinguished from others. Hence, *Transgressi in morem Judaeorum, idem usurpant*, must mean, that those who become proselytes to Judaism, do the same thing, viz. practise circumcision; and by this they become Jews. What follows seems to me plainly to relate to the doctrines or principles with which they are imbued, and not to the baptism which may be practised.

The passage in the Epictetus of Arrian (who flourished in the

first part of the second century) Lib. II. c. 9, is still more obscure. It runs thus: "Why dost thou call thyself a Stoic? Why dost thou deceive the multitude? Why dost thou, being a Jew, play the hypocrite with the Greek? Dost thou not see how any one is called a Jew, how a Syrian, how an Egyptian? And when we see any one acting with both parties, we are wont to say: He is no Jew, but he plays the hypocrite. But when ἀναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ἡρημένου, he takes on him the state and feelings (πάθος) of one who is WASHED OR BAPTIZED (βεβαμμένου) and has attached himself to the sect, then he is in truth, and is called, a Jew. But we are παραβαπτίζται, transgressors as to our baptism, or falsely baptized, if we are like a Jew in pretence, and something else in reality," etc. A great variety of opinions have been given on this passage. Some think that Arrian here refers to Christians; but I see no good ground for such a supposition. De Wette says, Opusc. p. 64, that "the passage is too obscure to collect any thing certain from it." One thing, however, seems to me certain; viz. that the passage does not refer simply to a Gentile proselyte becoming a Jew, but marks what the Jew was accustomed to practise. I can scarcely doubt, that the writer refers to the Jewish ablutions, so often demanded by the ritual law, and so often practised by the Hebrews. It is more difficult to make out the meaning of ἡρημένου, which is coupled with βεβαμμένου. The Middle voice of αἰρέω means to choose, to prefer; and as ἡρημένου is both of the Passive and Middle form, it may have here an Active sense, and may mean, as I have translated it, attached himself to a sect, i. e. become one of the αἵρεσις or sect. Paulus, Comm. I. p. 283, has endeavoured to explain away the force of the whole passage; and De Wette has followed in his steps, as is stated above. Bauer (Gottesdienstl. Verfassung, II. p. 390) has treated this question more fairly; but he suggests, that βεβαμμένου may probably refer to a Christian, whom Arrian confounds with a Jew, as early heathen writers were wont to do. The context does not seem to allow of this construction.—On the whole, I concede this to be a difficult and obscure passage, in some respects. The τὸ πάθος τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ἡρημένου, is certainly a peculiar Greek phrase; yet, if we construe it in whatever way is fairly possible, I think we cannot make out from it any degree of certainty, that βεβαμμένου refers to proselyte-baptism.

Another passage, found in Josephus, has also been appealed to, which states the custom of the Essenes in regard to the reception of proselytes among them; *Bel. Jud.* II. 8. 7; or p. 786 of the Cologne edition. It runs thus: "To those who are desirous of joining their sect, immediate access is not afforded; but they prescribe to each their own peculiar manner of living for one year, while he remains without . . . And when he has given proof of his temperance for such a time, he secures admission to their meals, *καὶ καθαρωτέρων τῶν πρὸς ἀγνείαν ὑδάτων μεταλαμβάνει*, and is made partaker of those purer waters which are designed for purification;" i. e. he is washed with water, before he sits down at the table with them. But so were the Essenes themselves; as is stated in another and preceding part of the same chapter in Josephus. His words are: "Labouring strenuously [at their usual occupation] until the fifth hour, they then assemble together in one place, and girding themselves with linen towels, *they wash the body in cold water*; and after this purification, they enter each his own house . . . and being purified, they assemble at the supper-hall, as a kind of sacred temple," *Bell. Jud.* II. 7. or 8. 5. Nothing more, then, was required of the converts to Essenism, than was demanded of those who already belonged to this sect. Nor, indeed, is it at all correct, to assume, that the bathing specified above was a token of admission in full to the communion of the Essenes; for, as the context tells us, "he [the new convert] is not yet received into their society (*συμβιώσεις*), for after exhibiting his power of self-restraint [for one year], his moral behaviour is put to the test *for two years more.*" *Ibid.* The initiatory rite of baptism, then, as practised by John the Baptist, or by the disciples of Christ, does not seem to be deduced from the practice of the Essenes. The ablutions of the Jews in general were quite as obvious a source of this rite, as the custom of that sect.

Thus much for Rabbinic and other external testimony, in regard to the antiquity of the baptismal rite among the Jews. Nothing from the heathen writers or Josephus, seems in any degree to confirm this antiquity. From the Rabbinic writers, all that we can gather is, that sometime in the latter part of the third century, when the Jerusalem Talmud was written, the custom of baptizing proselytes was common; still more so did it become, during the times when the Babylonian Talmud was written, i. e. from the commencement of the fifth century onward, some two

hundred or more years. I must except, however, the testimony of the Mishna from the above remarks. This has been made light of by some, or explained away by rendering טוּבַל *washed, cleansed*; but I cannot help the feeling, that impartiality in weighing testimony forbids this.

On the whole we must admit, that independently of the Scriptures, we have evidence which ought to satisfy us, that at the commencement of the third century, the custom of proselyte-baptism was known and practised among the Jews; and if the case of the Roman soldiers, related in the Jerusalem Talmud in Cod. Pesachim, fol. 36. b. as stated above, be truly represented, then, even while the temple was standing, proselyte-baptism must have been practised. But some degree of uncertainty always hangs over Talmudic stories. There are so many narrations in the Talmud which are gross mistakes and ridiculous conceits, that one hardly feels himself safe, in trusting to any of its statements respecting facts that happened long before the period when this book was written. We may, however, venture to believe, I think safely, that we have sufficient evidence of the fact, that *such baptism was practised at, or not long after, the time when the second temple was destroyed.*

But we shall be reminded here, that many writers have considered the Bible itself as determining our question; yea, determining that not only proselytes from the heathen were admitted by baptism to the Jewish communion, but that the whole congregation of Israel, at Mount Sinai, were admitted into covenant with God by virtue of the same rite. Such writers appeal to Ex. 19: 10 sq. But this shews only that the people were to wash their *clothes*, a thing which the whole ritual of Moses plainly distinguishes from washing or baptizing the body; as may be seen in the account of the ritual ablution given above, p. 306 sq. They appeal also to Ps. 114: 1, 2. Ezek. 16: 9. 20: 12. 1 Cor. 10: 2, as serving to confirm the idea, that the Jews were admitted to the covenant by baptism. But I am unable to discern, in these passages of Scripture, the traces of an argument which can establish this.

An appeal of a more specious nature, is made to the narration in John 1: 19—28. The messengers of the Pharisees who were sent to make inquiries of John the Baptist, asked him, “Why baptizest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?” These two latter individuals their traditionary interpretation of the Scriptures had connected with

the coming of the Messiah. The manner of the question does obviously seem to imply, that they expected of course the Messiah himself and his two coadjutors, Elijah and the prophet, to baptize those whom they should receive as disciples. But does this imply, that proselyte-baptism was already in use? So it has been thought and said. Yet I cannot see how this follows of necessity. Nay, I must even say that the necessary implication seems to be directly the contrary. What was the *initiatory rite* which they expected under a dispensation, that even in their own view was to be *new*, and very different in many respects from the former one? Was it to be a new rite, a distinctive sign; or was it to be merely the continuation of an old practice already in common usage? The former surely seems to be the most natural and probable. Indeed, the manner of the question put to John, absolutely forbids the idea, that those who put it considered baptism as a rite in common use. The necessary implication is, that unless John were either the Messiah, or Elijah, or the prophet, he could have no right to baptize. How could this be said with any good degree of force or congruity, in case the same kind of baptism which John practised was a matter of common usage? An appeal to this text, then, serves rather to confirm the opinion opposite to that, for the support of which the appeal is made.

In fine we are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte-baptism, antecedently to the Christian era. The original institution of admitting Jews to the covenant, and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than that of circumcision. No account of any other is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph the Blind, or in the work of any other Targumist, excepting Pseudo-Jonathan, whose work belongs to the 7th or 8th century. No evidence is found in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier Christian writers. How could an allusion to such a rite have escaped them all, if it were as common, and as much required by usage, as circumcision?

The baptism of John and of Jesus, then, I must regard as being a special appointment of heaven. So the intimation seems to be in John 1:33. Luke 3: 2, 3. 7: 30; and especially in Matt. 21: 24—27. In this latter passage, Jesus evidently means to imply, that the baptism of John was from heaven; and so the Jewish people regarded it, v. 26.

That we cannot point out the exact time when proselyte-bap-

tism began among the Jews, is little to the purpose of those who hold to its great antiquity; for where are the monuments which shew how and when many a rite began, which came into general reception in the churches of Christ in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries? Nor can I think, with many writers, that there is any thing mysterious in respect to the adoption of such a rite by the Jewish churches. How obvious the idea, that a heathen man who came over to the Jewish churches, was unclean in his heathen state! And what could be more natural, than to require ablution of him, especially when the days of Pharisaic superstition were fully come? The Rabbins tell us, that circumcision, baptism, and oblation were all necessary to his initiation. How then could the baptism of John or of Jesus, which was the *sole* initiatory rite, be derived from the proselyte-baptism of the Jews?

Besides all this, when a proselyte was once baptized and received, this rite was at an end. His children born after his reception, were no more required to be baptized, than those of the native Jews. What parallel, then, can be drawn between Christian and proselyte-baptism?

Dr Owen expresses his opinion, that the Rabbins introduced proselyte-baptism in imitation of the popular baptism of John; Theologoum. Lib. V. Digr. 4. So thinks Carpzov, also, in his Appar. Criticus, p. 48. Improbable, I think, this cannot be called; and particularly in connexion with the many ceremonial ablutions of the Jews, it cannot be so deemed.

That the Jews of our Saviour's time entertained the idea, that he would baptize his disciples, may be well accounted for, without resorting to the supposition that proselyte-baptism was already practised. Let the reader consult Isa. 12: 3. 44: 3. Ezek. 36: 25. Zech. 13: 1, and he will easily see how the Jews might have formed an opinion, that the Messiah would baptize his disciples. But be this as it may, or be the origin of proselyte-baptism as it may, I cannot see that there is any adequate evidence for believing that it existed cotemporarily with the baptism of John and of Jesus.

But what has all this to do with the question, What was the ancient mode of Christian baptism? Much; for it is on all hands conceded, that so far as the testimony of the Rabbins can decide such a point, the baptism of proselytes among the Jews was by *immersion*. To cite authorities to this purpose is needless. They may be seen in Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 269;

in Danz (Meuschen Nov. Test. etc.) p. 263, and elsewhere. It is therefore a matter of no little interest, so far as our question is concerned, to inquire whether Christian baptism had its origin from the proselyte-baptism of the Jews. This we have now done, and have come to this result, viz. that *there is no certainty that such was the case, but that the probability, on the ground of evidence, is strong against it.*

§ 8. *Mode of Baptism in the early Christian Churches.*

IV. We come now to inquire, *What was the mode of Baptism practised by the churches in the early ages of Christianity, and AFTER the times of the Apostles.*

Here we may anticipate something more definite and clear, than we have yet been able to find; and consequently this topic of inquiry becomes important to our purpose. It is not my intention here to make a very copious selection of testimonies. An appropriate number well chosen, and from good authorities, will satisfy the reasonable desires of every intelligent reader.

In the writings of the apostolical fathers, so called, i. e. the writers of the first century, or at least those who lived in part during this century, scarcely any thing of a *definite* nature occurs respecting baptism, either in a doctrinal or ritual respect. It is, indeed, frequently alluded to; but this is usually in a general way only. We can easily gather from these allusions, that the rite was practised in the church; but we are not able to determine, with precision, either the manner of the rite, or the stress that was laid upon it.

In the Pastor of Hermas, however, occurs one passage, (Cotelier. Patr. Apostol. I. p. 119 sq.) which runs as follows: "But that seal [of the sons of God] is water, *in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, into which men descend* who are bound to death, but those ascend who are destined to life. To them that seal is disclosed, and they make use of it, that they may enter the kingdom of God."

One would naturally expect something definite from Justin Martyr. But in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, nothing of this nature occurs. He compares baptism with circumcision, and speaks of it as an initiatory ceremony; but says nothing specific concerning the manner of the rite. In his Apology, however, (Opp. Pat. I. p. 210, ed. Oberthur,) a passage occurs which deserves our attention. Speaking of converts to Chris-

tianity or those who become believers, he says: "They are led out by us *to the place where there is water* . . . and in the name of the Father of the universe, the Lord God, and of the Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, *τὸ ὕδατι λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται, they wash themselves with water* . . . *τοῦτον λουσομένον ἄγοντες εἰς τὸ λουτρὸν, leading him who is to be washed to the bath or washing plate* . . . he who is enlightened *λούεται, is washed or washes himself*." It is remarkable here, that the verb *λούομαι* is employed throughout this passage, which is used by the Greeks to designate *washing the body*. But this may be done by bathing, by simple ablution, or by immersion. Immersion may of course be washing; although washing is not by any means always the same as immersion. The greater includes the less; but the less does not include the greater. I am persuaded, that this passage, as a whole, most naturally refers to immersion; for why, on any other ground, should the convert who is to be initiated, *go out to the place where there is water*? There could be no need of this, if mere sprinkling, or partial affusion only, was customary in the time of Justin.

Tertullian, who died in A. D. 220, is the most ample witness of all the early writers. In his works is an essay in defence of Christian baptism, which had been assailed by some of the heretics of his time. Passing by the multitude of expressions which speak of the importance of being *cleansed by water, being born in the water*, etc. I quote only such as are directly to the point. In § 2 he speaks of a baptized person, as "*in aquam demissus, let down into the water*, i. e. immersed, and *inter pauca verba tinctus*, i. e. dipped between the utterance of a few words;" by which latter expression he means, the repetition of the baptismal formula by the priest, while he was performing the act.

In § 4 is a passage which seems to convey a still more definite sense. He is speaking of the original waters at the time of the creation, having been made a sanctified element by the influence of the Spirit of God upon them; from which he goes on to argue the sanctifying influence of baptismal water. But some will object, he says, that "we are not dipped (*tinguimur*) in those waters which were at the beginning." His reply is, that all water is a species of that genus, and that the species must have the same quality with the genus. He then proceeds: "There is, then, no difference, whether any one is washed in a pool, river, fountain, lake, or channel, *alveus*, (canal?) nor is

there any difference of consequence between those whom John immersed (tinxit) in the Jordan, or Peter in the Tiber." Here then we have in a very clear passage, the usual elements named, in which baptism was performed. It was done at or in some stream, pool, or lake. What other good reason for this can be given, excepting that immersion was practised?

In § 6 he says: "Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit *in aquis* [i. e. in the baptismal water], but being cleansed in the water (in aqua emundati), we are prepared for the Holy Spirit." § 7. "Afterwards going out from the *ablution* or *bath* (lavacro), we are anointed," etc.

In § 11 and the sequel, he very often makes use of the Latin word *tingo*, in order to express the Greek word βαπτίζω. In § 16 he speaks of those who had been baptized, as being those *qui aqua lavarentur, who are washed with water*; and again, *qui aqua lavissent*.

In his book against Praxeas, § 26 sub fine, he says: "Not once, but *thrice*, according to the several names [Father, Son, and Holy Ghost] are we baptized (tinguimur) into the several persons." The reader is desired to note here, and in other passages which will be cited in the sequel, that the practice of *trine* immersion, i. e. of plunging three times into the water, in correspondence with the names of the Godhead as they occur in the formula of baptism, was usual at so early a period as the time of Tertullian; how much earlier, we have no certain testimony, at least none that I am acquainted with. Tertullian himself, however, seems to have regarded this *trine* immersion, as something superadded to the precepts of the gospel; for thus he speaks in his book *De Corona Militis*, § 3: "Thence we are thrice immersed (ter mergitatur), *answering*, i. e. fulfilling, *somewhat more* (amplius aliquid respondentes), than the Lord has decreed in the Gospel."

I do not see how any doubt can well remain, that in Tertullian's time, the practice of the African church, to say the least, as to the mode of baptism, must have been that of *trine immersion*.

Subsequent ages make the general practice of the church still plainer, if indeed this can be done. The Greek words *καταδύω* and *κατάδυσις* were employed as expressive of *baptizing* and *baptism*; and these words mean, *going down into the water* or *immerging*. So in the following examples:

Chrysostom, Homil. 40 in 1 Cor. i. "To be baptized and to
Vol. III. No. 10. 46

submerge (καταδύεσθαι), then to *emerge* (ἀνανεΐναι), is a symbol of descent to the grave, and of ascent from it." Ambrose, Lib. II. c. 7 de Sacramentis: "You were asked, Dost thou believe in God Almighty? Thou saidst, I believe; and *thus thou wast immersed* (mersisti), that is, thou wast buried." Augustine, Homil. IV. as cited by Gratian in P. III. Decretor. de Consecrat. Distinct. IV. Can. 76, "After you professed your belief, three times did we *submerge* (demersimus) your heads in the sacred fountain." Was it the head only? Or did he mean to include with it the whole body? Every now and then passages of this nature occur, which lead one to suspect that *total* immersion was not uniform in the early church. But that it was *usual*, seems to be clearly indicated by Dionysius Areop. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. 2, "Properly ἡ δι' ὕδατος ὀλική κάλυψις, *the total covering by water*, is taken from an image of death and burial out of sight." So the Council of Toletan: "For immersion in the water is like a descent to the grave; and again, emersion from the water (ab aquis emersio), is a resurrection."

The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them. Let the reader duly weigh the following ones.

Gregory Nyssen, De Baptismo Christi, "Coming into water, the kindred element of earth, *we hide ourselves* in it, as the Saviour did in the earth; and doing this three times, etc." Basil, De Spiritu c. 15, "By the *three immersions* (ἐν τρισὶ ταῖς καταδύσεσι), and by the like number of invocations, the great mystery of baptism is completed." Damascenus, Orthodox. Fides IV. 10, "Baptism is a type of the death of Christ; for by three *immersions* (καταδυσέων) baptism signifies, etc." So the Apostolical Constitutions (probably written in the fourth century), Lib. III. c. 17, "Immersion (κατάδυσις) denotes dying with him [Christ]; emersion (ἀνάδυσις), a resurrection with Christ." Photius (apud Oecumenium) on Rom. vi. "The three *immersions and emersions* (καταδύσεις καὶ ἀνάδύσεις) of baptism signify death and resurrection." Quest. apud Athanasium, Qu. 94, "To *immerse* (καταδύσαι) a child three times in the bath (or pool), and to *emerge* him (ἀνάδύσαι), this shews the death, etc." Chrysostom, in cap. iii. Johannis, "We, as in a sepulchre, *immersing* (καταδύντων) our heads in water, the old man is buried, and *sinking down* (καταδύς κάτω), the whole is concealed at once; then as we emerge, the new man again rises." Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 17, "For as he that goes down into the water and is baptized, is surrounded on all sides with water, so the apostles were baptized all over by the Spirit. The water surrounds the body externally, but the Spirit incomprehensibly baptizes the soul within." Jerome, Advers. Lucif. c. 4,

"Many other things which are observed in churches by tradition, have usurped to themselves the authority of the written law [of the Scriptures]; such as *in lavacro ter caput mergitare, to immerse the head three times in the bath.* Id. Comm. in Eph. iv, "Three times are we immerged, that the mystery etc." Augustine, in Decreto Gratiani de Consecrat. Distinc. IV. 78, "Rightly are ye immerged three times, who have received baptism in the name of Christ. . . . for that thrice repeated submersion (demersio) expresses a resemblance of the Lord's burial, etc."

But enough. "It is," says Augusti (Denkw. VII. p. 216), "a thing made out," viz. the ancient practice of immersion. So indeed all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject, conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times, which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject, to deny this.

That there were cases of exception allowed, now and then, is no doubt true. Persons in extreme sickness or danger, were allowed baptism by affusion, etc. Cyprian pleads strongly and conclusively for this, in his epistle to Magnus, Ep. 76 (al. 69). The Council of Neo-Caesarea, Euseb. Lib. VI. c. 43; and so the Council of Laodicea, Can. 47, sanction such baptisms. The Acta Laurentii, apud Surium Tom. IV. mention a Roman soldier who was baptized by Laurence, with a pitcher of water; and the same person also baptized Lucillus by pouring water upon his head. But all such cases were manifestly regarded as exceptions to the common usage of the church.

If the testimony already adduced should not be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable person, he may consider one circumstance more, which must be decisive. This is, that all candidates for baptism, men, women, and infants, were completely divested of all their garments, in order to be baptized. Revolting as this custom was, yet it is as certain as testimony can make it.

Thus Chrysostom, (Hom. 6 in Coloss.) speaking of baptism, says: "Men were as naked as Adam . . . but with this difference; Adam was naked because he had sinned, but in baptism a man was naked that he might be freed from sin." So Ambrose, Serm. X, "Naked were we born into the world; naked came we to the baptismal font. . . . How absurd, then, that he, whom his mother brought forth naked, the church received naked, should enter heaven with riches!" Cyril of Jerusalem testifies the same thing, Catech. Myst. 2, "As soon as ye came into the baptistery, ye put off your clothes . . . and being thus divested ye stood naked, imitating Christ

who was naked upon the cross. . . . O wonderful thing! ye were naked in the sight of men, and were not ashamed; in this truly imitating the first man Adam, who was naked in paradise, and was not ashamed."

One testimony more may suffice. Chrysostom, in describing the violent proceedings of his enemies against him, on the great Sabbath [before Easter], says: "They came armed into the church, and by violence expelled the clergy, killing many in the baptistery; by which the women, who were at that time unclothed in order to be baptized, were put into such a fright, that they fled away naked, and could not stay, in their terror, to put on such clothes as the modesty of the sex required."

Enough of this most unaccountable of all the practices of the ancient church. I am ready to thank God for the honour of the Christian religion, that the New Testament contains no intimation of such a usage; nor even any of the earlier fathers. How it was possible that it could prevail, is a problem difficult of solution. I know well, that the manners of ancient times rendered such things less scandalous than they would now be among us. But who needs to be told, that nothing but ignorance or superstition, to make the very best of the case, could ever have adopted and continued such a shameful practice.

Still, say what we may concerning it in a moral point of view, the argument to be deduced from it in respect to immersion, is not at all diminished. Nay, it is strengthened. For if such a violation of decency was submitted to, in order that baptism might be performed as the church thought it should be, it argues that baptizing by immersion was considered as a rite not to be dispensed with.

The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church has always continued to preserve, even down to the present time; see Allatii de Eccles. Orient. et Occident. Lib. III. c. 12. § 4; Acta et Script. Theol. Wirtemb. et Patriarch. Constant. Jer. p. 63, p. 238 sq. Christ. Angeli Enchirid. de Statu hodierno Graecor. cap. 24; Augusti, Denkwürd. VII. p. 226 sq. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the western churches, *sprinkled Christians*, by way of ridicule and contempt; Walch's Einleit. in die relig. Streitigkeiten, Th. V. pp. 476—481. They maintain, that βαπτίζω can mean nothing but *immerge*; and that *baptism by sprinkling* is as great a solecism as *immersion by aspersion*; and they claim to themselves the honour of having preserved the ancient sacred rite of the church free from change and from corruption, which

would destroy its significancy ; see Alex. de Stourdza, *Considerations sur la Doctrine et l'Esprit de l'Eglise Orthodoxe*, Stuttg. 1816, pp. 83—89.

F. Brenner, a Roman Catholic writer, has recently published a learned work, which contains a copious history of usages in respect to the baptismal rite ; viz. *Geschichtliche Darstellung der Verrichtung der Taufe*, etc. 1818. I have not seen the work ; but it is spoken of highly, on account of the diligence and learning which the author has exhibited in his historical details. The result of them respecting the point before us, I present, as given by Augusti, *Denkwürd.* VII. p. 68.

“Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water ; and only in extraordinary cases, was sprinkling or affusion permitted. These latter methods of baptism were called in question, and even prohibited.” Brenner adds : “For sixteen hundred years was the person to be baptized, either by immersion or affusion, entirely divested of his garments.”

These results will serve to shew, what a Roman Catholic writer feels himself forced by historical facts to allow, in direct contradiction to the present practice of his own church ; which no where practises immersion, except in the churches of Milan ; it being everywhere else even forbidden.

In the work of John Floyer on *Cold Bathing*, p. 50, it is mentioned, that the English church practised *immersion* down to the beginning of the seventeenth century ; when a change to the method of sprinkling gradually took place. As a confirmation of this, it may be mentioned, that the first Liturgy in 1547 enjoins a *trine immersion*, in case the child is not sickly ; Augusti, *ut sup.* p. 229.

We have collected facts enough to authorize us now to come to the following general conclusion, respecting the practice of the Christian church in general, with regard to the mode of baptism, viz. that from the earliest ages of which we have any account, subsequent to the apostolic age and downward for several centuries, the churches did generally practise baptism by immersion ; perhaps *by immersion of the whole person* ; and that the only exceptions to this mode which were usually allowed, were in cases of urgent *sickness* or other cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practised.

It may also be mentioned here, that *aspersion* and *affusion*, which had in particular cases been now and then practised in

primitive times, were *gradually* introduced. These became at length, as we shall see hereafter, quite common, and in the western church almost universal, sometime before the Reformation.

In what manner, then, did the churches of Christ from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word βαπτίζω in the New Testament? Plainly they construed it as meaning *immersion*. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of necessity and mercy only excepted.

If then we are left in doubt after a philological investigation of βαπτίζω, how much it necessarily implies; if the circumstances which are related as accompanying this rite, so far as the New Testament has given them, leave us still in doubt; if we cannot trace with any certainty the Jewish proselyte-baptism to a period as early as the baptism of John and Jesus, so as to draw any inferences with probability from this; still we are left in no doubt as to the more generally received usage of the Christian church, down to a period several centuries after the apostolic age.

That the Greek fathers, and the Latin ones who were familiar with the Greek, understood the usual import of the word βαπτίζω, would hardly seem to be capable of a denial. That they might be confirmed in their view of the import of this word, by common usage among the Greek classic authors, we have seen in the first part of this dissertation.

For myself, then, I cheerfully admit, that βαπτίζω in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does in all probability involve the idea, that this rite was usually performed by immersion, but not always. I say *usually*, and *not always*; for to say more than this, the tenor of some of the narrations, particularly in Acts 10: 47, 48. 16: 32, 33, and 2: 41, seem to me to forbid. I cannot read these examples, without the distinct conviction that *immersion* was not practised on these occasions, but *washing* or *affusion*.

For the satisfaction of the reader, I add here a word respecting the manner in which the author of the Peshito, an old Syriac version of the New Testament, has rendered the word βαπτίζω.

This version is the oldest of all the translations of the New Testament that are extant; for in all probability it should be dated during the first half of the second century. Withal, it is admitted by those who are able to consult it, to be one of the most faithful and authentic of all the ancient versions.

How does this translate the word in question? Only and always by ܚܘܒ , which corresponds (in point of form) to the Hebrew עָמַד , the Chaldee עָמַד , and the same word in the Arabic. This is a very remarkable circumstance; for the Syriac has a word, ܚܘܒ , like the Chaldee עָמַד and the corresponding Hebrew עָמַד , which means *to plunge, dip, immerse*, etc. See in Mich. Syr. Lex. sub voce. Why should it employ the word ܚܘܒ then (i. e. עָמַד), in order to render βαπτίζω ? In the Old Testament it is employed in the like sense, only in Num. 31: 34. Elsewhere, the Hebrew עָמַד is rendered ܚܘܒ . There is no analogy of kindred languages to support the sense in question of the Syriac ܚܘܒ . The Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic, all agree in assigning to the same word the sense of the Lat. *stare, perstare, fulcire, roborare*. It is hardly credible, that the Syriac word could vary so much from all these languages, as properly to mean, *immerse, dip*, etc.

We come almost necessarily to the conclusion, then, inasmuch as the Syriac has an appropriate word which signifies *to dip, plunge, immerse* (ܚܘܒ), and yet it is never employed in the Peshito, that the translator did not deem it important to designate any particular mode of baptism, but only to designate the rite by a term which evidently appears to mean, *confirm, establish*, etc. Baptism, then, in the language of the Peshito, is *the rite of confirmation* simply, while the manner of this is apparently left without being at all expressed.

We now come, after these philological and historical investigations, to our main question.

§ 9. Importance of the Mode of Baptism.

V. *Is any particular mode of applying water in Baptism, essential to the performance of this rite?*

The advocates of immersion in the Oriental church, and elsewhere, sometimes make the appeal to the *sixty millions* of Christians, who, as they affirm, preserve this apostolic usage. But if an appeal to *numbers* be argument, what shall we say to *one hundred and fifty millions*, who practise sprinkling or affusion? Even the Roman Catholic church, jealous as she is of

ancient usages, and tenacious of that which the ancient fathers practised, retains immersion, as we have seen, only in the churches of Milan, and inhibits it elsewhere.

What do these facts shew? They prove, at least, a general conviction in the minds of Christians, that immersion is not essential, nor even important. I need not make the appeal to multitudes of writers, Catholic and Protestant, who have often and fully expressed this view of the subject. Calvin, *Instit.* IV. c. 15. § 19, says: "It is of no consequence at all (minimum refert), whether the person baptized is totally immersed, or whether he is merely sprinkled by an affusion of water. This should be a matter of choice to the churches in different regions; although the word *baptize* signifies *to immerse*, and the rite of immersion was practised by the ancient church."

To this opinion I do most fully and heartily subscribe; not because it is Calvin's, nor because the great majority of Christians have adopted it. I have other, and I trust better, reasons than either of these; and it is proper that I should now give them.

1. The rite in question is *merely external*. I do not deny, that the grace of the Spirit may be given, when baptism is performed; but I feel myself authorized to say, that the rite itself does not *sanctify*; nor does the administration of it secure the sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God. The appeal in proof of this, is to the millions of cases in which baptism has been administered to persons, who have shewn themselves to be utterly destitute of sanctifying grace, by the whole tenor, from first to last, of their lives and conversation. It is not then the *opus operatum*, the rite itself as administered by any Christian minister, which sanctifies, or can sanctify, any individual. All that can with truth be said here, is, that this rite, like any other matter which concerns religious ordinances, may be used to a good purpose, or abused to a bad one.

Whenever an enlightened Christian wishes to make the inquiry, what is *essential* to his religion, should he not instinctively open his Bible at John iv, and there read thus: "Believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall worship the Father, neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem. . . . The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. GOD IS A SPIRIT, and they that worship him must worship him IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH."

Here is the very foundation-principle of all Christian and all acceptable worship. God, who is himself a Spirit, requires the homage of our spirits. All else is nothing while this is withheld; and when this is given, all else is *circumstance*, not essence.

I need not stop to prove positions so plain and certain as these. But I may ask, Can the mode of baptism, which in itself is only an external rite, enter into the essentials of piety or true religion? The mere *mode* of an external rite *essential* to the Christian religion! Does not the question answer itself to every mind, that has not gone over into some degree of Pharisaic superstition?

2. But you will say, perhaps, that if the rite is to be performed at all, it must be performed in the manner which the New Testament enjoins. This leads me to my second remark, *viz. That no injunction is any where given in the New Testament, respecting the manner in which this rite shall be performed.*

If there be such a passage let it be produced. This cannot be done. But it will doubtless be said, that 'the *manner* of the rite is involved in the word itself which is used to designate it; and that therefore this is as much a matter of command as the rite itself.'

To this I answer, that it would prove a great deal too much. I may illustrate this by a case, which is of a parallel nature, and has respect to a rite of equal importance; I mean the Lord's Supper. The original institution of this rite took place at the last passover which Jesus and his disciples celebrated in Jerusalem. They were assembled in an upper room; Luke 22: 12. They reclined upon the usual sofa or triclinium, on which the ancients reposed at their meals; John 13: 23, 25. It was night when they kept the feast, John 13: 30. They kept it with unleavened bread, for no other was found in the houses of the Jews, at the feast of the passover; Ex. 12: 19. The wine which they drank, was that of Palestine, probably red wine. It was kept in leathern bottles, it was served in peculiar vessels. The bread was made in a certain particular fashion. The clothes of the guests were of a certain form. In a word, all the circumstances of the occasion were, in some respect or other, different from those which now accompany the administration of the Lord's Supper. Yet Jesus gave command respecting this ordinance in the following manner: **THIS DO, in remembrance of me;** Luke 22: 19, 20. 1 Cor. 11: 24, 25.

I ask now all the advocates for the *literal* sense of βαπτίζω, who urge upon the churches the original *mode* of this rite, why they do not urge upon them in the same manner, and for the same reason, the *literal* doing of what Christ commanded, as to the sacrament? Is that ordinance, which is a symbol of the blood of Jesus shed for the remission of sins—of that blood which taketh away sin and without which there is no salvation—is that ordinance of less significance and importance than the rite of baptism? This cannot be pretended. Why then do you not plead for its celebration by night; and this too in a reclining posture, in an upper chamber, with unleavened bread, with the dress, furniture, and attendance that originally were exhibited? You regard not one of all these circumstances; not even a single one. How then do you obey the command of Jesus, *THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME?* According to the tenor of your own exegesis, you do not obey it; you cannot, while you do not literally imitate all these particulars.

But you say: I obey the substantial part of the command, viz. to partake of bread and wine, in grateful remembrance of the death of Christ; and this is all which the nature of the case seems to require. The symbol in question is really and truly exhibited, when I celebrate the Lord's supper in such a way that an appropriate meaning is really and truly given to it. The circumstances of place, time, position of the guests at the table, dress, furniture of the table and room, and other like things, are merely of a local and accidental nature. They cannot make an essential part of the symbolic representation; for this consists merely in using such elements of nourishment and refreshment for the body, as will significantly and appropriately symbolize the nourishment which he receives, who spiritually "eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Son of man."

I accede to the correctness of this answer. It conveys a sentiment which seems spontaneously to commend itself to any one, who has enlightened and spiritual views of the Christian dispensation. I can go even beyond the tenor of this answer, and say, that in my apprehension, the sacrament would be really and truly observed, if those elements of nourishment for the body, which are the common and principal ones in any place, should be made use of in lieu of bread and wine, in case these could not be easily procured. The whole symbolic instruction conveyed by the ordinance of the Lord's supper is this: What food and drink, represented by the more important articles of

the same, are to the body for its nourishment and support and comfort, that a crucified Saviour is to the soul, for its life and preservation and comfort. Could not the inhabitants of a country, then, to whom it might not be possible to procure wheat-bread and wine when it was proper to celebrate the Lord's supper—might they not employ other aliments, which would symbolize the death of Christ, and the benefits of that death to the believer, with the like significancy? How can we doubt this, without adopting a principle, which must necessarily, if we are consistent with ourselves, make us the *literal* imitators of every thing, even of dress, furniture, etc. which existed in the apostolic ages.

Look at the case of Iceland, during that year in which the island remained, for the whole summer, enclosed in the floating ice that had been driven there from the polar sea, and no access from abroad to the island was possible, nor any egress from it. Might not the inhabitants of the island, reduced to live upon fish and water, have celebrated the Lord's Supper acceptably upon these elements? Would it not have been as monitory and significant to them, as bread and wine, and as acceptable to him who instituted the feast? The man who doubts this, must believe in the mysterious and miraculous virtue of the sacrament as an *opus operatum*. With such an one it is not my present purpose to contend. Christians, as I must think, have reason to bless God, that principles such as that man cherishes, are fast vanishing away before the spreading light of the Sun of Righteousness.

Let us return to the rite of baptism. What is it that it signifies? *Purification* is the answer; and this is the only scriptural and consistent answer that we can give. So Paul seems to teach us: "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water [baptism] by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish;" Eph. 5: 25—27. "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," i. e. we are saved by that regeneration or sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, of which the washing with water is an emblem or symbol; for evidently the language of Paul is borrowed from this. So again in Heb. 10: 22, "Let us draw near [to God] with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with

pure water;" where again the symbol, i. e. the washing of the body with pure water, is joined with the thing signified by it, viz. the having the heart sprinkled, purified, from an evil conscience.

In accordance with all this, Peter likewise expresses himself: "The like figure whereunto, baptism, doth now save us; not the putting off the filth of the flesh, [not the mere outward cleansing by baptismal water,] but the answer of a good conscience toward God," i. e. our being purified so that we live with a good conscience, or (as Paul expresses it) "sprinkled from an evil conscience;" 1 Pet. 3: 21.

The Saviour himself has uttered the like sentiment: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John 3: 5; i. e. he must not only be purified by baptismal water, but he must be sanctified, regenerated, by the Spirit of God.

In all these and the like cases, it is perfectly clear that baptism is considered as the symbol of purification or sanctification. It is an emblem of that holiness and purity of life which the Christian engages to exhibit, and which the gospel requires; it is significant of that sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, which a Saviour's death has procured, and without which all must perish in their pollution.

Even in those controverted passages in Rom. 6: 4, 5, and Col. 2: 12, baptism is connected with the work of the Spirit and is significant of his influence. It is a dying to sin and being raised to a new spiritual life, which is prefigured by it. How greatly this has been overlooked, and how much the import of baptism has been estimated amiss, both in ancient and modern times, in consequence of overlooking the plain and obvious import of the baptismal rite, no one needs to be told, who has extensively examined this subject.

Why should baptism be made symbolical of the *death* of Christ? All Jewish analogy is against it. What were all the ablutions and sprinklings of the ritual law designed to prefigure and to signify? Most obviously we must answer, *purification*. The Jew, who washed his body, or sprinkled it with holy water, was taught by this the necessity that his soul should also be made clean, in order that he might be an acceptable worshipper of that God who is a Spirit, and seeks for spiritual worshippers. How could any thing but his ignorance or superstition overlook this? Yet many a Jew did overlook it, and trusted, as multi-

tudes now do, to the virtue of the external ordinance, to the *opus operatum*, to save him. But neither "the blood of goats nor bullocks, nor the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean," could do any more of themselves than "purify the flesh;" they were the mere emblems of a higher and spiritual purification.

So it is with baptism. How could an intelligent and spiritually minded Jew ever have regarded this rite as designed to prefigure the death and burial of Christ, when there was not a single thing that bore any analogy to this, in all the ablutions prescribed by the ritual law; nothing even in all those prescribed by the superstition of the Pharisees? The thing is in itself altogether improbable. It is doubly so, when we take into consideration those passages of the sacred writers which I have quoted above, and which shew the views of Christ and of the apostles, as to the symbolical meaning of baptism.

Under the ancient dispensation, the rites were divided into two great classes, viz. *those significant of purity or purification*, and *those significant of atonement for sin*. Nothing could be more appropriate than this. Man needed the one and the other, in order to find acceptance with God; the one is the work of the Spirit, and the other of the Saviour who redeemed us by his blood. Is there then any change in the *essential* conditions of salvation under the new dispensation? None, we must answer. Are not the significant symbols, then, under the new dispensation, a summary of those which existed under the old? The belief of this spontaneously forces itself upon my mind. The work of the Spirit is still symbolized under the gospel; and a Saviour's blood is still represented. The one baptism signifies; the other is as plainly indicated by the Lord's supper.

Whither must we be carried, if we dissent from this view of the subject, and maintain with many of the Christian fathers, and not a few of our brethren of the present day, that baptism is a symbol of the death and burial of Christ? All analogy is against it; for thus the ancient dispensation was not arranged. The nature of the thing itself is against it. Water, as exhibited in washing, sprinkling, etc. is never an emblem of death and the grave; it is only the image of overwhelming floods, or of mighty rushing streams, that is appropriate to signify the work of destruction. But both of these are foreign to the rite of baptism.

Finally, the explanation of the apostles and of Jesus himself, is clearly in favour of connecting baptism, as a *symbol*, with the

sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God. The texts produced above, and which are so plainly to this purpose, will not be overlooked by a candid and intelligent inquirer.

How can so much stress be laid, then, upon Rom. 6: 4, 5 and Col. 2: 12, as ascertaining the ancient *mode* of baptism? Where else in all the Bible is a ritual washing with water an emblem of death and burial? No where; and I venture therefore to say, that it is only *moral* or *spiritual* baptism into the death of Christ, of which the apostle speaks in these two passages. I know well, that an appeal against this opinion, can be made to many of the fathers. But I know, too, that by the like appeal I may prove, equally well, that baptism must be performed on naked subjects; and moreover, that it is regeneration and spiritual illumination, and is necessary to our final salvation. And if the appeal be also made against my opinion, as doubtless it will be, to the sentiments of the great body of modern critics respecting Rom. 6: 4, 5 and Col. 2: 12, I must still say, that they appear to me not to have sufficiently investigated the two-fold division of the external ritual under the ancient dispensation and under the Christian one, viz. into *rites emblematic of purity*, and *rites emblematic of atonement for sin*. Where is the first of these, if baptism is merely a type or emblem of the *death* of Christ? Have we then two rites under the new dispensation, and both significant of only one and the same thing, viz. the death of Jesus? Is this probable? Is it credible? Can we believe it to be so, without the most explicit testimony?

Yet the nature of the thing itself, and all the scriptural testimony concerning it, indicate that the rites of the new dispensation have an essential correspondence with those of the ancient one. I must regard this as being real matter of fact, until I see the whole subject in a light very different from that in which I now view it.

Once more, then, directly to our point. Is it essential, in order that baptism should symbolize *purification* or *purity*, that it should be performed by *immersion*? Plainly not; for in ancient times it was the water which was *sprinkled* upon the offending Jew, that was the grand emblem of purification. So Paul considers it, when he gives us (as it were) a summary of the whole ritual of purification, by specifying the most significant of all its usages, viz. that of the ashes of a heifer mixed with water (Num. 19: 17), with which "the unclean are *sprinkled*," Heb. 9: 13. So too he decides, when he speaks of "drawing

near to God, in the full assurance of faith, having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience," Heb. 10: 22. So also, even when atonement was made; for although sometimes the blood was poured out at the basis of the altar, and sometimes smeared on its horns, and on parts of the person for whom expiation was to be made, yet the grand significant emblem was that of *sprinkling*. On the great day of atonement, the high priest entered the most holy place, and sprinkled the ark of the covenant with blood; Lev. 4: 17. Heb. 9: 25. Hence Paul speaks of the blood of Jesus, as "the blood of *sprinkling*, which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel;" i. e. Jesus' blood calls for pardon, but Abel's for vengeance, Heb. 12: 24. Peter also adopts the same image, so significant to the mind of a Jew: "Elect . . . unto obedience, through sanctification of the Spirit, and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus," 1 Pet. 1: 2.

Nor was this all. When the whole nation were consecrated to God, at Mount Sinai, they, and the book of the Law, and the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, were *sprinkled* with blood, Heb. 9: 19—21.

It is then a perfectly clear case, that the *sprinkling* of water or of blood, was altogether the most significant mode of purification, or of atonement, or of consecration to God, under the ancient dispensation. And so the prophet Ezekiel speaks of water to be *sprinkled*, under the new dispensation. After describing the gathering in of all the Jews into the kingdom of Christ, he represents Jehovah as saying: "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you," etc. Ezek. 36: 25, 26.

Is there no significancy, then, in that mode of a rite, which, above all others, is spoken of in the Old Testament and the New, as the emblem of purification and atonement and consecration? Could Jews, who thus spoke and wrote about the application of water and blood by *sprinkling*, find in sprinkling no due significancy of purification? The question answers itself, after the considerations which have already been suggested.

In performing the rite of baptism, then, what are we to aim at? The shadow or the substance? The *substance*, enlightened Christians should say. But is not the substance the symbolizing of purity or purification? This, I hope, will not be denied. If then water be applied in any such way as to make the symbol or emblem significant or expressive, and highly so,

then is the main purpose of the rite answered. We have decided this to be the case, in respect to the Lord's supper; why then should we be inconsistent with ourselves, and deny it here?

After the examples which have been adduced of the *significancy of sprinkling*, both from the Old Testament and the New, I would hope that none of my readers will be dissatisfied, if I consider this significancy as a point made out. And now—what remains? Must I shew that we are not at liberty, without being justly exposed to the accusation of gross departure from Christianity, to depart from the *modes and forms* of the apostolic church in any respect? I have shewn that all the churches on earth do depart from these, in their celebration of the Lord's Supper; and yet, without any apprehension of being guilty of an impropriety, much less of being justly chargeable with the spirit of disobedience and revolt. I could easily extend this part of my view to many other particulars. I ask those who plead for literal conformity in mode to the ancient rite of baptism, how they dispose of the ordinance respecting the disciples' washing each other's feet, described at large in John c. xiii, and particularly enjoined in vs. 14, 15? Who has repealed the obligation to a literal conformity with this command? You will say, It is the *spirit*, rather than the letter, which is here inculcated. I accede. But what is the case in respect to baptism? Will nothing but the *letter* do here? So you may think and reason; but are you not entirely inconsistent with yourself?

Why do we not feel bound, at the present day, to follow the prescriptions of Paul to the Corinthian churches, in c. xi of his first epistle to them? In this chapter, women are directed to appear in public veiled; to wear their hair long; and men to wear theirs short; vs. 10—15. Is this matter of obligation now to us? Who believes and practises it? No churches on earth, unless their *civil* customs lead them so to do. But when and where were the precepts of Paul repealed? *Never and no where*, if I must answer in the spirit of those, who urge the literal meaning of *βαπτίζω* upon the churches; *always and every where*, I may answer in another spirit and with other views, whenever and wherever external customs and circumstances differ from those of the Corinthian churches. Mere *externals* must be things of particular *time and place*. Dress does not make the man. One dress may be more convenient, or more decorous than another; but neither the one nor the other is an essential part of the person.

So the common feeling of men has decided about most of the external matters pertaining to religion, the world over. They have always been modified by time and place, by manners and customs, and they always will be. The zealot may declaim against this, and cry out that the church is in danger, and that she has departed from the commands of the gospel; but considerate and really spiritual men will reply, that 'God is a Spirit, and that he seeks spiritual worshippers.'

Accordingly, long before the light of the Reformation began to dawn upon the churches, the Roman Catholics themselves were gradually adopting the method of baptism by *sprinkling* or *affusion*, notwithstanding their superstitious and excessive devotedness to the usages of the ancient churches. So testifies one of the most intelligent and useful ecclesiastical writers of the earlier part of the dark ages; I mean Walafrid Strabo (ob. 849), abbot of the convent of St. Gall. His words run thus: "It should be noted, that many have been baptized, not only by immersion, but by *affusion*, (non solum mergendo, verum etiam *de super fundendo*,) and they may yet be baptized in this manner, if there be any necessity for it; as in the passion of St. Laurence, we read of a certain person baptized by water brought in a pitcher (urceo allato);" De Rebus Eccles. c. 26. So Thomas Aquinas (fl. 1250) in Summa Theol. III. Quest. 66. Art. 7, says: "It is safer to baptize by the mode of immersion, because this has common usage in its favour." But these very words shew that a different usage was coming in, and that Aquinas did not look upon it with any strong disapprobation. In the Statut. Synod. Leodiens. anno 1287. c. 2, the mode of baptism is prescribed, and it is there said: "That danger in baptizing may be avoided, let not the head of the child be immersed in water, but let the priest pour water three times upon the head of the child, with a bason or some other clean and decent vessel, still holding the child carefully with his hand." The Synod at Cambray (Stat. Synod. Eccl. Camerac. an. 1300, de Bapt.) say: "That danger in baptizing may be avoided, let not [the priest] immerse the head of the child in the water, but, when he baptizes, let him pour water thrice upon the top of his head, with a basin or other clean and decent vessel." And in the same way run other decrees of councils about this time; while some are even still more liberal, permitting baptism to be performed either by immersion, affusion, or sprinkling.

All this serves to illustrate how there sprung up, in the bo-

som of a church superstitiously devoted to ancient rites and forms, a conviction that the mode of baptism was one of the *ἀδυσία* of religion, i. e. something unessential to the rite itself, and which might be modified by time and place, without any encroachment upon the command itself to baptize. Gradually did this conviction increase, until the whole Roman Catholic church, that of Milan only excepted, admitted it. By far the greater part of the Protestant world have also acceded to the same views. Even the English episcopal church, and the Lutheran churches, both zealous in times past for what they supposed to be apostolic and really ancient usage, have had no serious difficulty in adopting modes of baptism quite different from that of immersion.

To these evidences that departure from the method of baptism by immersion is not a novel thing, I may add some accidental testimony of a very interesting nature, taken from a late work of F. Münter, bishop of Zealand, and Professor of Theology in the University of Copenhagen, entitled, *Sinnbilder and Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen*. Dr. Münter, who has recently deceased, is regarded in Europe as having been one of its ablest and most judicious antiquarians. Certain it is, that the churches are greatly indebted to him for many illustrations of ancient facts and customs. In the second part of the work whose title is quoted above, under the head of *Baptism*, he has exhibited several pictures or representations taken mostly from cemeteries and catacombs, some of which deserve particular notice.

The first which I shall mention, is exhibited in Plate X. fig. 59. It represents Jesus as standing in the Jordan, immersed as high as the waist, and John the Baptist as standing on the shore, holding a reed-staff in his left hand, while his right is laid upon the head of the Saviour, and he is making invocation for a blessing. On the opposite shore of the river stands an angel, with a basin in his hand, and a towel for the purpose (as it would seem) of wiping off the water. For what purpose this basin can be represented in the picture, unless it be for that of pouring water on the head of Jesus when he was baptized, I am unable to divine. The picture Münter assigns to the early part of the middle ages.

In confirmation of the above explanation, I may refer to a picture presented by Bosio, in his *Roma Sotteranea*, 1632, p. 589. The Baptist stands, as in the representation above, with his clothes on, upon the brink of Jordan; and Jesus stands in the river, immersed to the waist. In the hand of John is a basin,

on which fire is represented as flowing down from heaven, while Jesus is affused with the water which descends from the basin.

In Plate XII. fig. 85 and 86, are two more representations of the rite of baptism. In fig. 85 are two children, who apparently have attained less than half their growth, standing in a vase of water which falls a little below the waist, and in which it would be impossible to immerse them, on account of the small size of the vase. The bishop who baptizes, is represented as having completed the act, and is presented in the attitude of invoking the divine blessing, while he lays his right hand upon the head of one of the children. This picture Münter supposes to be of earlier date than the 10th century. Fig. 86 is taken from Schöne's *Geschichtsforschungen über die kirchl. Gebräuche und Einrichtungen der Christen*, and was copied by him from a roughly hewn stone at Aquileia. The person baptized stands, as above, in a vase which falls below the knee, while the water is represented as streaming from a cloud above, and the Holy Spirit as descending in the shape of a dove. The bishop stands by, and, with his right hand stretched out, is invoking a blessing.

Dr Münter mentions also two other pictures, which are presented in J. Ciampini's *Explicatio duorum Sarcophagorum sacrum baptismatis ritum indicantium*, Rom. 1697. In one of these, a man and woman are represented as kneeling in a large baptismal basin, while the priest pours water on the head of the man from an urn or pitcher. Ciampini thinks that this is a representation of the baptism of Agilulf and his wife Theodolinde, king and queen of the Lombards, in A. D. 591. The second picture represents a man kneeling with folded hands, half divested of his clothing, on whose head the priest pours water from a pitcher. Both of these pictures are taken from sarcophagi, dug up in the vicinity of Naples. Ciampini attributes them to the sixth century; but Münter judges them to be of a later age.

It may naturally be asked, Why pictures of an earlier date than any of these, have not been found in cemeteries and catacombs, and in the ruins of ancient cities? The answer is, that the earlier churches never painted or otherwise represented by images, the sacred *mysteries* of baptism and the Lord's supper; for such they deemed them to be. Such in fact they continued to be, in their estimation, until the German nations that came in upon Rome began to be baptized by thousands; and then of course,

the rite of baptism could no longer be regarded as secret. From this time, such representations of this rite began to be made in various ways, as have been described above.

It will be seen from all this, that Christians began somewhat early to deflect from the ancient practice of immersing. It is remarkable, moreover, that so far as I have yet been able to discover, there is not one of the ancient pictures which represents baptism as performed by *immersion*. How could this happen, if immersion was so general, or rather so universal, in the middle ages, as it has often been affirmed to be? But I must return from these historical notices, to the argument which I am endeavouring to urge.

From all that has been said above it is manifest, that the great body of Christians have long come to the full conviction, that no one particular mode of baptism can be justly considered as essential to the rite itself. And is there not sufficient ground for this, in the considerations that have already been urged? The question, whether a religion preëminently spiritual, simple, and designed to be universal, would probably attach importance to the mere mode of an external rite, is one which every enlightened mind may answer, I had almost said, *a priori*. The probability is at once felt to be strongly against it, so soon as any one has thrown off all attachment to *opus operatum*, i. e. to the mystical power and merit of external ceremonies. Under the gospel, sanctification and purity are not so cheap, nor to be had on such easy terms, as the performance of outward rites. Every thing which teaches what is opposed to this sentiment, directly or indirectly, contradicts the spirit of the gospel; for this demands of us as a thing fundamental and essential, that we should be "poor in spirit," and "take up the cross" by real and internal self-denial, not with mere outward shew and ceremony.

The whole may be summed up in one single point. Either the rite of baptism has a mystical power of itself to sanctify, which depends on the mode of its administration, and its merit as an *opus operatum*; or it is a symbolical rite, significant of truth, i. e. of doctrine, or fact. A mystical power one cannot believe in, because millions of baptized persons have already gone to perdition; over these, therefore, baptism never did exercise any mystical and saving influence. But even if we should admit the existence of such a power, can it be shewn that it is exclusively connected with immersion only? Have the sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God been limited to that part

of the Christian church exclusively, who practise immersion? So far from this, that the most vicious and ignorant of all who bear the name of Christians, are the most numerous and zealous of all the advocates of immersion. I refer, in this declaration, to the Oriental church, which has a name to live while it is *twice dead*, and ought to be plucked up by the roots. If there are exceptions to my general remark, (as there certainly are, and most eminent ones too, among the Baptists of England and America,) it remains to be shewn that immersion has any thing of consequence to do with their evangelical character. The Baptists of the English and American world, evangelical and devoted to religion as many of them truly are, do not surpass in piety, as I must believe, many of their brethren in Christ, who differ from them in respect to the mode of baptism.

We come, then, of necessity to the conclusion, that the *moral good* to be expected from baptism, is to be derived from the moral or spiritual instruction which it conveys, and from the lively manner in which it impresses this, and the obligation under which it lays those who are concerned with the rite. All the rest appears to be mere dreaming Pharisaism; here is substantial reality. But may not this instruction be conveyed as well by *affusion* or *sprinkling*, as by immersion? If we look to the ancient dispensation, we must say, Yes. If we look at the nature of the thing itself, we must answer in the affirmative. If we appeal to the general conviction of the Christian world, which has decided against patristic and ancient usage, we must give the same answer. Water applied in this way or in that, is water still, i. e. a cleansing and purifying element. Its significance is not at all lost or even obscured. In the East, where bathing is so common, and where religious rites especially have required ablution, it may be more significant, in some cases to immerse; but in the west and north, where such rites have long ceased, (if indeed they were ever practised,) immersion can have no more significancy than affusion or sprinkling. Why then insist on it? Or if you are conscience-bound by your own views of the rite, why judge your brother who is not, and thinks that Christianity was never designed to become a religion of rituals?

In fine, aspersion or affusion of water exhibits, and fully exhibits, the essence of the thing, i. e. the instruction and symbol, aimed at by the rite of baptism. Why then should we be zealous about any thing more than this? Such strenuousness I

am most fully persuaded, is a zeal without a proper degree of Christian knowledge and liberality on this point. It is a zeal for the *costume* of religion, rather than the true spirit of it. So far as it goes, I must believe it to be really and truly sectarianism.

On the other hand, to maintain that sprinkling or affusion is the only mode of baptism, or the only proper mode, seems to me to partake of the like sectarian spirit. The great body of Christians have long ceased to think that any thing of importance, in a religious respect, is exclusively attached to either of these modes. It is my earnest hope, that the superstitious views of the Christian fathers, in respect to the mode of baptism, may never again mislead the churches, or interrupt their harmony.

3. I have one more suggestion to make, in respect to the *mode* of baptism. This is, that personal safety and convenience often demand that immersion should be dispensed with; and therefore, at least, it cannot well be supposed that it is in all cases necessary.

So thought the ancient church, even when they attached a very undue degree of importance to the rite itself, and regarded it, for the most part, as indispensable to salvation. I cannot forbear an appeal to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, (fl. A. D. 240,) a warm-hearted Christian and a martyr to his religion. When the question was put to him, whether *clinical* baptism, i. e. baptism by affusion on a sick-bed, was valid, he answered thus :

“You ask of me, my dear Son, what I think respecting those who have become subjects of divine grace in a state of languor and sickness; viz. whether they are to be regarded as lawful Christians, when they have not been bathed with saving water [immersed by baptism], but *perfusi, bedewed, affused*. In regard to this, let not our diffidence and modesty hinder any one to think according to his own opinion, and practise as he thinks. So far as my own humble opinion goes, I think the divine benefits [of the ordinance] are in no degree diminished or cut short [by any mode], nor that any thing of the divine bounty is at all diminished, where it [the ordinance] is received by the full faith of him who receives and him who administers it. Nor do I think that the contagion of sin is washed away by this salutary ordinance, (as the filth of the skin and body is by corporeal and secular bathing,) so that there is any need of soap and other means, [or] of a bathing-tub and pool in which the body can be washed and cleansed. The [physical] breast of a believer is cleansed in one way; the mind [or soul] of man in another way, by the deserts of faith.

In sacred rites performed as necessity dictates, through divine mercy, divine favour is bestowed on those who sincerely believe. *Nor should any be troubled, because sick persons are SPRINKLED or AFFUSED, since they obtain the favour of God;* for the Holy Spirit says by Ezekiel the prophet: 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you,' etc. [Ezek. 26: 25.] So in the book of Numbers: 'The man who shall be unclean . . . because the water of sprinkling is not sprinkled upon him.' And again: 'The Lord said, the water of purification.' And again: 'The water of sprinkling is purification.' [Num. 19: 19, 20. 8: 7. 19: 12, 13.] Hence it appears, that *SPRINKLING is of like value with the salutary bath* (aquae instar salutaris lavacri obtinere); and when these things are done in the church, where the faith is sound of the giver and receiver, *all is valid* (omnia stare), and may be completed and effected agreeably to the authority of the Lord and the truth of faith (*majestate Domini et fidei veritate*)." Eph. 76 or 69.

Here then *sprinkling*, so early as the former half of the third century, is pronounced to be legitimate and valid, by one of the noblest men among all the Christian fathers. The appeal which he makes to the Old Testament, in order to shew in what light this may be considered, is altogether apposite. I have shewn above, what significancy this mode of applying either water or blood had, in the view of the sacred writers. I need only to add, that this noble and liberal decision of Cyprian was confirmed and proclaimed by several ecclesiastical councils, not long afterwards.

That the ancient church habitually permitted departure from the ordinary method of baptism, in case of extreme sickness or danger, has been already remarked. The principle developed by this permission, so ably set forth by Cyprian, is what I design still further to illustrate, under my present head.

The cases of extreme sickness and imminent danger are not the only ones, in which reasonable consideration pleads for dispensing with immersion. In the midst of the dark ages, at the very midnight of superstition about rites and forms, Duns Scotus, the celebrated metaphysical theologian (fl. 1260), saw and felt this.

"A minister," says he, "may be excused from *trine immersion*; for example, in case a minister should be feeble as to strength, *et sit unus magnus rusticus*, and *there should be a huge country-fellow to be baptized*, whom he could neither plunge in nor lift out;" Comm. in IV. Sentent. Dist. 3. Ques. 4.

The quaintness of the illustration does not diminish aught

from its power, in respect to the principle which was to be explained. The like to this must often occur; especially if the most ancient practice of repairing to rivers and pools continue to be maintained.

Persons often need to be baptized, when access to water abroad is difficult, dangerous, or impossible. The infirm health of the officiating minister forbids the exposure of himself in this way; the feeble state of the person to be baptized forbids it; or the winter season forbids it. In all the northern and southern parts of the globe, reasons of climate must be urgent against the practice of immersion in rivers and pools, for some nine months in the year. On a sick bed, and *in extremis*, there are a multitude of cases in which it would cost life. Do you say: Then let baptism be dispensed with? So would I answer, although on a ground very different, perhaps, from yours. My answer would rest on the ground, that no external ordinance is obligatory, when it becomes dangerous to life or health. The great Lord of the Sabbath admits works of necessity and mercy, i. e. such services as are necessary to life and comfort, to be done on his holy day. He has said that *the Sabbath was made for man*. So was baptism. It was not instituted to injure, destroy, or even hazard life. In a case of distressing sickness and urgent danger, we may say in respect to this rite or any other external one, *Voluisse est habuisse*, i. e. to desire it, is accepted in lieu of its being administered. So would I answer in all cases of the like nature; but you, who plead as earnestly for the rite of *immersion*, as the Roman Catholics do for baptism by the hands of one of their own priests, you would say, that baptism must be dispensed with in the case named of imminent danger or extreme sickness, because the proper *mode* of it has become impracticable. With this reason I have no sympathy. While I believe that the gospel represents God as a *Spirit*, and as requiring *spiritual* worship; and that these two truths lie at the very foundation of all religious service whatever; I never can believe that *the mode* of a rite merely external, can be *essential* in any degree. I cannot submit to such a yoke of bondage, when the liberty of the gospel is proffered.

But you will tell me, that all the difficulties in respect to baptism abroad, in rivers and pools, can be avoided by the building of a *baptistery*, such as the ancient churches had; where the hazard even of cold water becomes unnecessary, and

the feeble may be accommodated with baths adapted in temperature to their state and condition.

I cannot admit, however, the sufficiency or consistency of your reply, on the grounds which you yourself maintain. For, in the first place, this practice of building *baptisteries* is well known to be an innovation upon the more ancient usage of the church. In the time of Justin Martyr there were no such accommodations as these. They went out from the churches, i. e. the places where they met, to rivers and pools, as he tells us, in order to perform the rite. Who gave liberty, then, to build baptisteries? In what part of the New Testament do we find any thing concerning them? What right have you now to depart from apostolic usage? You administer rebuke to me, because I do not *immerse*; and this, on account of the *literal* obedience which (as you aver) is due to the command to baptize all nations. Nothing, then, but literally doing as Christ and the apostles did, when they practised the rite in question, can be literal obedience. But where were the baptisteries in their days? May I not charge you now, in my turn, with a departure from the simplicity and significancy of baptism in pure and living or running water, as the rite was performed in the days of the apostles? On the ground which I occupy, this charge amounts to an accusation of no very grievous nature; on yours, it must be placed under the same category with your accusation against me, i. e. it must be considered as a grievous departure from the command of Christ. There is no avoiding this conclusion.

I go farther with this argument. If you take your stand on the ancient practice of the churches in the days of the early Christian fathers, and charge me with departure from this; in my turn I have the like charge to make against you. It is notorious, and admits of no contradiction, that baptism in those days of immersion, was administered to men, women, and children, *in puris naturalibus*, naked as Adam and Eve before their fall. The most tender, delicate, and modest females, young or old, could obtain no exception, where immersion must be practised. This practice was pleaded for and insisted upon, because it was thought to be apostolic. At all events, it began very early in the Christian church.

No wonder now that Athanasius complained, that in his times there were "scandalous occurrences in the baptistry." To tell the story of the ancient mode of baptism, is enough to

satisfy any one that his allegations must be well founded. In vain did the churches seek to avoid the reproach of this scandalous practice by building a separate baptistery for females, or by baptizing them separately. Priests, and priests only, in any common case, could administer the rite. The scandal of the thing still remained. Yea, it increased to such a degree, that the churches were at length forced into a proper sense of decency; and thus they burst asunder the bands of superstition.

You reject this usage, because you believe it to be an indecorum. But on the ground which you take, this is not a sufficient reason. *Literal* conformity to the usage of the ancient churches, is the only thing which should satisfy a conscience like yours.

But you say, 'There is no evidence that the primitive mode of baptism required persons to be divested of all their garments.' I grant it; but still, there is the same kind of evidence as proves to you, that immersion was the only apostolic mode of baptism, viz. the universal usage of the ancient churches. Your main reason for believing that βαπτίζω means immersion, must depend, after all, on the exegesis of the fathers and the ancient churches. New Testament usage of the word, in cases not relevant to this rite, clearly does not entitle you to such a conclusion with any confidence. If you say, 'The classical use of the word abundantly justifies the construction I put upon it;' my reply is, that classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament. Who does not know, that a multitude of Greek words here receive their colouring and particular meanings from the Hebrew, and not from the Greek classics? *Do θεός, οὐρανός, σάββας, πίστις, δικαιοσύνη,* and other words almost without number, exhibit meanings which conform to the Greek classics; or which, in several respects, can even be illustrated by them? Not at all. Then how can you be over confident in the application of the classical meaning of βαπτίζω, when the word is employed in relation to a rite that is purely Christian? Such a confidence is indeed common; but it is not the more rational, nor the more becoming, on this account.

After all, then, you depend for the exegesis of βαπτίζω, as meaning *to immerse*, mainly on the practice and the views of the early churches. If this be authoritative, then why not be consistent, and carry it through? We have seen, that Cyril could even exult in the practice of divesting the candidates for

baptism of all their garments, since he viewed all this as a most significant rite. Why not follow the good father in this, as well as in immersion?

But why stop even here? Can it not be shewn, that the ancient churches practised *unction*, both before and after baptism; and that the sign of the cross was a part of the ceremonial; that imposition of hands immediately succeeded it; and that various other ceremonies were sometimes practised? It can; and if usages such as these become authoritative, because the ancient church practised them, then the Romish church is nearest to Christian duty, who retains most of these usages. On the like ground, the whole apparatus of ancient superstition might be brought in upon the churches of the present day. When we once admit, that all of an external nature which the ancient churches practised, is binding upon us, there is no end of rites and forms and worthless ceremonies, which serve only to delude the multitude, and to deform a religion which in its very nature is truly spiritual.

Sed—manum de tabula. I have written enough to explain my own views and the grounds of them, if not enough to satisfy the minds of others. I have not engaged in this exposition with a willing mind, inasmuch as I almost deem it a loss of time to spend so much of it as this investigation has cost me, on a subject that so nearly approaches to a discussion of rites and forms. But I have been compelled, as it were to this service. For some years past, I have received letters, every few weeks, urging me to answer questions relative to the mode of the baptismal rite, and other things connected with it. The tenor of the two letters standing at the head of this article, is a specimen of them. I must beg my friends, one and all, to consider me as having now done with the subject, and intending to write no more upon it, unless indeed a new and pressing exigency shall occur, that I cannot at all anticipate. No efforts will draw me into a controversy. I have abstained, as the reader will perceive, from all criticisms on controversial books, and all polemical attitudes in respect to them. I have expressed, freely and fully, my own views. My Baptist friends will not be displeased at this; for they, most of all, have urged me to do so. If my sentiments go to shew that I believe them to be in an error, in regard to their zeal about immersion; they shew no more than what is matter of fact. I do believe that this is the *sectarianism* of their denomination; and moreover, that it does not accord well,

in this particular, with the elevated and spiritual views which, at such a time of light as the present, ought to be cherished.

I have read with attention, since writing most of the above essay, a recent publication by the Rev. A. Carson of Edinburgh, whose zeal is overflowing on this subject. I have found in it many useful and striking remarks on the classical use of *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*, and the distinction made between them by classical usage. Already, however, had I anticipated most of this, by my own researches; and now I see no occasion to change what I had before written. I have taken some five or six examples of the use of *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω* from Mr C. in reviewing my work for the press; but I have not once attempted to controvert him.

Mr Carson lays down some very adventurous positions, in respect to one meaning, and *one only*, of words; which, as it seems to me, every lexicon on earth contradicts, and always must contradict. His book is not destitute of evidence, that he has learning and acuteness. He sometimes professes much liberal feeling. But withal, he has so many adventurous philological positions; he occasionally makes such high and exclusive claims to *pure* Christianity, on the ground of an external rite; he sometimes utters such anathemas against his opponents; and joined with this, his book is often filled with so much levity, and so many attempts at witticism and sarcasm; that I am spontaneously led to ask, What can be the tendency of such discussion, except to break asunder the bands of brotherhood? If he rightly represents his opponents, it must be admitted that he was at least led into temptation. That Dr Ewing should gravely proffer to the public, the word *pop* as a translation of *βαπτίζω*, might tempt to sarcasm a graver man than Mr Carson. But what is to become of charity, kind feeling, and truth, in the midst of such controversy as this?

But it is no part of my object to write reviews, or make strictures upon the performances of others. Those who seek to promote kind and brotherly feeling, rather than to obtain victory in a dispute, will be grieved at reading any thing of this nature, come from whom it may, or however it may be recommended by learning or acuteness.

For myself, I have not the least difficulty with any man or men, who prefer immersion to other methods of baptism. I never can contend with any one about this, except so far as to vindicate myself for not believing in the necessity of this mode.

This I have now done—I would hope, not in a sectarian way. If I have felt obliged to speak freely, on the point of sectarian feeling, my brethren will forgive this, who have urged upon me fully to declare myself. I do not love them any the less, because they are Baptists; and I would hope, they will permit me still to believe in other modes of baptism than immersion, without regarding me, on their part, as guilty of so great a crime as Mr Carson charges on his opponents.

On the subject of *infant-baptism* I have said nothing. The present occasion did not call for it; and I have no wish or intention to enter into the controversy respecting it. I have only to say, that I believe in both the propriety and expediency of the rite thus administered; and therefore accede to it *ex animo*. Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find. Nor, with my views of it, do I need them. If the subject had respect to what is *fundamental* or *essential* in Christianity, then I must find either the one or the other, in order to justify adopting or practising it. But as the case now is, and the rite itself is but an external rite; the general analogy of the ancient dispensation; the *enlargement* of privilege under the Gospel; the silence of the New Testament on the subject of receiving children into a special relation to the church by the baptismal rite, which shews, at least, that there was no dispute in early ages relative to this matter; the certainty that in Tertullian's day the practice was general; all these considerations put together—united with the conviction that baptism is *symbol* and *dedication*, and may be so in the case of infants as well as adults; and that it brings parents and children into a peculiar relation to the church and under peculiarly recognized obligation—serve to satisfy me fully, that the practice may be, and should be, continued. My friends will be contented, I would hope, with this avowal, without an effort to draw me into dispute. It is my full purpose not to dispute on this point. The sentiments of the Baptists, in relation to this subject, are no obstacle to my kind feelings towards them. If their views are erroneous, still they are much better than the views of those who practise this rite promiscuously, without any regard to the character of those who offer their children in baptism.

I have only to add, that it is my earnest hope and prayer, that the time may speedily come, when all who love the Lord

Jesus shall cease to dispute about rites and forms, and shall believe that they have "one Lord, one faith, and *one baptism*," although the external mode of this latter ordinance may not be the same in all the churches. Why should there be any more jealousy on this subject, than there is in respect to the various modes and forms of administering and partaking of the Lord's Supper?

My correspondents whose letters I have printed at the commencement of this discussion, will at least feel themselves entitled to a word in particular. This I may add, without occupying much time.

My missionary Brethren will now perceive, that my opinion must of course be, in accordance with the principles above developed, that they should render the Greek βαπτίζω in the same way as our English version and the Vulgate have done, viz. by retaining the word βαπτίζω, and merely giving it a form that will render it analogous to other verbs in the language to which it is transferred. In doing this, they are still at full liberty to explain to their hearers the meaning of the word, according to the views of it which they entertain; while, at the same time, they free themselves from the charge, of having made a sectarian translation.

In regard to the third question they put, which respects the words in Acts 19: 5, I can hardly refrain from expressing my astonishment, that a doubt should ever have arisen, whether these are the words of Paul, or of Luke the historian. Yet no less a critic than Beza not only suggests this, but vehemently and confidently maintains that they are the words of Paul. His arguments are the following:

1. That *δέ* in v. 5 corresponds to *μέν* in v. 4, and that both these verses must of necessity belong to the words of Paul, for they must be corresponding parts of one and same sentence or declaration.—The answer to this is: (1) That *μέν* on which Beza places so much reliance, is a reading of a suspicious character, and is so marked by Knapp in his New Testament.—(2) *Μέν* is often used absolutely, i. e. alone, or without any *δέ* following it, in an apodosis; e. g. Acts 1: 1. Col. 2: 23. Rom. 1: 8. Heb. 12: 9. Rom. 3: 2. 1 Cor. 11: 18. Rom. 11: 13. 2 Cor. 12: 12. 1 Thess. 2: 18. Acts 26: 9. Rom. 7: 12. 10: 1. Acts 28: 22, etc. etc. and 'in the same way in the Septuagint, and the Greek classics also. Beza was too good a schol-

ar not to know this ; but his zeal against the Anabaptists misled him. And even if *μὲν* here be considered as belonging to the protasis of a sentence, and therefore requiring *δέ* to follow it ; yet the *δέ* which usually succeeds the protasis, is not of necessity always expressed. The apodosis, if any is to be supposed, may, in the present case, easily be made out : ‘ John indeed baptized the baptism of repentance, etc. . . . but Jesus in a different way, i. e. with the Holy Ghost.’ In the same way, *μὲν* itself is often omitted in the protasis, while *δέ* stands in the apodosis ; e. g. James 2: 11. 1 Cor. 4: 12. Phil. 1: 18. 1 Pet. 2: 14.—(3) *Ἄ* in v. 5 I take to be simply the usual *continuative* of narration, employed times without number when *μὲν* does not precede it, both in sacred and profane writings ; see Bretschn. Lex. *δέ*. 3.

2. Beza is evidently moved to his criticism, by the doctrine of the Anabaptists of his day, who strenuously insisted on rebaptizing those who had been baptized only in infancy. He seems to be jealous for the honour of John’s baptism, and wishes to make it out, that Jesus, being baptized by John, received in fact the same baptism as that of Christians. But what is all this to the purpose of *philology* ? I might say, What is it to the purpose of theology ? For why should baptism into a mere *preparatory* state for the Messiah’s kingdom, be the same thing as baptism into that kingdom itself ? And what after all can be more probable, than that, of the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost, many had been baptized by John ?

Against all this on the part of Beza, lie some insuperable objections in the text itself of Acts 19: 4—6. If Beza is correct, then, according to v. 5, John baptized *into the name of Christ* ; a statement no where made in the sacred records ; and one which by implication is contradicted, as well by the nature of his baptism, as by the manner of the narration of the sacred writers, and the phraseology respecting John’s baptism which they employ, and which Paul here employs in v. 4. Moreover, if v. 5 contain the words of Paul, and relates to baptism as performed by John, then does it follow of necessity, by v. 6, that Paul was present when John baptized, and that he laid his hands upon John’s disciples, and communicated to them the Holy Ghost. This supposition not only contradicts fact, but is involved in the additional difficulty of contradicting what John’s disciples are here represented as saying in v. 3, viz. ‘ that they had not so much as heard, whether there be any Holy Ghost.’ All

this contradiction, I say, follows from Beza's supposition; for *αὐτοῖς* in v. 6 inevitably relates to the persons who are mentioned in v. 5 as being baptized. The sacred writer says, in terms that are not capable of any ambiguity, that Paul laid his hands on the same persons who were baptized, and communicated to them the Holy Ghost. Of all this Beza has taken no notice.—As to *rebaptizing*; it is one thing to repeat *Christian* baptism, and another to perform this rite where it has never been performed. Being baptized into an *initiatory* dispensation, is not being baptized into one that is established and completed, and to which the first was merely *preparatory*.

In regard to the first question of the missionary Brethren respecting 1 John 5: 7, I have only to say, that there is an overwhelming mass of critical evidence against the genuineness of it, as the state of the matter now is; and yet there are some very singular evidences, that the reading in question was early in the copies of some of the western churches. The path of safety is to insert it, but to include it in brackets, and mark it as probably spurious. More or less than this, the present state of critical knowledge respecting it does not seem to permit us to do.

In regard to my anonymous correspondent, he will see, by the perusal of my disquisition, that I differ widely from his mode of reasoning about *external* rites. My mode is thus: What is external merely, never can be essential to a religion which is truly spiritual. But, so far as external rites belong to the *costume* of religion, they are valuable only for the instruction which they convey, i. e. the symbols which they present and which are significant of important truth. No mystical power of *opus operatum* can be allowed by true Protestants. But an *external* rite, to all intents and purposes of any possible consequence, is *essentially* preserved or performed, *when its significance is essentially kept up*. This is done by immersion, affusion, or sprinkling of water in baptism. The Old Testament and the New stamp all these methods with an indelible impression of genuineness as to such significancy. What God has thus sanctioned, let us not seem to make light of.

My belief is, that we *do obey* the command to baptize, when we do it by affusion or sprinkling; that the mere *mode* of applying water cannot possibly make any difference in the case; that he who maintains the contrary, if consistent with himself, should go over to the *opus operatum* of the Roman Catholics;

that on such excessive attachment to the mere externals of religion, are justly chargeable the divisions and feuds of Christians in relation to the mode of baptism; and that the church never can have peace, until men will cease from the spirit of contention about matters of *costume* in religion, and leave every one to his own choice in this respect. My correspondent will of course see, that I accede to no part of his arguments. I verily believe them to be founded in altogether erroneous views of the nature and value of external rites; and have no apprehension, that if I am so happy as ever to attain to a place among the blessed of another world, I shall lose any part of the honour or glory of that world, because I have fully believed and taught here, that **GOD IS A SPIRIT**, and *that those who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth*; and have resisted all efforts to lead men to trust in the *manner* of any external ordinances. "Circumcision is nothing; and uncircumcision is nothing." "The letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive." A view such as my correspondent has, ought to carry him, as it did Constantine, to a belief, that he can be lawfully baptized only in the Jordan, because Jesus was there baptized. How can consistency stop short of this?

Has my concealed friend never read in 2 Chron 30: 18—20, that, when the great multitude of Israel assembled at Jerusalem, according to the invitation of King Hezekiah, in order to keep the feast of the passover, "many in the congregation were not sanctified," i. e. were not clean according to the requisitions of the Levitical law; moreover, that "a multitude of people . . . who had not cleansed themselves, did eat of the passover otherwise than was written?" And what did this good king in respect to them? Did he excommunicate them, or refuse to keep the passover with them? Neither; but "he prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary!" And what was the result? Did such a prayer come up before the throne of mercy with acceptance? It did; "the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people."

And is not this fraught with instruction, as to the real value which the Bible sets upon *externals*? It does seem to me to be so; and I wish my brethren who bar up their communion-table against all who have not been immersed, might study such passages with more attention. That distinguished man among

them, whose sun has recently gone down, although its beams still illuminate the whole horizon, studied and felt the power of such an example as Hezekiah set. *The love of Christ*, was a passport to communion at his table, and to the fraternal confidence of his benevolent heart. Blessings will rest, as I believe, on the head of those magnanimous brethren of his denomination, who follow his example of Christian liberality. It is indeed a serious responsibility that we take upon ourselves, when we say, in the midst of all the light which the nineteenth century sheds around us, 'I allow you to be a true disciple of Jesus; I hope and believe you have been born of the Spirit; but I cannot sit down with you at the feast of Jesus' dying love, because water has not been applied to you in the same manner as it has to me.' Thus did not Hezekiah; and thus, those who resemble him in the temper of their souls, I must hope and believe, will not much longer do. It is too late. The Spirit will triumph at last over the flesh; the love of God, and of fellow Christians redeemed by a Saviour's blood, will burst asunder the manacles of rites and forms, and dispel the charms of sectarian persuasives; and there will yet be, in our American churches, "one Lord, and one faith,;" yea, and "one baptism" also, inasmuch as variety of mode will no longer be regarded as infringing upon the unity of this rite. Yes, those who have been sprinkled by Jesus' blood, and sanctified by his Spirit, will yet be *one* in him, as he prayed they might be, in his last fervent supplication for them. The Lord hasten these blessed things in their time!

My correspondent will forgive me for speaking thus freely. The occasion demands it. Those who are ready to break the church in pieces, by contending for rites and forms, seem to me not well entitled to take the position, that others are chargeable with this, who will not succumb to such doctrines. For one, I believe that the liberty of Christ entitles us to be free from a spirit of zeal for externals; nor do I think it probable, that the churches in general will ever be entangled again in such a yoke of bondage.

ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES.

I. GeseNII *Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Lips. 1833. 8vo. pp. 1124. This long expected Manual has at length appeared, and been received for sale by the Publishers of this work. The general character of this new lexicon of Gesenius, has been already described in this work; see Vol. I. p. 187. The third edition of his Hebrew and German lexicon lies at the basis; but the work has been much enlarged in consequence of new investigations. It contains about 100 pages more than the preceding edition. The introductory Essay on Hebrew Lexicography, is omitted. The following extracts from the Preface, exhibit the chief points of improvement aimed at in the present edition.

“*Primum* quidem in tribus primis alphabeti litteris maioris operis latini, cui Thesauri titulum fecimus, epitomen dedimus ad litterarum ordinem digestam: in reliqua libri parte raro in verbis germanicis latine reddendis acquievimus, sed alia auximus et virorum doctorum magis quam tironum usibus accommodavimus, alia plane de integro retractavimus, saepe etiam commentarios copiosiores in usum Thesauri elaboratos inseruimus paucioribus verbis comprehensos, omissis quae ab hoc instituto aliena viderentur. *Deinde*, quod editione tertia coeperam, ut radicum hebraearum internam et nativam potestatem, ex qua reliquae translatae tanquam ex fonte profluxerunt, quoad eius fieri posset, penitus indagarem, id strenue persecutus sum magna cum voluptate in eo nunc ingenium exercens.—Neque mediocrem in hac opera fructum attulit radicum indogermanicarum (sanscritae, persicae, graecae, latinae, gothicae, et quae his finitimae sunt) comparatio, quarum cum *radicibus semiticis* (ut magna fuerit *grammaticae rationis* diversitas) necessitudinem nunc indies magis agnoscunt quicunque ex scholarum hebraearum graecarumque umbra ad totius Asiae linguas illustrandas evolarunt, quamque multo latius patere, quam vulgo creditur, etiam hoc nostro libro ostendisse nobis videmur. *Tum* assiduam curam impendi variis vocabulorum significationibus (sunt autem, quibus permagna est significatum varietas) de novo digerendis, prout vel linguae latinae rationes postulabant, vel dialectica quaedam in dispescendis notionibus subtilitas, quam in prima huius libri descriptione minus curaveram, frequentiorum notiorumque vocabulorum significationes constituisse, collegisse, exemplis firmasse, et populari quodam naturalique modo descripsisse satishabens,

in rariorum incertorumque vera potestate exploranda atque in erroribus a vitis eliminandis praecipuam fere laudem ponens.—*Denique*, quem iam editione tertia accuratius et copiosius tractaveram, locum de particulis (et pronominiibus), eum pro huius libri modulo auxi et emendavi."

II. The following works are also announced as published.

1. FREYTAG, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*. Tom. II. Sect. 1. Halle 1832.—Price of the whole work in 3 Parts, 20 rth. = \$15.

2. KÖSTER, F. B. *Das Buch Hiob und der Prediger Salomo's nach ihrer strophischen Anordnung übersetzt. Nebst Abhandlungen über den strophischen Charakter dieser Bücher*. Schleswig, 1832. [See *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. I. p. 611.]

3. OLSHAUSEN, H. *Nachweis der Echtheit sämmtlicher Schriften des Neuen Testaments, für gebildete Leser aller Stände*. Hamb. 1832. 8 vo. pp. 184.

4. SCHNECKENBURGER, *Annotatio ad Epist. Jacobi perpetua, cum brevi Tractatione Isagogica*. Stuttg. 1832. 8vo. pp. 160.

5. ——— Beiträge zur Einleitung ins N. Test. u. zur Erklärung seiner schwierigen Stellen. *ibid.* 8vo. pp. 240.

6. SCHOTT, H. A. *Erörterungen einiger wichtigen chronologischen Punkte in der Lebensgeschichte des Apostel Paulus*. Jena 1832. 8vo. pp. 184.

7. STEIGER, W. *Der erste Brief Petri, mit Berücksichtigung des ganzen biblischen Lehrbegriffs ausgelegt*. Berlin 1832. 8vo. pp. 436. Price 1½ rth. = \$1. 12½.

8. THILO, L. C. *Codex Apocryphus Novi Test. e libris editis et manuscriptis etc. collectus, recensitus, notisque et prolegomenis illustratus*. Tom. I. Lips. 1832. Price 4½ rth. = \$3.37½.

9. THOLUCK, *Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des Neuen Testaments*. Halle 1832. 8vo. pp. 172. Price ¾ rth. = 50 cts.

10. TITTMANN, J. A. H. *De Synonymis in Novo Testamento Libri II. Post mortem auctoris edidit, alia ejusdem Opuscula exeget. argumenti adjecit Guil. Becher*. Lips. 1832. 8vo. pp. 88. Price ½ rth. = 37½ cts.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. XI.

JULY, 1833.

**ART. I. SKETCHES OF IDUMEA AND ITS PRESENT
INHABITANTS.**

From the Travels of Burckhardt and Legh.

With an Historical Introduction.

By the Editor.

SECOND ARTICLE.

IN the preceding number of this work, the Editor has attempted to give a connected Sketch of the History and Geography of ancient Idumea, so far as the facts and circumstances are to be gathered from the notices of ancient writers, both sacred and profane. This sketch was meant to be merely introductory to the modern accounts of Burckhardt and Legh respecting the same tract of country and its inhabitants; in the belief that the ancient notices would serve to elucidate and give interest to these accounts; while the latter could not fail to throw light upon what was defective and dark in the former. The article in the present number is from Burckhardt; and is everywhere accompanied with the necessary notes and references to the ancient parallel notices.

Burckhardt, it is well known, was employed by the African Institution; and his ultimate destination was, to explore the interior of Africa. It was however a prudent course, to spend some years at first in Syria, and there become familiar with

the language and customs of the East, in order that he might afterwards travel in Africa with more facility as an Oriental Mussulman. He went in 1809 to Syria, where he remained two years and a half, chiefly at Aleppo and Damascus, making during that period, several excursions to Mount Lebanon, the Haouran, etc. In 1812 he proceeded to Egypt, travelling every where as a native Arab, an inhabitant of Damascus. His route was through the northern part of Palestine, and then along the Jordan and east of the Dead sea, through the ancient Arabia Petraea or Edom, as far as Wady Mousa; whence he struck directly across the western desert to Egypt. It is from his account of this journey, that the following extracts are taken. Burckhardt afterwards ascended the Nile almost to Dongola; made a pilgrimage to Mecca; visited Mount Sinai in 1816; and was just ready for his departure into the interior of Africa, when he was suddenly arrested by death in 1817. As a traveller, his character is of the highest rank. He accomplished very much; but it must still be remembered, that what he thus accomplished was only by way of preparation for the great object to which he had devoted his life.

The following extracts are taken from Burckhardt's "Travels in Syria and the Holy Land," 4to. Lond. 1822. p. 377—443.—Burckhardt reached Kerek with his guide, July 15, 1812.

EDITOR.

II. SKETCHES ETC. FROM BURCKHARDT.

I hesitated where I should alight at Kerek, and whether I should announce myself as a Turk or a Christian, for I knew that the success of my progress southward depended upon the good will of the people of this place. I had a letter of recommendation to the Sheikh of the town, given to me by a Turkish gentleman of Damascus, whose wife was a native of Kerek, and he had mentioned me in such terms as led me to anticipate a good reception; but as I knew that I should be much harassed by inquisitive visitors, were I to take up my lodgings at the Sheikh's house, I determined to alight at some Christian's, and then consult upon my future proceeding with the Greek priest, whom I knew by report. I no sooner entered the north gate of the town, where is the quarter of the Christians, than I was sur-

rounded by several of these hospitable people, who took hold of the bridle of my horse, every one insisting upon my repairing to his dwelling; I followed one, and the whole neighbourhood was soon assembled, to partake of the sheep that was slaughtered in honour of my arrival; still no one had asked me who I was, or whither I was going. After some conversation with the priest, I thought it expedient to pay a visit of ceremony to the Sheikh, in order to deliver my letter. I soon however had reason to repent: he received me very politely; but when he heard of my intention of proceeding southward, he told me that he could not allow of my going forward with one guide only, and that as he was preparing to visit the southern district himself, in a few days, I should wait for him or his people to conduct me. His secretary then informed me, that it was expected I should make some present to the Sheikh, and pay him, besides, the sum which I must have given for a guide. The present I flatly refused to make, saying that it was rather the Sheikh's duty to make a present to the guest recommended to him by such a person as my Damascene friend was. With respect to the second demand, I answered that I had no more money with me than was absolutely necessary for my journey. Our negotiations on this point lasted for several days; when seeing that I could obtain no guide without an order from the Sheikh, I at last agreed to pay fifteen piastres for his company as far as Djebel Sherah. If I had shewn a disposition to pay this sum immediately, every body would have thought that I had plenty of money, and more considerable sums would have been extorted; in every part of Turkey it is a prudent rule not to grant the Turks their demands immediately, because they soon return to the charge. Had I not shewn my letter to the Sheikh, I should have procured a guide with little trouble; I should have had it in my power to see the borders of the Dead sea, and should have been enabled to depart sooner; but having once made my agreement with him, I was obliged to wait for his departure, which was put off from day to day, and thus I was prevented from going to any distance from the town, from the fear of being left behind. I remained therefore at Kerek for twenty successive days, changing my lodgings almost every day, in order to comply with the pressing invitations of its hospitable inhabitants.

The town of Kerek, a common name in Syria, is built upon the top of a steep hill, surrounded on all sides by a deep and

narrow valley, the mountains beyond which command the town. In the valley, on the west and north sides, are several copious springs, on the borders of which the inhabitants cultivate some vegetables, and considerable plantations of olive trees. The principal of these sources are, Ain Sara, which issues from the rock in a very romantic spot, where a mosque has been built, now in ruins; this rivulet turns three mills. The other sources are Ain Szafszaf, Ain Kobeysha, and Ain Frandjy, or the European spring, in the rock near which, as some persons told me, is an inscription in Frank characters, but no one ever would, or could, shew it me.

The town is surrounded by a wall, which has fallen down in several places; it is defended by six or seven large towers, of which the northern is almost perfect, and has a long Arabic inscription on its wall, but too high to be legible from the ground; on each side of the inscription is a lion in bas-relief, similar to those seen on the walls of Aleppo and Damascus. The town had originally only two entrances, one to the south and the other to the north; they are dark passages, forty paces in length, cut through the rock. An inscription on the northern gate ascribes its formation to Sultan Seyfeddin. Besides these two gates, two other entrances have been formed, leading over the ruins of the town wall. At the west end of the town stands a castle, on the edge of a deep precipice over the Wady Kobeysha. It is built in the style of most of the Syrian castles, with thick walls and parapets, large arched apartments, dark passages with loopholes, and subterraneous vaults; and it probably owes its origin, like most of these castles, to the prudent system of defence adopted by the Saracens against the Franks during the Crusades. In a large Gothic hall are the remains of paintings in fresco, but so much defaced that nothing can be clearly distinguished. Kerek having been for some time in the hands of the Franks, this hall may have been built at that time for a church, and decorated with paintings.*

Kerek is inhabited by about four hundred Turkish, and one hundred and fifty Christian families; the former can furnish upwards of eight hundred firelocks, the latter about two hundred and fifty. The Turks are composed of settlers from all parts of southern Syria, but principally from the mountains about

* See the *Histor. Introd.* above, p. 270, 285.

Hebron and Nablous. The Christians are, for the greater part, descendants of refugees from Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Beit Djade. They are free from all exactions, and enjoy the same rights with the Turks.

The Christians of Kerek are renowned for their courage, and more especially so, since an action which lately took place between them and the Rowalla, a tribe of Aeneze. A party of the latter had on a Sunday, when the men were absent, robbed the Christian encampment, which was at about an hour from the town, of all its cattle. On the first alarm given by the women, twenty-seven young men immediately pursued the enemy, whom they overtook at a short distance, and had the courage to attack, though upwards of four hundred men mounted on camels, and many of them armed with firelocks. After a battle of two hours the Rowalla gave way, with the loss of forty-three killed, a great many wounded, and one hundred and twenty camels, together with the whole booty which they had carried off. The Christians had only four men killed. To account for the success of this heroic enterprise, I must mention that the people of Kerek are excellent marksmen; there is not a boy among them who does not know how to use a firelock by the time he is ten years of age.

The Sheikh of Kerek has no greater authority over his people than a Bedouin Sheikh has over his tribe. In every thing which regards the Bedouins, he governs with the advice of the most respectable individuals of the town; and his power is not absolute enough to deprive the meanest of his subjects of the smallest part of his property. Latterly his influence has been sustained chiefly by the Christians, the Turks being jealous of the great personal reputation he has acquired among the Bedouins.

These Bedouins are divided into different tribes, of which the Dhamour and Beni Neym are the most numerous. Each tribe has its Sheikh, who consults with the chief Sheikh in affairs of consequence. The Christians of Kerek have also two individuals whom they style their Sheikhs, and who, in conjunction with the priest, are the directors of the affairs of their community.

Four years since, the people of Kerek became Wahabis, but they have never yet paid full tribute to Ibn Saoud; and it seems that the latter knows enough of politics not to try to enforce what

he is very doubtful of obtaining by such means. He is apparently upon very good terms with the Sheikh of Kerek, and even sent him considerable presents last year, for having collected from the southern Arabs eighty dollars, due to him by these Arabs. Ibn Saoud has also conferred on him the title of Emir of all the Bedouins to the south of Damascus, as far as the Red sea; and is unceasingly exhorting him to make war upon the infidel Turks; he has likewise written to the Christians, to exhort them to pay him their capitation tax, but hitherto without effect. A few days before my arrival at Kerek two Wahabi tax-gatherers arrived from Medina, where Ibn Saoud then was, but they departed without obtaining a single piastre. During their stay, however, tobacco was banished from the stranger's room at the Sheikh's house, in conformity with the religious practices of the Wahabi; and the Turks shewed their adherence to the faith by going regularly to prayers, which very few of them are in the habit of doing, the Sheikh excepted.

The inhabitants of Kerek being thus exempted, by their own strength, from all taxes and impositions, it might be supposed that they are wealthy. This, however, is not the case: the great hospitality that prevails prevents the increase of wealth, and the richest man in the town is not worth more than about £1000 sterling. Their custom of entertaining strangers is much the same as at Szalt. They have eight *Menzels*, or *Medhafs*, for the reception of guests, six of which belonging to the Turks, and two to the Christians: their expenses are not defrayed by a common purse; but whenever a stranger takes up his lodging at one of the *Medhafs*, one of the people present declares that he intends to furnish that day's entertainment, and it is then his duty to provide a dinner or supper, which he sends to the *Medhafs*, and which is always in sufficient quantity for a large company. A goat or a lamb is generally killed on the occasion, and barley for the guest's horse is also furnished. When a stranger enters the town, the people almost come to blows with one another in their eagerness to have him for their guest, and there are Turks who every other day kill a goat for this hospitable purpose. Indeed it is a custom here, even with respect to their own neighbours, that whenever a visitor enters a house, dinner or supper is to be immediately set before him. Their love of entertaining strangers is carried to such a length, that not long ago, when a Christian silversmith, who came from Jerusalem to work for the ladies, and who, being an industrious man, seldom stirred out of

his shop, was on the point of departure after a two months residence, each of the principal families of the town sent him a lamb, saying that it was not just that he should lose his due, though he did not choose to come and dine with them. The more a man expends upon his guests, the greater is his reputation and influence; and the few families who pursue an opposite conduct are despised by all the others.

Kerek is filled with guests every evening; for the Bedouins, knowing that they are here sure of a good supper for themselves and their horses, visit it as often they can; they alight at one Medhase, go the next morning to another, and often visit the whole before they depart. The following remarkable custom furnishes another example of their hospitable manners: it is considered at Kerek an unpardonable meanness to sell butter or to exchange it for any necessary or convenience of life; so that, as the property of the people chiefly consists in cattle, and every family possesses large flocks of goats and sheép, which produce great quantities of butter, they supply this article very liberally to their guests. Besides other modes of consuming butter in their cookery, the most common dish at breakfast or dinner, is Fetyte, a sort of pudding made with sour milk, and a large quantity of butter. There are families who thus consume in the course of a year, upwards of ten quintals of butter. If a man is known to have sold or exchanged this article, his daughters or sisters remain unmarried, for no one would dare to connect himself with the family of a Baya el Samin, or seller of butter, the most insulting epithet that can be applied to a man of Kerek. This custom is peculiar to the place, and unknown to the Bedouins.

The people of Kerek, intermarry with the Bedouins; and the Aeneze even give the Kerekein their girls in marriage. The sum paid to the father of the bride is generally between six and eight hundred piastres; young men without property are obliged to serve the father five or six years, as menial servants, in compensation for the price of the girl.* The Kerekein do not treat their wives so affectionately as the Bedouins; if one of them falls sick, and her sickness is likely to prevent her for some time from taking care of the family affairs, the husband sends her back to her father's house, with a message that "he must cure her;" for, as he says, "I bought a healthy wife of you, and it is not just that I should be at the trouble and expense of curing her." This is a rule with both Mohammedans and Christians.

* Compare the case of Jacob, Gen. 29: 18 sq.

It is not the custom for the husband to buy clothes or articles of dress for his wife; she is, in consequence, obliged to apply to her own family, in order to appear decently in public, or to rob her husband of his wheat and barley, and sell it clandestinely in small quantities; nor does she inherit the smallest trifle of her husband's property. The Kerekein never sleep under the same blanket with their wives; and to be accused of doing so, is considered as great an insult as to be called a coward.

The domestic manners of the Christians of Kerek are the same as those of the Turks; their laws are also the same, excepting those relating to marriage; and in cases of litigation, even amongst themselves, they repair to the tribunal of the Kadhy, or judge of the town, instead of submitting their differences to their own Sheikhs. The Kadhy is elected by the Sheikhs. With respect to their religious duties, they observe them much less than any other Greeks in Syria; few of them frequent the church, alleging, not without reason, that it is of no use to them, because they do not understand one word of the Greek forms of prayer. Neither are they rigid observers of Lent, which is natural enough, as they would be obliged to live almost entirely on dry bread, were they to abstain wholly from animal food. Though so intimately united with the Turks both by common interests and manners, as to be considered the same tribe, yet there exists much jealousy among the adherents of the two religions, which is farther increased by the Sheikh's predilection for the Christians. The Turks seeing that the latter prosper, have devised a curious method of participating in the favours which Providence may bestow on the Christians on account of their religion. Many of them baptize their male children in the church of St. George, and take Christian godfathers for their sons. There is neither Mollah nor fanatic Kadhy to prevent this practice, and the Greek priest, who is handsomely paid for baptizing, reconciles his conscientious scruples by the hope that the boy so baptized may perhaps die a Christian; added to this, he does not give the child entire baptism, but dips the hands and feet only in the water, while the Christian child receives total immersion, and this pious fraud sets all his doubts at rest as to the legality of the act. The priests pretend nevertheless that such is the efficacy of the baptism, that these baptized Turks have never been known to die otherwise than by old age.

Kerek is the see of a Greek bishop, who generally resides at Jerusalem. The diocese is called *Battra* in Arabic, and *Πέτρας* in Greek; and it is the general opinion among the clergy of

Jerusalem, that Kerek is the ancient *Petra*; but it will be seen in the sequel of this journal that there is good reason to think they are mistaken; Kerek therefore is probably the *Charax Omanorum* of Pliny.* The bishop's revenue is about six pounds sterling per annum; he visits his diocese every five or six years. During my stay, a Greek priest arrived from Jerusalem, to collect for his convent, which had been at a great expense in rebuilding the church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Greeks delivered to him in sheep to the value of about fifteen pounds sterling.

The district of Kerek comprises three other villages, which are under the orders of the Sheikh of Kerek, viz. Ketherabba, Oerak, and Khanzyre. There are besides a great number of ruined places in the district.—Several Wadys descend from the mountains of Kerek into the plain on the shore of the Dead sea, and are there lost, either in the sands or in the fields of the peasants who cultivate the plain, none of them reaching the lake itself in the summer. To the S. of the Modjeb is the Seyl Djerra, and farther south, Wady Beni Hammad. In the valley of this river, perhaps the *Zared* of Scripture, are hot-wells, with some ruined buildings near them, about five hours from Kerek, in a northern direction. Next follow Seyl el Kerek, Wady el Draah, Seyl Assal, perhaps *Assan*, which rises nearer Ketherabba; El Nemeyra, coming from Oerak; Wady Khanzyre, and El Ahsa, a river which divides the territory of Kerek from the district to the S. of it, called El Djebel.

The direction of Jerusalem from Kerek, as pointed out to me several times, is N. by W. The direction of Katrane, a station of the pilgrim caravan to Mekka, is E. S. E. distant about eight hours. That of Szafye, or the S. point of the Dead sea, is W. by S. distant about twelve hours. The Dead sea is here called Bahret Lout, the Sea of Lot.

August 4th.—After having remained nearly three weeks at Kerek, waiting from day to day for the departure of the Sheikh, he at last set out, accompanied by about forty horsemen. The inhabitants of Kerek muster about one hundred horsemen, and have excellent horses; the Sheikh himself possessed the finest horse I had seen in Syria; it was a gray Saklawy, † famous all over the desert.

* See *Histor. Introd.* p. 285.

† This is the Arabic form of the word *Slavic* or *Sclavonic*.—ED.
VOL. III. No. 11.

We descended into the valley of Ain Frandjy, and ascended the mountain on the other side, our road lying nearly S. S. W. In one hour and a half from Kerek we reached the top of the mountain, from whence we had a fine view of the southern extremity of the Dead sea, which presented the appearance of a lake, with many islands or shoals covered with a white saline crust. The water is very shallow for about three hours from its south end. Where narrowest, it may be about six miles across. The mountain which we had passed was a barren rock of flint and chalk. We met with an encampment of Beni Hamyde, where we breakfasted. At the end of two hours and a half we reached, on the descent of the mountain, Ain Terayn, a fine spring, with the ruins of a city near it. The rivulet which takes its rise here joins that of Ketherabba, and descends along a narrow valley into the Ghor, which it reaches near the ruined place called Assal, from which it takes the name of Wady Assal. Near the rivulet are some olive plantations. At two hours and three quarters is Ketherabba, a village with about eighty houses. Many of its inhabitants live under tents pitched in the square open spaces left among the houses of the village. The gardens contain great numbers of large fig trees. The mountains in the neighbourhood are cultivated in some parts by the Beni Ammer. The village of Szafye in the Ghor bears from hence W.

August 5th.—We left Ketherabba early in the morning. Our road lay through a wild and entirely barren rocky country, ascending and descending several Wadys. In one hour and a quarter we came to Oerak, a village of the same size as the former, very picturesquely situated; it is built at the foot of a high perpendicular cliff, down which a rivulet rushes into the Wady below. Many immense fragments have separated from the cliff, and fallen down; and amongst these rocks the houses of the village are built. Its inhabitants cultivate, besides wheat, barley, and dhourra,* olives, figs, and tobacco, which they sell to advantage. We rested here the greater part of the day, under a large Kharnoub tree.† Our Sheikh had no pressing business,

* *Dhourra* or *Durra* is a small species of maize, or *Turkish wheat* as it is sometimes called, the *Holcus* of the ancients. The lower class of Arabs scarcely taste of any other than dhourra-bread. Niebuhr Beschir. von Arabien, pp. 150, 155.—Ed.

† *Kharnoub*, i. e. carob-tree, the *Ceratonia Siliqua* of Linn. from

but like all Arabs, fond of idleness, and of living well at other people's expense, he by no means hastened his journey, but easily found a pretext for stopping; wherever we alighted a couple of sheep or goats were immediately killed, and the best fruits, together with plenty of tobacco, were presented to us. Our company increased at every village, as all those Arabs who had horses followed us, in order to partake of our good fare, so that our party amounted at last to eighty men. At two hours and a quarter is a fine spring; two hours and a half, the village Khanzyre, which is larger than Oerak and Ketherabba. Here we stopped a whole day, our Sheikh having a house in the village, and a wife, whom he dared not carry to Kerek, having another family there. In the evening he held a court of justice, as he had done at Ketherabba, and decided a number of disputes between the peasants; the greater part of these were concerning money transactions between husbands and the families of their wives; or related to the mixed property of the Arabs in mares, in consequence of the Bedouin custom of selling only one-half, or one-third of those animals.

August 6th.—Khanzyre is built on the declivity of one of the highest mountains on the eastern side of the Dead sea; in its neighbourhood are a number of springs whose united waters form a rivulet which irrigates the fields belonging to the village, and an extensive tract of gardens. The villages of this country are each governed by its own Sheikh, and the peasants are little better than Bedouins; their manners, dress, and mode of living are exactly the same. In the harvest time they live in the mountains under tents, and their cattle are entrusted during the whole year to a small encampment of their own shepherds. In the afternoon of this day we were alarmed by loud cries in the direction of the opposite mountain. The whole of our party immediately mounted, and I also followed. On reaching the spot from whence the cries came, we found two shepherds of Khanzyre quite naked; they had been stripped by a party of the Arabs Terabein, who live in the mountains of Hebron, and each of the robbers had carried off a fat sheep upon his mare. They were now too far off to be overtaken; and our people, not being able to engage the enemy, amused themselves with a sham-fight in

which are produced the *κράτια*, *carob-beans*, of Luke 15: 16. Eng' Tr. *husks*. See Freytag's *Lex. Arab.* Art. *خرب* Calmet's *Dict.* Bost. 1832, Art. *HUSKS*.—ED.

their return home. They displayed superior strength and agility in handling the lance, and great boldness in riding at full speed over rugged and rocky ground. In the exercise with the lance the rider endeavours to put the point of it upon the shoulder of his adversary, thus showing that his life is in his power. When the parties become heated, they often bear off upon their lances the turbans of their adversaries, and carry them about with insolent vociferation. Our Sheikh of Kerek, a man of sixty, far excelled all his people in these youthful exercises; indeed he seemed to be an accomplished Bedouin Sheikh; though he proved to be a treacherous friend to me. As I thought that I had settled matters with him to his entire satisfaction, I was not a little astonished, when he took me aside in the evening to announce to me, that unless he received twenty piastres more, he would not take charge of me any farther. Although I knew it was not in his power to hinder me from following him, and that he could not proceed to violence without entirely losing his reputation among the Arabs, for ill-treating his guest, yet I had acquired sufficient knowledge of the Sheikh's character to be persuaded that if I did not acquiesce in his demand, he would devise some means to get me into a situation which it would have perhaps cost me double the sum to escape from; I therefore began to bargain with him; and brought him down to fifteen piastres. I then endeavoured to bind him by the most solemn oath used by the Bedouins; laying his hand upon the head of his little boy, and on the fore feet of his mare, he swore that he would, for that sum conduct me himself, or cause me to be conducted, to the Arabs Howeytat, from whence I might hope to find a mode of proceeding in safety to Egypt. My precautions, however, were all in vain. Being satisfied that my cash was reduced to a few piastres, he began his plans for stripping me of every other part of my property which had excited his wishes. The day after his oath, when we were about to depart from Ayme, he addressed me in the presence of the whole company, saying that his saddle would fit my horse better than my own did, and that he would therefore change saddles with me. Mine was worth nearly forty piastres, his was not worth more than ten. I objected to the exchange, pretending that I was not accustomed to ride upon the low Bedouin saddle; he replied, by assuring me that I should soon find it much more agreeable than the town saddle; moreover, said he, you may depend upon it that the Sheikh of the Howeytat will take your saddle from

you, if you do not give it to me. I did not dare to put the Sheikh in mind of his oath, for had I betrayed to the company his having extorted from me so much, merely for the sake of his company, he would certainly have been severely reprimanded by the Bedouins present, and I should thus have exposed myself to the effects of his revenge. All the bye-standers at the same time pressed me to comply with his request: "Is he not your brother?" said they. "Are not the best morsels of his dish always for you? Does he not continually fill your pipe with his own tobacco? Fie upon your stinginess." But they did not know that I had calculated upon paying part of the hire of a guide to Egypt with the value of the saddle, nor that I had already handsomely paid for my brotherhood. I at last reluctantly complied; but the Sheikh was not yet satisfied; the stirrups he had given me, although much inferior to those he had taken from me, were too good in his eyes, to form part of my equipment. In the evening his son came to me to propose an exchange of these stirrups against a pair of his own almost unfit for use, and which I knew would wound my ankles, as I did not wear boots; but it was in vain to resist. The pressing intreaties of all my companions in favour of the Sheikh's son lasted for two whole days; until tired at length with their importunity, I yielded, and, as I had expected, my feet were soon wounded.* I have entered into these details in order to shew what Arab cupidity is; an article of dress, or of equipment, which the poorest townsman would be ashamed to wear, is still a covetable object with the Bedouins; they set no bounds to their demands; delicacy is unknown amongst them, nor have they any word to express it; if indeed one persists in refusing, they never take the thing by force; but it is extremely difficult to resist their eternal supplications and compliments without yielding at last. With regard to my behaviour towards the Bedouins, I always endeavoured, by every possible means, to be upon good terms with my companions, whoever they were, and I seldom failed in my endeavours. I found, by experience, that putting on a grave face, and talking

* Mr Legh and his companions travelled under the guidance of this same Sheikh, and describe his character in not dissimilar terms; though of course he might be expected to wear a different exterior towards Englishmen travelling with authority, from what he had exhibited towards Burckhardt, apparently a poor Arab townsman.—Ed.

wisely among them, was little calculated to further the traveller's views. On the contrary, I aspired to the title of a merry fellow; I joked with them whenever I could, and found that by a little attention to their ways of thinking and reasoning, they are easily put into good humour. This kind of behaviour, however, is to be observed only in places where one makes a stay of several days, or towards fellow travellers; in passing rapidly through Arab encampments, it is better for the traveller not to be too talkative in the tents where he alights, but to put on a stern countenance.

We left Khanzyre late in the evening, that we might enjoy the coolness of the night air. We ascended for a short time, and then began to descend into the valley called Wady el Ahsa. It had now become dark, and this was, without exception, the most dangerous route I ever travelled in my life. The descent is steep, and there is no regular road over the smooth rocks, where the foot slips at every step. We had missed our way, and were obliged to alight from our horses, after many of us had suffered severe falls. Our Sheikh was the only horseman who would not alight from his mare, whose step, he declared, was as secure as his own. After a march of two hours and a half, we halted upon a narrow plain, on the declivity of the Wady, called El Derredje, where we lighted a fire, and remained till day-break.

August 7th.—In three quarters of an hour from Derrédje, we reached the bottom of the valley. The Wady el Ahsa, which takes its rise near the castle El Ahsa, or El Hassa, on the Syrian Hadj road, runs here in a deep and narrow bed of rocks, the banks of which are overgrown with *Defle*.* There was more water in the rivulet than in any of those I had passed south of Zerka; the water was quite tepid, caused by a hot spring, which empties itself into the Ahsa from a side valley higher up the Wady. This forms the third hot spring on the east of the Dead sea, one being in the Wady Zerka Mayn, and another in the Wady Hammad. The valley El Ahsa divides the district of Kerek from that of *Djebal*, (Plur. of *Djebel*), the ancient *Gebalene*.† In the Ghor the river changes its name into

* The *Defle* or *Defla* is the *Oleander* or *Rose-bay*, *Nerium Oleander* of Linn.—Ed.

† See Hist. Introd. above p. 249, 271.

that of Kerahy, and is likewise called Szafye. This name is found in all the maps of Arabia Petræa, but the course of the river is not from the south, as there laid down; Djebal also, instead of being laid down at the S. E. extremity of the lake, is improperly placed as beginning on the S. W. of it. The rock of the Wady el Ahsa is chiefly sand-stone, which is seldom met with to the N. of this valley; but it is very common in the southern mountains.*

We ascended the southern side of the valley, which is less steep and rocky than the northern, and in an hour and a half reached a fine spring called El Kaszrein, surrounded by verdant ground and tall reeds. The Bedouins of the tribe of Beni Naym here cultivate some dhourra fields, and there are some remains of ancient habitations. In two hours and a quarter we arrived at the top of the mountain, where we entered upon an extensive plain, and passed the ruins of an ancient city of considerable extent called El Kerr, perhaps the ancient *Kura*, a bishopric belonging to the diocese of *Rabba Moabitis*;† nothing remains but heaps of stones. The plain, which we crossed in a S. W. by S. direction, consists of a fertile soil, and contains the ruins of several villages. At the end of two hours and three quarters, we descended by a steep road into a Wady, and in three hours reached the village of Ayme, situated upon a narrow plain at the foot of high cliffs. In its neighbourhood are several springs, and wherever these are met with, vegetation readily takes place, even among barren sand-rocks. Ayme is no longer in the district of Kerek, its Sheikh being now under the command of the Sheikh of Djebal, whose residence is at Tafyle. One half of the inhabitants live under tents, and every house has a tent pitched upon its terrace, where the people pass the mornings and evenings, and sleep. The climate of all these

* "The valley and stream *El Ahsa* is doubtles the same which Legh, under date of May 19, improperly calls *Ellasar*, thinking perhaps of that scriptural name; while by another unpardonable error, he calls the same stream (May 13), where it falls into the Dead sea, *Naher el Hossan*, or *Horse river*. Scetzen names it *Wady el Hossa*. But the orthography of Burckhardt is alone correct. Abulf. Arabia ed. Gagn. p. 47. Rommel p. 91.—This stream is not improbably the brook of willows, Is. 15: 7, which was the southern border between Moab and Edom." GESEN. Notes to Burckh. p. 1066.—Ed.

† See *Histor. Introd.* above, p. 274.

mountains, to the southward of the Belka, is extremely agreeable; the air is pure, and although the heat is very great in summer, and is still further increased by the reflection of the sun's rays from the rocky sides of the mountains, yet the temperature never becomes suffocating, owing to the refreshing breeze which generally prevails. I have seen no part of Syria in which there are so few invalids. The properties of the climate seem to have been well known to the ancients, who gave this district the appellation of *Palestina Tertia, sive Salutaris*.* The winter is very cold; deep snow falls, and the frosts sometimes continue till the middle of March. This severe weather is doubly felt by the inhabitants, as their dress is little fitted to protect them from it. During my stay in Gebalene, we had every morning a fog which did not disperse till mid-day. I could perceive the vapours collecting in the Ghor below, which, after sun-set, was completely enveloped in them. During the night they ascend the sides of the mountains, and in general are not entirely dissipated until near mid-day. From Khanzyre we had the Ghor all the way on our right, about eight or ten hours distant; but, in a straight line, not more than six hours.

August 8th.—At one hour and a quarter from Ayme, route S. by W. we reached Tafyle, built on the declivity of a mountain, at the foot of which is Wady Tafyle. This name bears some resemblance to that of *Phanon* or *Phynon*, which, according to Eusebius, was situated between Petra and Zoara.* Tafyle contains about six hundred houses; its Sheikh is the nominal chief of Djebal, but in reality the Arabs Howeytat govern the whole district, and their Sheikh has lately constructed a small castle at Tafyle at his own expense. Numerous springs and rivulets (ninety-nine according to the Arabs), the waters of which unite below and flow into the Ghor, render the vicinity of this town very agreeable. It is surrounded by large plantations of fruit trees; apples, apricots, figs, pomegranates, and olive and peach trees of a large species are cultivated in great numbers. The fruit is chiefly consumed by the inhabitants and their guests, or exchanged with the Bedouin women for butter; the figs are dried and pressed together in large lumps, and are thus exported to Ghaza, two long days journey from hence.

The inhabitants of Djebal are not so independent as the Kere-

* See *Histor. Introd.* above, p. 268.

† *Ibid.* p. 274.

kein, because they have not been able to inspire the neighbouring Bedouins with a dread of their name. They pay a regular tribute to the Beni Hadjaya, to the Szaley, but chiefly to the Howeytat, who often exact also extraordinary donations. Wars frequently happen between the people of Djebel and of Kerek, principally on account of persons who having committed some offence, fly from one town to seek an asylum in the other. At the time of my visit a coolness had existed between the two districts for several months, on account of a man of Tafyle, who having eloped with the wife of another, had taken refuge at Kerek; and one of the principal reasons which had induced our Sheikh to undertake this journey, was the hope of being able to bring the affair to an amicable termination. Hence we were obliged to remain three days at Tafyle, tumultuous assemblies were held daily upon the subject, and the meanest Arab might give his opinion, though in direct opposition to that of his Sheikh. The father of the young man who had eloped, had come with us from Kerek; for the whole family had been obliged to fly, the Bedouin laws entitling an injured husband to kill any of the offender's relations, in retaliation for the loss of his wife. The husband began by demanding from the young man's father two wives in return for the one carried off, and the greater part of the property which the emigrant family possessed in Tafyle. The father of the wife and her first cousin also made demands of compensation, for the insult which their family had received by her elopement. Our Sheikh, however, by his eloquence and address, at last got the better of them all: indeed it must in justice be said that Youssef Medjaly was not more superior to the other mountaineers in the strength of his arm, and the excellence of his horsemanship, than he was by his natural talents. The affair was settled by the offender's father placing his four infant daughters, the youngest of whom was not yet weaned, at the disposal of the husband and his father-in-law, who might betroth them to whomsoever they chose, and receive themselves the money which is usually paid for girls. The four daughters were estimated at about three thousand piastres, and both parties seemed to be content. In testimony of peace being concluded between the two families, and of the price of blood being paid, the young man's father, who had not yet shewn himself publicly, came to shake hands with the injured husband, a white flag was suspended at the top of the tent in which we sat, a sheep

was killed, and we passed the whole night in feasting and conversation.

The women of Tafyle are much more shy before strangers than those of Kerek. The latter never, or at least very seldom, veil themselves, and they discourse freely with all strangers; the former, on the contrary, imitate the city ladies in their pride, and reserved manners. The inhabitants of Tafyle, who are of the tribe of Djowabere, supply the Syrian Hadj with a great quantity of provisions, which they sell to the caravan at the castle El Ahsa; and the profits which they derive from this trade are sometimes very great. It is much to be doubted whether the peasants of Djebal and Shera will be able to continue their field-labour, if the Syrian pilgrim caravan be not soon re-established.* The produce of their soil hardly enables them to pay their heavy tribute to the Bedouins, besides feeding the strangers who alight at their Menzels; for all the villages in this part of the country treat their guests in the manner, which has already been described. The people of Djebal sell their wool, butter, and hides at Ghaza, where they buy all the little luxuries which they stand in need of; there are, besides, in every village, a few shopkeepers from El Khalyl or Hebron, who make large profits. The people of Hebron have the reputation of being enterprising merchants, and not so dishonest as their neighbours of Palestine; their pedlars penetrate far into the desert of Arabia, and a few of them remain the whole year round at Khaibar in the Nedjed.

The fields of Tafyle are frequented by immense numbers of crows; the eagle Rakhm is very common in the mountains, as are also wild boars. In all the Wadys south of the Modjeb, and particularly in those of Modjeb and El Ahsa, large herds of mountain goats, called by the Arabs Beden, are met with. This is the Steinbock, or Bouquetin of the Swiss and Tyrol Alps: they pasture in flocks of forty or fifty together; great numbers of them are killed by the people of Kerek and Tafyle, who hold their flesh in high estimation. They sell the large knotty horns to the Hebron merchants, who carry them to Jerusalem, where they are worked into handles for knives and daggers. I saw a pair of these horns at Kerek three feet and a half in length.

* While the Wahabis had possession of Mecca and Medina, the Hadj or pilgrim-caravans both of Syria and Egypt, were of necessity discontinued.—ED.

The Arabs told me that it is very difficult to get a shot at them, and that the hunters hide themselves among the reeds on the banks of streams where the animals resort in the evening to drink; they also asserted, that when pursued, they will throw themselves from a height of fifty feet and more upon their heads without receiving any injury.* The same thing is asserted by the hunters in the Alps. In the mountains of Belka, Kerek, Djebal, and Shera, the bird Katta is met with in immense numbers; they fly in such large flocks that the Arab boys often kill two or three at a time, merely by throwing a stick amongst them. Their eggs, which they lay on the rocky ground, are collected by the Arabs. It is not improbable that this bird is the Seloua, or quail, of the children of Israel.†

The peasants of Tafyle have but few camels; they till the ground with oxen and cows, and use mules for the transport of their provisions. At half an hour south of Tafyle is the valley of Szolfsehe. From a point above Tafyle the mountains of Dhana (which I shall have occasion to mention hereafter) bore S. S. W.

August 11th.—During our stay at Tafyle we changed our lodgings twice every day, dining at one public house and supping at another. We were well treated, and had every evening a musical party, consisting of Bedouins famous for their performance upon the Rababa, or guitar of the desert, and who knew all the new Bedouin poetry by heart. I here met a man from Aintab, near Aleppo, who hearing me talk of his native town, took a great liking to me, and shewed me every civility.

• We left Tafyle on the morning of the 11th. In one hour we reached a spring, where a party of Beni Szaleyty was encamped. At two hours was a ruined village, with a fine spring, at the head of a Wady. Two hours and three quarters, the village Beszeyra. Our road lay S. W. along the western declivity of the

* See more on the habits of this animal, the *Wild Goat* of the Bible, in Calmet's Dict. 1832, Art. GOAT, p. 461, 462.—ED.

† This bird is a species of partridge, *Tetrao Alkatta*, and is found in large flocks in May and June in every part of Syria. It has been particularly described in Russel's Aleppo, vol. ii. p. 194. [That this is the quail, שֵׁלֻוָּה *selav*, of the Israelites, is hardly probable; since the Arabs still call the European quail by the same name, *seloua*, and they are found in large flocks in the deserts around Sinai. The quail of Europe and Asia is a different species from that found in America.—ED.]

mountains, having the Ghor continually in view. The Wadys which descend the mountains of Djebal south of Tafyle do not reach the lowest part of the plain in the summer, but are lost in the gravelly soil of the valley. Beszeyra is a village of about fifty houses. It stands upon an elevation, on the summit of which a small castle has been built, where the peasants place their provisions in times of hostile invasion. It is a square building of stone, with strong walls. The villages of Beszeyra, Szolfebe, and Dhana are inhabited by descendants of the Beni Hamyde, a part of whom have thus become Fellahein, or cultivators, while the greater number still remain in a nomadic state. Those of Beszeyra lived formerly at Omteda, now a ruined village three or four hours to the north of it. At that time the Arabs Howeytat were at war with the Djowabere, whose Sheikh was an ally of the Hamyde. The Howeytat defeated the Djowabere, and took Tafyle, where they constructed a castle, and established a Sheikh of their own election; they also built, at the same time, the tower of Beszeyra. The Hamyde of Omteda then emigrated to this place, which appears to have been, in ancient times, a considerable city, if we may judge from the ruins which surround the village. It was probably the ancient *Psora*, a bishopric of *Palæstine Tertia*.* The women of Beszeyra were the first whom I saw wearing the Berkoa, or Egyptian veil, over their faces.

The Sheikh of Kerek had come thus far, in order to settle a dispute concerning a colt which one of the Hamyde of Beszeyra demanded of him. We found here a small encampment of Howeytat Arabs, to one of whom the Sheikh recommended me; he professed to know the man well, and assured me that he was a proper guide. We settled the price of his hire to Cairo, at eighty piastres; and he was to provide me with a camel for myself and baggage. This was the last friendly service of Sheikh Youssef towards me; but I afterwards learnt, that he received for his interest in making the bargain, fifteen piastres from the Arab, who, instead of eighty, would have been content with forty piastres. After the Sheikh had departed on his return, my new guide told me that his camels were at another encampment, one day's distance to the south, and that he had but one with him, which was necessary for the transport of his tent. This avowal was sufficient to make me understand the charac-

* See *Histor. Introd.* p. 274.

ter of the man, but I still relied on the Sheikh's recommendation. In order to settle with the guide, I sold my mare for four goats and for thirty-five piastres worth of corn, a part of which I delivered to him, and I had the remainder ground into flour, for our provision during the journey; he took the goats in payment of his services, and it was agreed that I should give him twenty piastres more on reaching Cairo. I had still about eighty piastres in gold, but kept them carefully concealed in case of some great emergency; for I knew that if I were to shew a single sequin, the Arabs would suppose that I possessed several hundreds, and would either have robbed me of them, or prevented me from proceeding on my journey by the most exorbitant demands.

August 13th.—I remained two days at Beszeyra, and then set out with the family of my guide, consisting of his wife, two children, and a servant girl. We were on foot, and drove before us the loaded camel and a few sheep and goats. Our road ascended; at three quarters of an hour, we came to a spring in the mountain. The rock is here calcareous, with basalt. At two hours and a half was Ain Djedolat, a spring of excellent water; here the mountain is overgrown with short Balout trees.* At the end of two hours and three quarters, direction S. we reached the top of the mountain, which is covered with large blocks of basalt. Here a fine view opened upon us; to our right we had the deep valley of Wady Dhana, with the village of the same name on its S. side; farther west, about four hours from Dhana, we saw the great valley of the Ghor, and towards the E. and S. extended the wide Arabian desert, which the Syrian pilgrims cross in their way to Medina. In three hours and a quarter, after a slight descent, we reached the plain, here consisting of arable ground covered with flints. We passed the ruins of an ancient town or large village, called El Dhahel. The castle of Aanciza, with an insulated hillock near it, a station of the pilgrims, bore S. S. E. distant about five hours; the

* The *quercus ballota* of botanists, or *sweet-acorn oak*, a large and handsome evergreen tree, whose trunk is from twenty to thirty feet high, the wood hard, compact, and very useful. The acorns are cylindrical, one and a half or two inches long and half an inch in diameter, eatable and very palatable, either raw or roasted. See Freytag's *Lex. Arab.* Art. *بل*. Rees' *Cyclop.* Art. QUERCUS, no. 31.—Ed.

town of Maan, S. distant ten or twelve hours; and the castle El Shobak, S. S. W. East of Aaneiza runs a chain of hills called Teloul Djaafar. Proceeding a little farther, we came to the high borders of a broad valley, called El Ghoeyr, (diminutive of El Ghor,) to the S. of Wady Dhana. Looking down into this valley, we saw at a distance a troop of horsemen encamped near a spring; they had espied us, and immediately mounted their horses in pursuit of us. Although several people had joined our little caravan on the road, there was only one armed man amongst us, except myself. The general opinion was that the horsemen belonged to the Beni Szakher, the enemies of the Howeytat, who often make inroads into this district; there was therefore no time to lose; we drove the cattle hastily back, about a quarter of an hour, and hid them, with the women and baggage, behind some rocks near the road, and we then took to our heels towards the village of Dhana, which we reached in about three quarters of an hour, extremely exhausted, for it was about two o'clock in the afternoon and the heat was excessive. In order to run more nimbly over the rocks, I took off my heavy Arab shoes, and thus I was the first to reach the village; but the sharp flints of the mountain wounded my feet so much, that after reposing a little I could hardly stand upon my legs. This was the first time I had ever felt fear during my travels in the desert; for I knew that if I fell in with the Beni Szakher, without any body to protect me, they would certainly kill me, as they did all persons whom they supposed to belong to their inveterate enemy, the Pasha of Damascus, and my appearance was very much that of a Damascene. Our fears however were unfounded; the party that pursued us proved to be Howeytat, who were coming to pay a visit to the Sheikh at Tafyle; the consequence was that two of our companions, who had staid behind, because being inhabitants of Maan, and friends of the Beni Szakher, they conceived themselves secure, were stripped by the pursuers, whose tribe was at war with the people of Maan. Dhana, which I suppose to be the ancient *Thoana*,* is prettily situated, on the declivity of Tor Dhana, the highest mountain of Djebal, and has fine gardens and very extensive tobacco plantations. The Howeytat have built a tower in the village. The inhabitants were now at war with those of Beszeyra, but both parties respect the lives of their enemies, and their hos-

* See *Histor. Introduc.* p. 274.

tile expeditions are directed against the cattle only. Having reposed at Dhana, we returned in the evening to the spot where we had left the women and the baggage, and rested for the night at about a quarter of an hour beyond it.

August 14th.—We skirted, for about an hour, the eastern borders of Wady Ghoeyr, when we descended into the valley, and reached its bottom at the end of three hours and a half, travelling at a slow pace. This Wady divides the district of Djebal from that of Djebel Shera, or the mountains of Shera, which continue southwards towards the Akaba. These are the mountains called in the Scriptures *Mount Seir*, the territory of the Edomites.* The valley of Ghoeyr is a large rocky and uneven basin, considerably lower than the eastern plain, upwards of twelve miles across at its eastern extremity, but narrowing towards the west. It is intersected by numerous Wadys of winter torrents, and by three or four valleys watered by rivulets which unite below and flow into the Ghor. The Ghoeyr is famous for the excellent pasturage produced by its numerous springs, and it has, in consequence, become a favourite place of encampment for all the Bedouins of Djebal and Shera. The borders of the rivulets are overgrown with *Desfe* and the shrub *Rethem*.† The rock is principally calcareous; and there are detached pieces of basalt and large tracts of brescia formed of sand, flint, and pieces of calcareous stone. In the bottom of the valley we passed two rivulets, one of which is called *Seyl Megharye*, where we arrived at the end of a four hours walk, and found some Bedouin women washing their blue gowns, and the wide shirts of their husbands. I had taken the lead of our party, accompanied by my guide's little boy, with whom I reached an encampment, on the southern side of the valley, to which these women belonged. This was the encampment to which my guide belonged, and where he assured me that I should find his camels. I was astonished to see nobody but women in the tents, but was told that the greater part of the men had gone to Ghaza to sell the soap-ashes which these Arabs collect in the

* See however the *Histor.* Introd. p. 252, and note 12.

† "*Rethem*, Heb. רוֹתֵם *rothem*, is the *Genista* or *Spanish broom*, *Spartium junceum* of Linn. which is very common in Palestine, Arabia, Spain, etc." GESEN. Notes to Burckh. p. 1068. In 1 K. 19: 4, 5, and elsewhere in the Bible, the English and most other versions have translated the Hebrew word by *juniper*.—Ed.

mountains of Shera. The ladies being thus left to themselves, had no impediment to the satisfying of their curiosity, which was very great at seeing a townsman, and what was still more extraordinary, a man of Damascus (for so I was called), under their tents. They crowded about me, and were incessant in their inquiries respecting my affairs, the goods I had to sell, the dress of the town ladies, &c. &c. When they found that I had nothing to sell, nor any thing to present to them, they soon retired; they however informed me that my guide had no other camels in his possession than the one we had brought with us, which was already lame. He soon afterwards arrived, and when I began to expostulate with him on his conduct, he assured me that his camel would be able to carry us all the way to Egypt, but begged me to wait a few days longer, until he should be well enough to walk by its side; for, since we left Beszeyra he had been constantly complaining of rheumatic pains in his legs. I saw that all this was done to gain time, and to put me out of patience, in order to cheat me of the wages he had already received; but, as we were to proceed on the following day to another encampment at a few hours distance, I did not choose to say any thing more to him on the subject in a place where I had nobody but women to take my part; hoping to be able to attack him more effectually in the presence of his own tribe's men.

August 15th.—We remained this day at the women's tents, and I amused myself with visiting almost every tent in the encampment, these women being accustomed to receive strangers in the absence of their husbands. The Howeytat Arabs resemble the Egyptians in their features; they are much leaner and taller than the northern Arabs; the skin of many of them is almost black, and their features are much less regular than those of the northern Bedouins, especially the Aeneze. The women are tall and well made, but too lean; and even the handsomest among them are disfigured by broad cheek bones.

The Howeytat occupy the whole of the Shera, as far as Akaba, and south of it to Moyeleh, five days from Akaba, on the Egyptian Hadj road. To the east they encamp as far as Akaba el Shamy, or the Akaba on the Syrian pilgrim route; while the northern Howeytat take up their winter quarters in the Ghor. The strength of their position in these mountains renders them secure from the attacks of the numerous hordes of Bedouins who encamp in the eastern Arabian desert; they are, however, in continual warfare with them, and sometimes under-

take expeditions of twenty days journey, in order to surprise some encampment of their enemies in the plains of the Nedjed. The Beni Szakher are most dreaded by them, on account of their acquaintance with the country, and peace seldom lasts long between the two tribes. The encampment where I spent this day was robbed of all its camels last winter by the Beni Szakher, who drove off, in one morning, upwards of twelve hundred belonging to their enemies. The Howeytat receive considerable sums of money as a tribute from the Egyptian pilgrim caravan; they also levy certain contributions upon the castles on the Syrian Hadj route, situated between Maan and Tebouk, which they consider as forming a part of their territory. They have become the carriers of the Egyptian Hadj, in the same manner as the Aeneze transport with their camels the Syrian pilgrims and their baggage. When at variance with the Pashas of Egypt, the Howeytat have been known to plunder the caravan; a case of this kind happened about ten years ago, when the Hadj was returning from Mekka; the principal booty consisted of several thousand camel loads of Mocha coffee, an article which the pilgrims are in the constant habit of bringing for sale to Cairo; the Bedouins not knowing what to do with so large a quantity, sold the greater part of it at Hebron, Tafyle, and Kerek, and that year happening to be a year of dearth, they gave for every measure of corn an equal measure of coffee. The Howeytat became Wahabis; but they paid tribute only for one year, and have now joined their forces with those of Mohammed Ali, against Ibn Saoud.

August 16th.—We set out for the encampment of the Sheikh of the northern Howeytat, with the tent and family of my guide; who was afraid of leaving them in this place, where he thought himself too much exposed to the incursions of the Beni Szakher. We ascended on foot, through many Wadys of winter torrents, up the southern mountains of the Ghoeyr; we passed several springs, and the ruined place Szyhhan, and at the end of three hours walk arrived at a large encampment of the Howeytat, situated near the summit of the basin of the Ghoeyr. It is usual, when an Arab with his tent reaches an encampment placed in a Douar, or circle, that some of the families strike their tents, and pitch them again in such a way as to widen the circle for the admission of the stranger's tent; but the character of my guide did not appear to be sufficiently respectable to entitle him to this compliment, for not a tent was moved,

and he was obliged to encamp alone out of the circle, in the hope that they would soon break up for some other spot where he might obtain a place in the Douar. These Arabs are much poorer than the Aeneze, and consequently live much worse. Had it not been for the supply of butter which I bought at Beszeyra, I should have had nothing but dry bread to eat; there was not a drop of milk to be got, for at this time of the year the ewes are dry; of camels there was but about half a dozen in the whole encampment.

I here came to an explanation with my guide, who, I saw, was determined to cheat me out of the wages he had already received. I told him that I was tired of his subterfuges, and was resolved to travel with him no longer, and I insisted upon his returning me the goats, or hiring me another guide in his stead. He offered me only one of the goats; after a sharp dispute therefore I arose, took my gun, and swore that I would never re-enter his tent, accompanying my oath with a malediction upon him, and upon those who should receive him into their encampment, for I had been previously informed that he was not a real Howeytat, but of the tribe of Billy, the individuals of which are dispersed over the whole desert. On quitting his tent, I was surrounded by the Bedouins of the encampment, who told me that they had been silent till now, because it was not their affair to interfere between a host and his guest, but that they never would permit a stranger to depart in that way; that I ought to declare myself to be under the Sheikh's protection, who would do me justice. This being what I had anticipated, I immediately entered the tent of the Sheikh, who happened to be absent; my guide now changed his tone, and began by offering me two goats to settle our differences. In the evening the Sheikh arrived, and after a long debate I got back my four goats, but the wheat which I had received at Beszeyra, as the remaining part of the payment for my mare, was left to the guide. In return for his good offices, the Sheikh begged me to let him have my gun, which was worth about fifteen piastres; I presented it to him, and he acknowledged the favour, by telling me that he knew an honest man in a neighbouring encampment, who had a strong camel, and would be ready to serve me as a guide.

August 18th.—I took a boy to shew me the way to this person, and driving my little flock before us, we reached the encampment, which was about one hour to the westward. The

boy told the Bedouin that I had become the Sheikli's brother; I was therefore well received, and soon formed a favourable opinion of this Arab, who engaged to take me to Cairo for the four goats, which I was to deliver to him now, and twenty piastres (about one pound sterling) to be paid on my arrival in Egypt. This will be considered a very small sum for a journey of nearly four hundred miles; but a Bedouin puts very little value upon time, fatigue, and labour; while I am writing this, many hundred loaded camels, belonging to Bedouins, depart every week from Cairo for Akaba, a journey of ten days, for which they receive twenty-five piastres per camel. Had I been known to be an European, I certainly should not have been able to move without promising at least a thousand piastres to my guide. The excursion of M. Boutin, a French traveller, from Cairo to the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon, a journey of twelve days, undertaken in the summer of 1812, cost for guides only, four thousand piastres.

August 19th.—In the morning I went to the castle of Shobak, where I wished to purchase some provisions. It was distant one hour and a quarter from the encampment, in a S. E. direction. Shobak, also called Kerek el Shobak, perhaps the ancient *Carcaria*,* is the principal place in Djebel Shera; it is situated about one hour to the south of the Ghoeyr, upon the top of a hill in the midst of low mountains, which bears some resemblance to Kerek, but is better adapted for a fortress, as it is not commanded by any higher mountains. At the foot of the hill are two springs, surrounded by gardens and olive plantations. The castle is of Saracen construction, and is one of the largest to the south of Damascus; but it is not so solidly built as the castle of Kerek. The greater part of the wall and several of the bastions and towers are still entire. The ruins of a well built vaulted church are now transformed into a public inn or Medhafa. Upon the architraves of several gates I saw mystical symbols, belonging to the ecclesiastical architecture of the lower empire. In several Arabic inscriptions I distinguished the

* See *Histor. Introd.* p. 274. Shobak is the *Mons Regalis* of the Crusaders; see p. 269, above. Mr Bankes found here, on the architrave of the principal door of the castle, an imperfect Latin inscription, of which he made out so much as to leave no doubt, that it was a work of one of the Frank kings of Jerusalem. Irby and Mangles p. 380. *Mod. Traveller in Arabia*, p. 330. Amer. Edit.—Ed.

name of Melek el Dhaher. Where the hill does not consist of precipitous rock, the surface of the slope is covered with a pavement. Within the area of the castle a party of about one hundred families of the Arabs Mellahein have built their houses or pitched their tents. They cultivate the neighbouring grounds, under the protection of the Howeytat, to whom they pay tribute. The horsemen of the latter who happen to encamp near the castle, call regularly every morning at one of the Medhafes of Shobak, in order to have their mares fed; if the barley is refused, they next day kill one of the sheep belonging to the town.

At one hour and a half north of Shobak, on the side of the Ghoeyr, lies the village of Shkerye. From Shobak the direction of Wady Mousa is S. S. W. Maan bears S. S. E. The mountain over Dhana, N. N. E. To the east of the castle is an encampment of Bedouin peasants, of the tribe of Hababene, who cultivate the ground. As I had no cash in silver, and did not wish to shew my sequins, I was obliged to give in exchange for the provisions which I procured at Shobak my only spare shirt, together with my red cap, and half my turban. The provisions consisted of flour, butter, and dried *leben*, or sour milk mixed with flour and hardened in the sun, which makes a most refreshing drink when dissolved in water. There are several Hebron merchants at Shobak.

August 20th.—I remained in the tent of my new guide, who delayed his departure, in order to obtain from his friends some commissions for Cairo, upon which he might gain a few piastres. In the afternoon of this day we had a shower of rain, with so violent a gust of wind, that all the tents of the encampment were thrown down at the same moment; for the poles are fastened in the ground very carelessly during the summer months.

August 21st.—The whole encampment broke up in the morning, some Bedouins having brought intelligence that a strong party of Beni Szakher had been seen in the district of Djebal. The greater part of the males of the Howeytat, together with their principal Sheikh Ibn Rashyd,* were gone to Egypt, in order to transport the Pasha's army across the desert to Akaba and Yambo; we had therefore no means of defence against these formidable enemies, and were obliged to take refuge in

* This Sheikh proved afterwards the most resolute and efficient protector of Mr Legh and his companions, in their visit to Wady Mousa. See Legh under date of May 23.—Ed.

the neighbourhood of Shobak, where they would not dare attack the encampment. When the Bedouins encamp in small numbers, they choose a spot surrounded by high ground, to prevent their tents from being seen at a distance. The camp is, however, not unfrequently betrayed by the camels which pasture in the vicinity.

In the evening we took our final departure, crossing an uneven plain, covered with flints and the ruins of several villages, and then descended into the Wady Nedjed; the rivulet, whose source is in a large paved basin in the valley, joins that of Shobak. Upon the hills which border this pleasant valley are the ruins of a large town of the same name, of which nothing remains but broken walls and heaps of stones. In one hour and a quarter from our encampment, and about as far from Shobak, we reached the camp of another tribe of Fellahein Bedouins, called Refaya, where we slept. They are people of good property, for which they are indebted to their courage in opposing the extortions of the Howeytat. Here were about sixty tents and one hundred firelocks. Their herds of cows, sheep, and goats are very numerous, but they have few camels. Besides corn fields they have extensive vineyards, and sell great quantities of dried grapes at Ghaza, and to the Syrian pilgrims of the Hadj. They have the reputation of being very daring thieves.

August 22nd.—I was particularly desirous of visiting Wady Mousa, of the antiquities of which I had heard the country people speak in terms of great admiration; and from thence I had hoped to cross the desert in a straight line to Cairo; but my guide was afraid of the hazards of a journey through the desert, and insisted upon my taking the road by Akaba, the ancient *Eziongeber*, at the extremity of the eastern branch of the Red sea, where he said that we might join some caravans, and continue our route towards Egypt. I wished, on the contrary, to avoid Akaba, as I knew that the Pasha of Egypt kept there a numerous garrison to watch the movements of the Wahabi and of his rival the Pasha of Damascus; a person therefore like myself, coming from the latter place, without any papers to shew who I was, or why I had taken that circuitous route, would certainly have roused the suspicions of the officer commanding at Akaba, and the consequences might have been dangerous to me among the savage soldiery of that garrison. The road from Shobak to Akaba, which is tolerably good, and might easily be rendered practicable even to artillery, lies to the E. of Wady

Mousa ; and to have quitted it, out of mere curiosity to see the Wady, would have looked very suspicious in the eyes of the Arabs ; I therefore pretended to have made a vow to slaughter a goat in honour of Haroun (Aaron), whose tomb I knew was situated at the extremity of the valley, and by this stratagem I thought that I should have the means of seeing the valley in my way to the tomb. To this my guide had nothing to oppose ; the dread of drawing upon himself, by resistance, the wrath of Haroun, completely silenced him.

We left the Refaya early in the morning, and travelled over hilly ground. At the end of two hours we reached an encampment of Arabs Saoudye, who are also Fellabein or cultivators, and the strongest of the peasant tribes, though they pay tribute to the Howeytat. Like the Refaya they dry large quantities of grapes. They lay up the produce of their harvest in a kind of fortress called Oerak, not far from their camp, where are a few houses surrounded by a stone wall. They have upwards of one hundred and twenty tents. We breakfasted with the Saoudye, and then pursued the windings of a valley, where I saw many vestiges of former cultivation, and here and there some remains of walls and paved roads, all constructed of flints. The country hereabouts is woody. In three hours and a half we passed a spring, from whence we ascended a mountain, and travelled for some time along its barren summit, in a S. W. direction, when we again descended, and reached Ain Mousa, distant five hours and a half from where we had set out in the morning. Upon the summit of the mountain, near the spot where the road to Wady Mousa diverges from the great road to Akaba, are a number of small heaps of stones, indicating so many sacrifices to Haroun. The Arabs who make vows to slaughter a victim to Haroun, think it sufficient to proceed as far as this place, from whence the dome of the tomb is visible in the distance ; and after killing the animal they throw a heap of stones over the blood which flows to the ground. Here my guide pressed me to slaughter the goat which I had brought with me from Shobak, for the purpose ; but I pretended that I had vowed to immolate it at the tomb itself. Upon a hill over the Ain Mousa the Arabs Lyathene were encamped, who cultivate the valley of Mousa. We repaired to their encampment, but were not so hospitably received as we had been the night before.

Ain Mousa is a copious spring, rushing from under a rock at the eastern extremity of Wady Mousa. There are no ruins

near the spring ; a little lower down in the valley is a mill, and above it is the village of Badabde, now abandoned. It was inhabited till within a few years by about twenty families of Greek Christians, who subsequently retired to Kerek. Proceeding from the spring [westward] along the rivulet for about twenty minutes, the valley opens, and leads into a plain about a quarter of an hour in length and ten minutes in breadth, in which the rivulet joins with another descending from the mountain to the southward. Upon the declivity of the mountain, in the angle formed by the junction of the two rivulets, stands Eldjy, the principal village of Wady Mousa. This place contains between two and three hundred houses, and is enclosed by a stone wall with three regular gates. It is most picturesquely situated, and is inhabited by the Lyathene abovementioned, a part of whom encamp during the whole year in the neighbouring mountains. The slopes of the mountain near the town are formed into artificial terraces, covered with corn fields and plantations of fruit trees. They are irrigated by the waters of the two rivulets and of many smaller springs which descend into the valley below Eldjy, where the soil is also well cultivated. A few large hewn stones dispersed over the present town indicate the former existence of an ancient city in this spot, the happy situation of which must in all ages have attracted inhabitants. I saw here some large pieces of beautiful saline marble, but nobody could tell me from whence they had come, or whether there were any rocks of this stone in the mountains of Shera.

I hired a guide at Eldjy, to conduct me to Haroun's tomb, and paid him with a pair of old horse-shoes. He carried the goat, and gave me a skin of water to carry, as he knew that there was no water in the Wady below.

In following the rivulet of Eldjy westwards, the valley soon narrows again ; and it is here that the antiquities of Wady Mousa begin. Of these I regret that I am not able to give a very complete account ; but I knew well the character of the people around me. I was without protection in the midst of a desert where no traveller had ever before been seen ; and a close examination of these works of the infidels, as they are called, would have excited suspicions that I was a magician in search of treasures ; I should at least have been detained and prevented from prosecuting my journey to Egypt, and in all probability should have been stripped of the little money which I possessed, and what was infinitely more valuable to me, of my journal

book. Future travellers may visit the spot under the protection of an armed force; the inhabitants will become more accustomed to the researches of strangers; and the antiquities of Wady Mousa will then be found to rank amongst the most curious remains of ancient art.

At the point where the valley becomes narrow is a large sepulchral vault, with a handsome door hewn in the rock on the slope of the hill which rises from the right bank of the torrent. On the same side of the rivulet, a little farther on, I saw some other sepulchres with singular ornaments. Here a mass of rock has been insulated from the mountain by an excavation, which leaves a passage five or six paces in breadth between it and the mountain. It forms nearly a cube of sixteen feet, the top being a little narrower than the base; the lower part is hollowed into a small sepulchral cave with a low door; but the upper part of the mass is solid. There are three of these mausolea at a short distance from each other. A few paces lower, on the left side of the stream, is a larger mausoleum similarly formed, which appears from its decayed state, and the style of its architecture, to be of more ancient date than the others. Over its entrance are four obelisks, about ten feet in height, cut out of the same piece of rock; below is a projecting ornament, but so much defaced by time that I was unable to discover what it had originally represented; it had, however, nothing of the Egyptian style.

Continuing for about three hundred paces farther along the valley, which is in this part about one hundred and fifty feet in breadth, several small tombs are met with on both sides of the rivulet, excavated in the rock, without any ornaments.* Beyond these is a spot where the valley seemed to be entirely closed by high rocks; but upon a nearer approach, I perceived a chasın about fifteen or twenty feet in breadth, through which the rivulet flows westwards in winter; in summer its waters are lost in the sand and gravel before they reach the opening, which is called El Syk. The precipices on either side of the torrent are about eighty feet in height; in many places the opening between them at top is less than at bottom, and the sky is not visible from below. As the rivulet of Wady Mousa must have been of the greatest importance to the inhabitants of the valley,

* Compare the extract from Irby and Mangles on page 426.—Ed.

and more particularly of the city, which was entirely situated on the west of the Syk, great pains seem to have been taken by the ancients to regulate its course. Its bed appears to have been covered with a stone pavement, of which many vestiges yet remain, and in several places stone walls were constructed on both sides, to give the water its proper direction, and to check the violence of the torrent. A channel was likewise cut on each side of the Syk, on a higher level than the river, to convey a constant supply of water into the city in all seasons, and to prevent all the water from being absorbed in summer by the broad torrent bed, or by the irrigation of the fields in the valley above the Syk.

About fifty paces below the entrance of the Syk, a bridge of one arch thrown over the top of the chasm is still entire; immediately below it, on both sides, are large niches worked in the rock, with elegant sculptures, destined probably for the reception of statues. Some remains of antiquities might perhaps be found on the top of the rocks near the bridge; but my guide assured me, that notwithstanding repeated endeavours had been made, nobody had ever been able to climb up the rocks to the bridge, which was therefore unanimously declared to be the work of the Djan, or evil genii. In continuing along the winding passage of the Syk, I saw in several places small niches cut in the rock, some of which were single; in other places there were three or four together, without any regularity; some are mere holes, others have short pilasters on both sides; they vary in size from ten inches to four or five feet in height; and in some of them the bases of statues are still visible.

We passed several collateral chasms between perpendicular rocks, by which some tributary torrents from the south side of the Syk empty themselves into the river. I did not enter any of them, but I saw that they were thickly overgrown with *Desfe* trees. My guide told me that no antiquities existed in these valleys, but the testimony of these people on such subjects is little to be relied on. The bottom of the Syk itself is at present covered with large stones, brought down by the torrent, and it appears to be several feet higher than its ancient level, at least towards its western extremity. After proceeding for twenty-five minutes between the rocks, we came to a place where the passage opens, and where the bed of another stream coming from the south joins the Syk. On the side of the perpendicular rock, directly opposite to the issue of the main valley, an

excavated mausoleum came in view, the situation and beauty of which are calculated to make an extraordinary impression upon the traveller, after having traversed for nearly half an hour such a gloomy and almost subterraneous passage as I have described. It is one of the most elegant remains of antiquity existing in Syria; its state of preservation resembles that of a building recently finished, and on a closer examination I found it to be a work of immense labour.*

* The whole description of this chasm finely illustrates the epithet which Diodorus Siculus applies to the single approach to Petra, viz. *χειροποίητος*, made by hand; see *Histor. Introd.* p. 279. This approach or chasm is also described by Legh, under date of May 29th, but more fully in the unpublished work of Captains Irby and Mangles. From the latter we subjoin here the following account:

"The natural features of the defile grew more and more imposing at every step, and the excavations and sculpture more frequent on both sides, till it presented at last a continued street of tombs, beyond which the rocks, gradually approaching each other, seemed all at once to close without any outlet. There is, however, one frightful chasm for the passage of the stream, which furnished, as it did anciently, the only avenue to Petra on this side. It is impossible to conceive any thing more awful or sublime than such an approach. The width is not more than just sufficient for the passage of two horsemen abreast; the sides are in all parts perpendicular, varying from four hundred to seven hundred feet in height; and they often overhang to such a degree, that, without their absolutely meeting, the sky is intercepted and completely shut out for one hundred yards together, and there is little more light than in a cavern. The screaming of the eagles, hawks, and owls, who were soaring above our heads in considerable numbers, seemingly annoyed at any one approaching their lonely habitation, added much to the singularity of this scene. The tamarisk, the wild fig, and the oleander, grow luxuriantly about the road, rendering the passages often difficult; in some places, they hang down most beautifully from the cliffs and crevices where they had taken root. The caper-plant was also in luxuriant growth, the continued shade furnishing them moisture.

"Very near the entrance into this romantic pass, a bold arch is thrown across at a great height, connecting the opposite sides of the cliff. Whether this was part of an upper road upon the summit of the mountain, or whether it be a portion of an aqueduct, which seems less probable, we had no opportunity of examining; but, as the traveller passes under it, its appearance is most surprising, hanging thus above his head betwixt two rugged masses apparently inaccessible. The ravine, without changing much its general direction, presents so

The principal part is a chamber sixteen paces square, and about twenty-five feet high. There is not the smallest orna-

many elbows and windings in its course, that the eye can seldom penetrate forward beyond a few paces, and is often puzzled to distinguish in what direction the passage will open, so completely does it appear obstructed. . . . We followed this sort of half-subterranean passage for the space of nearly two miles, the sides increasing in height as the path continually descended, while the tops of the precipices retained their former level. Where they are at the highest, a beam of stronger light breaks in at the close of the dark perspective, and opens to view, half seen at first through the tall, narrow opening, columns, statues, and cornices of a light and finished taste, as if fresh from the chisel, without the tints or weather-stains of age, and executed in a stone of a pale rose colour, which was warmed, at the moment we came in sight of them, with the full light of the morning sun. The dark green of the shrubs that grow in this perpetual shade, and the sombre appearance of the passage whence we were about to issue, formed a fine contrast with the glowing colour of this edifice. We know not with what to compare this scene; perhaps, there is nothing in the world that resembles it. Only a portion of a very extensive architectural elevation is seen at first; but it has been so contrived, that a statue with expanded wings, perhaps of Victory, just fills the centre of the aperture in front, which being closed below by the sides of the rock folding over each other, gives to the figure the appearance of being suspended in the air at a considerable height; the ruggedness of the cliffs below setting off the sculpture to the highest advantage. The rest of the design opened gradually as we advanced, till the narrow defile, which had continued thus far without any increase of breadth, spreads on both sides into an open area of a moderate size, whose sides are by nature inaccessible, and present the same awful and romantic features as the avenues which lead to it; this opening gives admission to a great body of light from the eastward. The position is one of the most beautiful that could be imagined for the front of a great temple, the richness and exquisite finish of whose decorations offer a most remarkable contrast to the savage scenery. No part is built, the whole being purely a work of excavation; and its minutest embellishments, wherever the hand of man has not purposely effaced them, are so perfect, that it may be doubted whether any work of the ancients, excepting, perhaps, some on the banks of the Nile, have come down to our time so little injured by the lapse of age. There is, in fact, scarcely a building of forty years' standing in England, so well preserved in the greater part of its architectural decorations.

"The area before the temple is about fifty yards in width, and about three times as long. It terminates to the S. in a wild, precipitous cliff."—ED.

ment on the walls, which are quite smooth, as well as the roof, but the outside of the entrance door is richly embellished with architectural decorations. Several broad steps lead up to the entrance, and in front of all is a colonnade of four columns, standing between two pilasters. On each of the three sides of the great chamber is an apartment for the reception of the dead. A similar excavation, but larger, opens into each end of the vestibule, the length of which latter is not equal to that of the colonnade as it appears in front, but terminates at either end between the pilaster and the neighbouring column. The doors of the two apartments opening into the vestibule are covered with carvings richer and more beautiful than those on the door of the principal chamber. The colonnade is about thirty-five feet high, and the columns are about three feet in diameter with Corinthian capitals. The pilasters at the two extremities of the colonnade, and the two columns nearest to them, are formed out of the solid rock, like all the rest of the monument; but the two centre columns, one of which has fallen, were constructed separately, and were composed of three pieces each. The colonnade is crowned with a pediment, above which are other ornaments, which, if I distinguished them correctly, consisted of an insulated cylinder crowned with a vase, standing between two other structures in the shape of small temples, supported by short pillars. The entire front, from the base of the columns to the top of the ornaments, may be sixty or sixty-five feet. The architrave of the colonnade is adorned with vases, connected together with festoons. The exterior wall of the chamber at each end of the vestibule, which presents itself to the front between the pilaster and the neighbouring column, was ornamented with colossal figures in bas-relief; but I could not make out what they represented. One of them appears to have been a female mounted upon an animal, which, from the tail and hind leg, appears to have been a camel. All the other ornaments sculptured on the monument are in perfect preservation.

The natives call this monument *Kasr Faraoun*, or *Pharaoh's castle*; and pretend that it was the residence of a prince. But it was rather the sepulchre of a prince, and great must have been the opulence of a city, which could dedicate such monuments to the memory of its rulers.

From this place, as I before observed, the *Syk* widens, and the road continues for a few hundred paces lower down through a spacious passage between the two cliffs. Several very large

sepulchres are excavated in the rocks on both sides; they consist generally of a single lofty apartment with a flat roof; some of them are larger than the principal chamber in the Kaszr Faraoun. Of those which I entered, the walls were quite plain and unornamented; in some of them are small side rooms, with excavations and recesses in the rock for the reception of the dead; in others I found the floor itself irregularly excavated for the same purpose, in compartments six to eight feet deep, and of the shape of a coffin; in the floor of one sepulchre I counted as many as twelve cavities of this kind, besides a deep niche in the wall, where the bodies of the principal members of the family, to whom the sepulchre belonged, were probably deposited.

On the outside of these sepulchres, the rock is cut away perpendicularly above and on both sides of the door, so as to make the exterior façade larger in general than the interior apartment. Their most common form is that of a truncated pyramid, and as they are made to project one or two feet from the body of the rock, they have the appearance, when seen at a distance, of insulated structures. On each side of the front is generally a pilaster, and the door is seldom without some elegant ornaments. These fronts resemble those of several of the tombs of Palmyra; but the latter are not excavated in the rock, but constructed with hewn stones. I do not think, however, that there are two sepulchres in Wady Mousa perfectly alike; on the contrary, they vary greatly in size, shape, and embellishments. In some places, three sepulchres are excavated one over the other, and the side of the mountain is so perpendicular that it seems impossible to approach the uppermost, no path whatever being visible; some of the lower have a few steps before their entrance.

In continuing a little farther among the sepulchres, the valley widens to about one hundred and fifty yards in breadth. Here to the left is a theatre cut entirely out of the rock, with all its benches. It may be capable of containing about three thousand spectators; its area is now filled up with gravel, which the winter torrent brings down. The entrance of many of the sepulchres is in like manner almost choked up. There are no remains of columns near the theatre. Following the stream about one hundred and fifty paces further, the rocks open still farther, and I issued upon a plain two hundred and fifty or three hundred yards across, bordered by heights of more gradual ascent

than before. Here the ground is covered with heaps of hewn stones, foundations of buildings, fragments of columns, and vestiges of paved streets; all clearly indicating that a large city once existed here; on the left side of the river is a rising ground extending westwards for nearly a quarter of an hour, entirely covered with similar remains.* On the right bank, where the ground is more elevated, ruins of the same description are also seen. In the valley near the river, the buildings have probably been swept away by the impetuosity of the winter torrent; but even here are still seen the foundations of a temple, and a heap of broken columns; close to which is a large Birket, or reservoir of water, still serving for the supply of the inhabitants during the summer. The finest sepulchres in Wady Mousa are in the eastern cliff, in front of this open space, where I counted upwards of fifty close to each other. High up in the cliff I particularly observed one large sepulchre, adorned with Corinthian pilasters.

Farther to the west the valley is shut in by the rocks, which extend in a northern direction; the river has worked a passage through them, *and runs under ground*, as I was told, for about a quarter of an hour. Near the west end of Wady Mousa are the remains of a stately edifice, of which part of the wall is still standing; the inhabitants call it Kaszr Bent Faraoun, or the palace of Pharaoh's daughter. In my way I had entered several sepulchres, to the surprize of my guide, but when he saw me turn out of the footpath towards the Kaszr, he exclaimed: "I see now clearly that you are an infidel, who have some particular business amongst the ruins of the city of your forefathers; but depend upon it that we shall not suffer you to take out a single para of all the treasures hidden therein, for they are in our territory, and belong to us." I replied that it was mere curiosity, which prompted me to look at the ancient works, and that I had no other view in coming here, than to sacrifice to

* "The defile assumes, for about 300 yards [beyond the temple], the same features which characterize the eastern approach, with an infinite variety of tombs, both Arabian and Roman, on either side. This pass conducts (in a N. W. direction) to the theatre; and here, the ruins of the city burst on the view in their full grandeur, shut in, on the opposite side by barren, craggy precipices, from which numerous ravines and valleys, like those we had passed, branch out in all directions." Irby and Mangles.—ED.

Haroun ; but he was not easily persuaded, and I did not think it prudent to irritate him by too close an inspection of the palace, as it might have led him to declare, on our return, his belief that I had found treasures, which might have led to a search of my person and to the detection of my journal, which would most certainly have been taken from me, as a book of magic. It is very unfortunate for European travellers that the idea of treasures being hidden in ancient edifices is so strongly rooted in the minds of the Arabs and Turks ; nor are they satisfied with watching all the stranger's steps ; they believe that it is sufficient for a true magician to have seen and observed the spot where treasures are hidden, (of which he is supposed to be already informed by the old books of the infidels who lived on the spot,) in order to be able afterwards, at his ease, to command the guardian of the treasure to set the whole before him. It was of no avail to tell them to follow me and see whether I searched for money. Their reply was, "of course you will not dare to take it out before us, but we know that if you are a skilful magician you will order it to follow you through the air to whatever place you please." If the traveller takes the dimensions of a building or a column, they are persuaded that it is a magical proceeding. Even the most liberal minded Turks of Syria reason in the same manner, and the more travellers they see, the stronger is their conviction that their object is to search for treasures. "Maou delayl," "he has indications of treasure with him," is an expression I have heard a hundred times.

On the rising ground to the left of the rivulet, just opposite to the Kaszr Bent Faraoun, are the ruins of a temple, with one column yet standing, to which the Arabs have given the name of Zob Faraoun, i. e. hasta virilis Pharaonis ; it is about thirty feet high, and composed of more than a dozen pieces. From thence we descended amidst the ruins of private habitations, into a narrow lateral valley, on the other side of which we began to ascend the mountain, upon which stands the tomb of Aaron. There are remains of an ancient road cut in the rock, on both sides of which are a few tombs. After ascending the bed of a torrent for about half an hour, I saw on each side of the road a large excavated cube, or rather truncated pyramid, with the entrance of a tomb in the bottom of each. Here the number of sepulchres increases, and there are also excavations for the dead in several natural caverns. A little farther on, we

reached a high plain called Szetouh Haroun, or Aaron's terrace, at the foot of the mountain upon which his tomb is situated. There are several subterranean sepulchres in the plain, with an avenue leading to them, which is cut out of the rocky surface.

The sun had already set when we arrived on the plain; it was too late to reach the tomb, and I was excessively fatigued; I therefore hastened to kill the goat, in sight of the tomb, at a spot where I found a number of heaps of stones, placed there in token of as many sacrifices in honour of the saint. While I was in the act of slaying the animal, my guide exclaimed aloud, "O Haroun, look upon us! it is for you we slaughter this victim. O Haroun, protect us and forgive us! O Haroun, be content with our good intentions, for it is but a lean goat! O Haroun, smooth our paths; and praise be to the Lord of all creatures!" This he repeated several times, after which he covered the blood that had fallen on the ground with a heap of stones; we then dressed the best part of the flesh for our supper, as expeditiously as possible, for the guide was afraid of the fire being seen, and of its attracting hither some robbers.

August 23d.—The plain of Haroun and the neighbouring mountains have no springs; but the rain water collects in low grounds, and in natural hollows in the rocks, where it partly remains the whole year round, even on the top of the mountain; but this year had been remarkable for its drought. Juniper trees grow here in considerable numbers. I had no great desire to see the tomb of Haroun, which stands on the summit of the mountain that was opposite to us, for I had been informed by several persons who had visited it, that it contained nothing worth seeing except a large coffin, like that of Osha in the vicinity of Szalt. My guide, moreover, insisted upon my speedy return, as he was to set out the same day with a small caravan for Maan; I therefore complied with his wishes, and we returned by the same road we had come. I regretted afterwards, that I had not visited Haroun's tomb, as I was told that there are several large and handsome sepulchres in the rock near it. A traveller ought, if possible, to see every thing with his own eyes, for the reports of the Arabs are little to be depended on, with regard to what may be interesting, in point of antiquity; they often extol things which upon examination, prove to be of no kind of interest, and speak with indifference of those which are curious and important. In a room adjoining the apartment, in which is the tomb of Haroun, there are

three copper vessels for the use of those who slaughter the victims at the tomb; one is very large, and destined for the boiling of the flesh of the slaughtered camel. Although there is at present no guardian at the tomb, yet the Arabs venerate the Sheikh too highly, to rob him of any of his kitchen utensils. The road from Maan and from Wady Mousa to Ghaza, leads by the tomb, and is much frequented by the people of Maan and the Bedouins; on the other side of Haròun the road descends into the great valley.*

In comparing the testimonies of the authors cited in Reland's *Palaestina*, it appears very probable that the ruins in Wady Mousa are those of the ancient *Petra*, and it is remarkable that Eusebius says the tomb of Aaron was shewn near *Petra*.† Of this at least I am persuaded, from all the information I procured, that there is no other ruin between the extremities of the Dead sea and the Red sea, of sufficient importance to answer to that city. Whether or not I have discovered the remains of the capital of Arabia Petraea, I leave to the decision of Greek scholars, and shall only subjoin a few notes on these ruins.

The rocks, through which the river of Wady Mousa has worked its extraordinary passage, and in which all the tombs

* This tomb was visited by Mr Legh and his party; see the description of it by Legh under date of May 26. The view from the summit of Mount Hor is said to be very fine. "No where," say Captains Irby and Mangles, "is the extraordinary colouring of these mountains more striking, than in the road to the Tomb of Aaron. The rock sometimes presented a deep, sometimes a paler blue, and sometimes was occasionally streaked with red, or shaded off to lilac or purple; sometimes, a salmon colour was veined in wavy lines and circles with crimson and even scarlet, so as to resemble exactly the colour of raw meat; in other places, there are livid stripes of yellow or bright orange; and in some parts, all the different colours were ranged side by side in parallel strata; there are portions also with paler tints, and some quite white, but these last seem to be soft, and not good for preserving the sculpture. It is this wonderful variety of colours, observable throughout the whole range of mountains, that gives to *Petra* one of its most characteristic beauties; the facades of the tombs, tastefully as they are sculptured, owe much of their imposing appearance to this infinite diversity of hues in the stone."—Ed.

† See all these testimonies collected in the *Histor. Introd.* p. 278 sq.—Ed.

and mausolea of the city have been excavated, as high as the tomb of Haroun, are sand-stone of a reddish colour. The rocks above Eldjy are calcareous, and the sand-stone does not begin until the point where the first tombs are excavated. To the southward the sand-stone follows the whole extent of the great valley, which is a continuation of the Ghor. The forms of the summits of these rocks are so irregular and grotesque, that when seen from afar, they have the appearance of volcanic mountains. The softness of the stone afforded great facilities to those who excavated the sides of the mountains; but, unfortunately, from the same cause it is in vain to look for inscriptions; I saw several spots where they had existed, but they are all now obliterated.* The position of this town was well-chosen, in point of security; as a few hundred men might defend the entrance to it against a large army; but the communication with the neighbourhood must have been subjected to great inconveniences. I am not certain whether the passage of the Syk was made use of as a road, or whether the road from the town towards Eldjy was formed through one of the side valleys of the Syk. The road westward towards Haroun and the valley below, is very difficult for beasts of burthen. The summer heats must have been excessive, the situation being surrounded on all sides by high barren cliffs, which concentrate the reflection of the sun, while they prevent the westerly winds from cooling the air. I saw nothing in the position that could have compensated the inhabitants for these disadvantages, except the river, the benefit of which might have been equally enjoyed had the town been built below Eldjy. Security therefore was probably the only object which induced the people to overlook such objections, and to select such a singular position for a city. The architecture of the sepulchres, of which there are at least two hundred and fifty in the vicinity of the ruins, is of very different periods.

* "The sides of the mountains, covered with an endless variety of excavated tombs and private dwellings, presented altogether the most singular scene we have ever beheld; and we must despair of giving the reader an idea of the singular effect of rocks tinted with the most extraordinary hues, whose summits present to us nature in her most savage and romantic form, while their bases are worked out in all the symmetry and regularity of art, with colonnades, and pediments, and ranges of corridors adhering to the perpendicular surface." *Irby and Mangles.—Ed.*

On our return I stopped a few hours at Eldjy. The town is surrounded with fruit-trees of all kinds, the produce of which is of the finest quality. Great quantities of the grapes are sold at Ghaza, and to the Bedouins. The Lyathene cultivate the valley as far as the first sepulchres of the ancient city; in their town-houses they work at the loom. They pay tribute to the Howeytat and carry provisions to the Syrian pilgrims at Maan, and to the Egyptian pilgrims at Akaba. They have three encampments of about eighty tents each. Like the Bedouins and other inhabitants of Shera they have become Wahabis, but do not at present pay any tribute to the Wahabi chief.

Wady Mousa is comprised within the territory of Damascus, as are the entire districts of Shera and Djebal. The most southern frontiers of the Pashalik are, Tor Hesma, a high mountain so called at one day's journey north of Akaba; from thence northward to Kerek, the whole country belongs to the same Pashalik, and consequently to Syria; but it may easily be conceived that the Pasha has little authority in these parts. In the time of Djezzar, the Arabs of Wady Mousa paid their annual land-tax into his treasury, but no other Pasha has been able to exact it.

I returned from Eldjy to the encampment above Ain Mousa, which is considerably higher than the town, and set out from thence immediately, for I very much disliked the people, who are less civil to strangers than any other Arabs in Shera. We travelled in a southern direction along the windings of a broad valley which ascends from Ain Mousa, and reached its summit at the end of two hours and a quarter. The soil, though flinty, is very capable of cultivation. This valley is comprised within the appellation of Wady Mousa, because the rain water which collects here joins, in the winter, the torrent below Eldjy. The water was anciently conducted through this valley in an artificial channel, of which the stone walls remain in several places. At the extremity of the Wady are the ruins of an ancient city, called Betahy, consisting of large heaps of hewn blocks of silicious stone; the trees on this mountain are thinly scattered. At a quarter of an hour from Betahy we reached an encampment, composed of Lyathene and Naymat, where we alighted, and rested for the night.

August 24th.—Our road lay S. S. W. and in one hour we came to Ain Mefrak, where are some ruins. From thence we ascended a mountain, and continued along the upper ridge of

Djebel Shera. To our right was a tremendous precipice, on the other side of which runs the chain of sand-rocks which begin near Wady Mousa. To the west of these rocks we saw the great valley forming the continuation of the Ghor. At the end of three hours, after having turned a little more southward, we arrived at a small encampment of Djeylat, where we stopped to breakfast. The Bedouin tents which composed a great part of this encampment were the smallest I had ever seen; they were about four feet high, and ten in length. The inhabitants were very poor, and could not afford to give us coffee; our breakfast or dinner therefore consisted of dry barley cakes, which we dipped in melted goat's grease. The intelligence which I learnt here was extremely agreeable; our landlord told us that a caravan was to set out in a few days for Cairo, from a neighbouring encampment of Howeytat, and that they intended to proceed straight across the desert. This was exactly what I wished, for I could not divest myself of apprehensions of danger in being exposed to the undisciplined soldiers of Akaba. It had been our intention to reach Akaba from hence in two days, by way of the mountainous district of Reszeyfa (a part of Shera so called) and Djebel Hesma; but we now gladly changed our route, and departed for the encampment of the Howeytat. We turned to the S. E. and in half an hour from the Djeylat passed the fine spring called El Szadeke, near which is a hill with extensive ruins of an ancient town consisting of heaps of hewn stones.* From thence we descended by a slight declivity into the eastern plain, and reached the encampment, distant one hour and a half from Szadeke. The same immense plain which we had entered in coming from Beszeyra, on the eastern borders of the Ghoeyr, here presented itself to our view. We were about six hours S. of Maan, whose two hills, upon which the two divisions of the town are situated, were distinctly visible. The Syrian Hadj route passes at about one hour to the east of the encampment. About eight hours S. of Maan, a branch of the Shera extends for three or four hours in an eastern direction across the plain; it is a low hilly chain.

The mountains of Shera are considerably elevated above the level of the Ghor, but they appear only as low hills when seen from the eastern plain, which is upon a much higher level than the Ghor. I have already noticed the same peculiarity with

* Probably the ancient *Zodocatha*; see *Histor. Introd.* p. 275.—ED.

regard to the upper plains of El Kerek and the Belka ; and it is observable also in the plain of Djolan relatively to the level of the lake of Tiberias. The valley of the Ghor, which has a rapid slope southward, from the lake of Tiberias to the Dead sea, appears to continue descending from the southern extremity of the latter as far as the Red sea ; for the mountains on the E. of it appear to increase in height the farther we proceed southward, while the upper plain, apparently continues upon the same level. This plain terminates to the S. near Akaba, on the Syrian Hadj route, by a steep rocky descent, at the bottom of which begins the desert of Nedjed, covered, for the greater part, with flints. The same descent, or cliff, continues westward towards Akaba on the Egyptian Hadj road, where it joins the Djebel Hesma (a prolongation of Shera), about eight hours to the N. of the Red sea. We have thus a natural division of the country, which appears to have been well known to the ancients, for it is probably to a part of this upper plain, together with the mountains of Shera, Djebel, Kerek, and Belka, that the name of *Arabia Petraea* was applied, the western limits of which must have been the great valley or Ghor. It might with truth be called *Petraea*, not only on account of its rocky mountains, but also of the elevated plain already described, which is so much covered with stones, especially flints, that it may with great propriety be called a stony desert, although susceptible of culture ; in many places it is overgrown with wild herbs, and must once have been thickly inhabited, for the traces of many ruined towns and villages are met with on both sides of the Hadj road between Maan and Akaba, as well as between Maan and the plains of Haouran, in which direction are also many springs. At present all this country is a desert, and Maan is the only inhabited place in it. All the castles on the Syrian Hadj route from Fedhein to Medina are deserted. At Maan are several springs, to which the town owes its origin, and these, together with the circumstance of its being a station of the Syrian Hadj, are the cause of its still existing. The inhabitants have scarcely any other means of subsistence than the profits which they gain from the pilgrims in their way to and from Mekka, by buying up all kinds of provisions at Hebron and Ghaza, and selling them with great profit to the weary pilgrims ; to whom the gardens and vineyards of Maan are no less agreeable, than the wild herbs collected by the people of Maan are to their camels. The pomegranates, apricots, and

peaches of Maan are of the finest quality. In years when a very numerous caravan passes, pomegranates are sold at one piastre each, and every thing in the same proportion. During the two days' stay of the pilgrims, in going, and as many in returning, the people of Maan earn as much as keeps them the whole year.*

Maan is situated in the midst of a rocky country, not capable of cultivation; the inhabitants therefore depend upon their neighbours of Djebal and Shera for their provision of wheat and barley. At present, owing to the discontinuance of the Syrian Hadj, they are scarcely able to obtain money to purchase it. Many of them have commenced peddlars among the Bedouins, and fabricators of different articles for their use, especially sheep-skin furs, while others have emigrated to Tafyle and Kerek. The Barbary pilgrims who were permitted by the Wahabi chief to perform their pilgrimage in 1810, and 1811, returned from Medina by the way of Maan and Shobak to Hebron, Jerusalem, and Yaffa, where they embarked for their own country, having taken this circuitous route on account of the hostile demonstrations of Mohammed Ali Pasha on the Egyptian road. Several thousands of them died of fatigue before they reached Maan. The people of this town derived large profits from the survivors, and for the transport of their effects; but it is probable that if the Syrian Hadj is not soon re-established, the place will in a few years be abandoned. The inhabitants considering their town as an advanced post to the sacred city of Medina, apply themselves with great eagerness to the study of the Koran. The greater part of them read and write, and many serve in the capacity of Imams or secretaries to the great Bedouin Sheikhs. The two hills upon which the town is built, divide the inhabitants into two parties, almost incessantly engaged in quarrels which are often sanguinary; no individual of one party even marries into a family belonging to the other.

On arriving at the encampment of the Howeytat, we were informed that the caravan was to set out on the second day; I had the advantage, therefore, of one day's repose. I was now reduced to that state which can alone ensure tranquillity to the traveller in the desert; having nothing with me that could attract the notice or excite the cupidity of the Bedouins; my clothes and linen were torn to rags; a dirty Keffye, or yellow

* For *Maan*, see *Histor. Introd.* p. 277.

handkerchief, covered my head; my leathern girdle and shoes had long been exchanged, by way of present, against similar articles of an inferior kind, so that those I now wore were of the very worst sort. The tube of my pipe was reduced from two yards to a span, for I had been obliged to cut off from it as much as would make two pipes for my friends at Kerek; and the last article of my baggage, a pocket handkerchief, had fallen to the lot of the Sheikh of Eldjy. Having thus nothing more to give, I expected to be freed from all further demands; but I was mistaken; I had forgotten some rags torn from my shirt, which were tied round my ancles, wounded by the stirrups which I had received in exchange from the Sheikh of Kerek. These rags happening to be of white linen, some of the ladies of the Howeytat thought they might serve to make a Berkoa, or face veil, and whenever I stepped out of the tent I found myself surrounded by half a dozen of them, begging for the rags. In vain I represented that they were absolutely necessary to me in the wounded state of my ancles; their answer was, "you will soon reach Cairo, where you may get as much linen as you like." By thus incessantly teasing me they at last obtained their wishes; but in my anger I gave the rags to an ugly old woman, to the no slight disappointment of the young ones.

August 26th.—We broke up in the morning, our caravan consisting of nine persons, including myself, and of about twenty camels, part of which were for sale at Cairo; with the rest the Arabs expected to be able to transport, on their return home, some provisions and army-baggage to Akaba, where Mohammed Ali Pasha had established a depot for his Arabian expedition. The provisions of my companions consisted only of flour; besides flour, I carried some butter and dried *leben* (sour milk), which when dissolved in water, forms not only a refreshing beverage, but is much to be recommended as a preservative of health when travelling in summer. These were our only provisions. During the journey we did not sup till after sunset, and we breakfasted in the morning upon a piece of dry bread, which we had baked in the ashes the preceding evening, without either salt or leaven. The frugality of these Bedouins is indeed without example; my companions, who walked at least five hours every day, supported themselves for four and twenty hours with a piece of dry black bread of about a pound and a half weight, without any other kind of nourishment. I endeavoured, as much as possible to imitate their abstemious-

ness, being already convinced from experience that it is the best preservative against the effects of the fatigues of such a journey. My companions proved to be very good natured people; and not a single quarrel happened during our route, except between myself and my guide. He too was an honest, good tempered man, but I suffered from his negligence, or rather from his ignorance of my wants, as an European. He had brought only one water-skin with him, which was to serve us both for drinking and cooking; and as we had several intervals of three days without meeting with water, I found myself on very short allowance, and could not receive any assistance from my companions, who had scarcely enough for themselves. But these people think nothing of hardships and privations, and take it for granted, that other people's constitutions are hardened to the same aptitude of enduring thirst and fatigue, as their own.

We returned to Szadeke, where we filled our water-skins, and proceeded from thence in a W. S. W. direction, ascending the eastern hills of Djebel Shera. After two hours march we began to descend, in following the course of a Wady. At the end of four hours is a spring called Ibn Reszeysz. The highest point of Djebel Hesma, in the direction of Akaba, bears from hence S. W. Hesma is higher than any part of Shera. In five hours we reached Ain Daleghe, a spring in a fertile valley, where the Howeytat have built a few huts, and cultivate some dhourra fields. We continued descending Wady Daleghe, which in winter is an impetuous torrent. The mountains are quite barren here; calcareous rock predominates, with some flint. At the end of seven hours we left the Wady, which takes a more northern direction, and ascended a steep mountain. At eight hours and a half we alighted on the declivity of the mountain, which is called Djebel Koula, and which appears to be the highest summit of Djebel Shera. Our road was tolerably good all the way.

August 27th.—After one hour's march we reached the summit of Djebel Koula, which is covered with a chalky surface. The descent on the other side is very wild, the road lying along the edges of almost perpendicular precipices amidst large blocks of detached rocks, down a mountain entirely destitute of vegetation, and composed of calcareous rocks, sand-stone, and flint, lying over each other in horizontal layers. At the end of three hours we came to a number of tombs on the road side, where

the Howeytat and other Bedouins who encamp in these mountains bury their dead. In three hours and a half we reached the bottom of the mountain, and entered the bed of a winter torrent, which like Wady Mousa has worked its passage through the chain of sand-stone rocks that form a continuation of the Syk. These rocks extend southwards as far as Djebel Hesma. The narrow bed is enclosed by perpendicular cliffs, which, at the entrance of the Wady, are about fifteen or twenty yards distant from each other, but wider lower down. We continued in a western direction for an hour and a half, in this Wady, which is called Gharendel. At five hours the valley opens, and we found ourselves upon a sandy plain, interspersed with rocks; the bed of the Wady was covered with white sand. A few trees of the species called by the Arabs Talh, Tarfa, and Adha, grow in the midst of the sand, but their withered leaves cannot divert the traveller's eye from the dreary scene around him. At six hours the valley again becomes narrower; here are some more tombs of Bedouins on the side of the road. At the end of six hours and a half we came to the mouth of the Wady, where it joins the great lower valley, issuing from the mountainous country into the plain by a narrow passage, formed by the approaching rocks. These rocks are of sand-stone and contain many natural caverns. A few hundred paces above the issue of the Wady are several springs, called Ayoun Gharendel, surrounded by a few date trees, and some verdant pasture ground. The water has a sulphureous taste, but these being the only springs on the borders of the great valley within one day's journey to the N. and S. the Bedouins are obliged to resort to them. The wells are full of leeches, some of which fixed themselves to the palates of several of our camels whilst drinking, and it was with difficulty that we could remove them. The name of *Arindela*, an ancient town of *Palaestina Tertia*, bears great resemblance to that of Gharendel.*

On issuing from this rocky country, which terminates the Djebel Shera, on its western side, the Wady Gharendel empties itself into the valley El Araba, in whose sands its waters are lost. This valley is a continuation of the Ghor, which may be said to extend from the Red sea to the sources of the Jordan. The valley of that river widens about *Jericho*, and its inclosing

* Comp. Histor. Introd. p. 275.

hills are united to a chain of mountains which open and enclose the Dead sea. At the southern extremity of the sea they again approach, and leave between them a valley similar to the northern Ghor, in shape; but which the want of water makes a desert, while the Jordan and its numerous tributary streams render the other a fertile plain. In the southern Ghor the rivulets which descend from the eastern mountains, to the S. of Wady Szafye, or El Karahy, are lost amidst the gravel in their winter beds, before they reach the valley below, and there are no springs whatever in the western mountain; the lower plain, therefore, in summer is entirely without water, which alone can produce verdure in the Arabian deserts, and render them habitable. The general direction of the southern Ghor is parallel to the road which I took in coming from Khanzyre to Wady Mousa. At the point where we crossed it, near Gharendel, its direction was from N. N. E. to S. S. W. From Gharendel it extends southwards for fifteen or twenty hours, till it joins the sandy plain which separates the mountains of Hesma from the eastern branch of the Red sea. It continues to bear the appellation of El Ghor as far as the latitude of Beszeyra, to the S. of which place, as the Arabs informed me, it is interrupted for a short space by rocky ground and Wadys, and takes the name of Araba, which it retains till its termination near the Red sea. Near Gharendel, where I saw it, the whole plain presented to the view an expanse of shifting sands, whose surface was broken by innumerable undulations, and low hills. The sand appears to have been brought from the shores of the Red sea by the southerly winds; and the Arabs told me that the valley continued to present the same appearance beyond the latitude of Wady Mousa. A few Talh trees (the acacia which produces the gum arabic), Tarfa (tamarisk), Adha, and Rethem, grow among the sand hills; but the depth of sand precludes all vegetation of herbage. Numerous Bedouin tribes encamp here in the winter, when the torrents produce a copious supply of water, and a few shrubs spring up upon their banks, affording pasturage to the sheep and goats; but the camels prefer the leaves of the trees, especially the thorny Talh.

The existence of the valley El Araba, the *Kadesh Barnea*,* perhaps, of the Scriptures, appears to have been unknown both to ancient and modern geographers, although it forms a promi-

* See Vol. II. p. 791.

ment feature in the topography of Syria and Arabia Petraea.* It deserves to be thoroughly investigated, and travellers might proceed along it in winter time, accompanied by two or three Bedouin guides of the tribes of Howeytat and Terabein, who could be procured at Hebron. Akaba, or *Eziongaber*, might be reached in eight days by the same road by which the communication was anciently kept up between Jerusalem and her dependencies on the Red sea, for this is both the nearest and the most commodious route, and it was by this valley that the treasures of Ophir were probably transported to the warehouses of Solomon.

Of the towns which I find laid down in D'Anville's maps, between Zoara and Ælana, no traces remain, *Thoana* excepted, which is the present Dhana. The name of Zoar is unknown to the Arabs, but the village of Szafye is near that point; the river which is made by D'Anville to fall into the Dead sea near Zoara, is the Wady El Ahsa; but it will have been seen in the above pages, that the course of that Wady is rather from

* The remark of Burckhardt, that this valley, El Ghor and El Araba, "appears to have been unknown both to ancient and modern geographers," has been adopted and copied by other writers without hesitation; but probably without sufficient examination. It was of course known in the times of the Crusades; and it is singular that no writer of that age should have mentioned it. On turning over the pages of Abulfeda, who flourished in the fourteenth century, (*Tab. Syriae* ed. Koehler, Lips. 1786,) I find that he describes *Shobak* as situated on the eastern side of the *Ghor*, p. 89; and on p. 13, 14, he gives a description of it as follow: "From the Dead sea and Zoar to Bisan and Tiberias, the tract is called *El Ghor*, because it is included between two ranges of mountains. The other part of Syria joins it. One part of the Ghor is reckoned to the region of the Jordan, the other to Palestine. Ibn Haukal adds: The Ghor begins at the lake of Gennesareth, whence it extends to Bisan, and so to Zoar and Jericho, even to the Dead sea; and thence to Ailah." To this passage is subjoined a note, containing a Scholion of Abulfeda himself, taken from the autograph manuscript of his work preserved at Leyden, in the following words: "*El Ghor* is properly any deep valley shut in by mountains. This tract abounds in palm trees, fountains, and streams; and snow sometimes falls in it. One portion of it stretches from the region of Jordan till you pass Bisan, and then comes Palestine. And if one should proceed continuously in this valley [towards the south], it would bring him to Ailah." These notices, it will be remarked, accord precisely with the description given by Burckhardt.—Ed.

the east than south. I inquired in vain among the Arabs for the names of those places where the Israelites had sojourned during their progress through the desert; none of them are known to the present inhabitants. The country about Akaba, and to the W. N. W. of it, might, perhaps, furnish some data for the illustration of the Jewish history. I understand that M. Seetzen went in a stright line from Hebron to Akaba, across the desert El Ty; he may perhaps, have collected some interesting information on the subject.*

[From this point, Burckhardt travelled across the western desert to Egypt. Copious extracts relating to this part of his route, have already been given in this work; see Vol. II. p. 780 sq.]

* The name of Seetzen is so often mentioned, that a slight notice of his travels may not be unacceptable. He was a native of East Friesland, and studied at Göttingen under Blumenbach. Animated by a strong desire to explore the almost unknown regions of Western Asia, he prepared himself in astronomy etc. under the guidance of Baron Zach, then at Gotha; and, furnished to a considerable extent with instruments and funds by the Duke of Gotha, he arrived at Constantinople in Dec. 1802. In Nov. 1803 he went to Aleppo, where he remained till April 1805, engaged in the necessary preparation for his future journeys. He then repaired to Damascus, where during the summer he made excursions into the Haouran and other regions adjacent. In Jan. 1806 he left Damascus, and travelled through the countries east of the Jordan. He was the first modern traveller who visited the ruins of Jerrash (Gerasa) and Amman. He extended his journey as far south as Kerek, and then returned over Jerusalem to Acre, where he arrived in May 1806. He again visited Jerusalem; left it March 15, 1807, for Hebron; whence he departed March 27, travelling directly across the desert and mountains El Tyh, to Mount Sinai. He reached Cairo in May, where he remained most of the time for two years, visiting in the mean time different parts of Egypt, etc. In July 1809, he went to Djidda and Mecca, and proceeded in March 1810 to Yemen. The last letter received from him is dated at Mocha in Nov. 1810. Later accounts inform us only, that he died of poison on a journey from Mocha to Sana, in Oct. 1811. As a traveller, his name stands in the foremost rank; but alas! we have not yet received the full fruits of his labours. All the information which has been given to the public respecting his travels, is contained in his letters to Baron Zach, published in the various volumes of the *Monatliche Correspondenz*. His private journal or

ART. II. INTRODUCTION TO THE PSALMS.

From De Wette's "Commentar ueber die Psalmen." Translated by J. Torrey, Professor of Languages in the University of Vermont.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

IN presenting to the readers of this work the following elegant translation of De Wette's Introduction to the Psalms, it is proper to subjoin the following extract from a letter of the translator accompanying the manuscript. "It was my original design," he says, "to add a few notes to the translation of De Wette, not with a view of illustrating any of his main topics, but merely to express my dissent from him in those passages where his wild notions on the subject of inspiration come out. Upon further reflection I have abandoned it,—supposing that as a matter of course you will give some account of De Wette; and what it would be proper to say with respect to his dogmatical errors, would find its most appropriate place in such an introduction. A few words would set the matter in its proper light; and every reader might be easily made to understand, that the chief object of the writer is the *poetry* of the Psalms, and that the great merit of the piece consists in the ability with which that point is handled."

The suggestion here made in respect to an introductory notice of De Wette, it is not the intention of the Editor to comply with, any farther than to state that his theological views are already well known in this country as belonging to the rationalist school; and that therefore we are not to look, in this Introduction, for any thing more than a philological and rhetorical mode

diary, arranged by himself up to April 1809, is still in existence; and must of course contain the results of all his researches, except those connected with Arabia. It was, and probably is still, in the hands of Prof. Kruse, formerly of Halle, now of Dorpat. This gentleman once made preparations to publish it; but was prevented, it is said, by his inability to make out the Arabic words and names, and his unwillingness to employ another person to do this for him. It was stated to the writer by Gesenius, who had examined the manuscripts, that they contain few important general facts, more than have already been given to the public by Sctzen himself in his letters.—Ed.

of treating the subjects under consideration. Indeed, the light in which De Wette, Gesenius, and other critics of the same school regard the study and interpretation of the Scriptures, and their mode of handling the sacred volume, are precisely the same as Heyne and Wolf have followed in respect to the poems of Homer, and such as all critics and editors of classic authors daily practise. Their object is simply to arrive at a thorough and familiar acquaintance with the philological sense,—the diction, style, manner, rhythm, imagery, etc. of the sacred writers; leaving out of view entirely the question of any higher inspiration, in which they do not believe. Some appropriate remarks on De Wette in particular, from the pen of Prof. Stuart, may be seen in a former volume of this work; see Vol. I. p. 60, 61.

With these limitations, the following article may be recommended to the student of sacred literature, as an able and elegant exhibition of the characteristic features of Hebrew poetry in general, and of the Book of Psalms in particular. Indeed, as a writer of taste and poetical susceptibility, De Wette stands foremost in the ranks of German theologians. Viewed in this light, this essay cannot but prove attractive and useful in a high degree, to those who wish to drink deep of the pure and holy streams of Hebrew poetry at their original fountain.—EDITOR.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PSALMS.

I. *Poetical Character and Contents of the Psalms.*

The Psalms are *lyric poems*. This is all that is implied in the name which they bear. *Ψαλμός*, from *ψάλλειν*, *chordas tangere, fidibus canere*, signifies *the music of a stringed instrument, the sound of the lyre*, then, *a song sung to the music of the lyre*. This word is used by the Alexandrine translators for the Hebrew *זמיר*, as well as *ψάλλειν* for the verb *זמר*; but these Hebrew words, whatever may be their etymology,* have the signification of song accompanied with music. *Psalter* (*ψαλτήριον*), the name, which, in imitation of the Greeks, we give to

* Michaelis (ad Lowth. Praef. IV. not. 8) and Gesenius (ad verb.) have justly rendered suspicious the etymology from *זמר* to *prune sc. the vine*, whence, in Piel, to *speak in rhythmical periods* (caesuras), proposed by A. Schultens in Hariri Consess. p. 92, and by Lowth de Poesi sacra Hebraeorum p. 36. ed. Rosenm.

the collection of Psalms, properly denotes a *stringed instrument*, and the appellation is to be understood in the same manner, as when we give to a collection of lyric poems the title of *Lyre*.¹ The Jews call the Psalms תְּהִלִּים *songs of praise*, and the collection תְּהִלִּים נְשָׂא, also abbreviated, תְּהִלִּים, an appellation which applies to a part only of the Psalms. The term מְזֻמְרִים or שִׁירִים, *songs, odes*, would be more correct.

The Psalms are lyric in the proper sense; for with the Hebrews, as in the ancient world generally, song and music were connected, and the titles to most of the Psalms determine their connexion with music, though in a manner which is unintelligible to us. These compositions deserve, moreover, the name of lyric on account of their character as works of taste. The essence of lyric poetry is the immediate expression of feeling; and feeling is the sphere to which most of the Psalms belong. Pain, sorrow, fear, hope, joy, confidence, gratitude, submission to God, every thing that moves and elevates the soul, is expressed in these hymns. Most of them are the warm outpourings of the excited, susceptible heart; the fresh offspring of inspiration and elevation of thought; while only a few seem like the colder productions of artificial imitation, and a few others are simply forms of prayer, temple hymns, and collections of proverbs.

The Psalter may with much propriety be called a Lyric Anthology.² It contains the lyric productions of different authors belonging to different periods; for the title, "Psalms of David," is adopted only out of respect to the most distinguished portion of them. This anthology, however, contains merely the remnants of the lyric poetry of the Hebrews. The productions of this class were undoubtedly far more numerous, than would seem to have been the case from these remains, and spread through a wider and more diversified field. The Psalter is chiefly composed of religious and devotional hymns; but it cannot be maintained that the lyric poetry of the Hebrews was exclusively devoted to the service of religion and of the public worship. The supposition is sufficiently contradicted by those invaluable examples of another species of lyric poetry, which are preserved in other parts of the Scriptures; such as David's elegy over

¹ Thus the title is correctly explained by Euthym. Zigab. Praef. in Psalm. ed. le Moyne p. 172.

² Augusti (Einleit. ins A. T. § 158) compares it not amiss with the Anthology of the Greeks.

Saul and Jonathan, the Song at the well, Numbers 21: 17, and especially the Song of Solomon; although the last belongs to a somewhat different branch of poetical composition. In the book of *Psalms* itself, there is one production which possesses an altogether secular character, namely, Ps. 45. Probably we are indebted, for most of the hymns which are extant, to the religious use to which they were consecrated, rather than to any common poetical sympathy; and hence so few secular songs have been preserved from destruction.

In respect to their contents and character, the *Psalms* may be classified in the following manner.

I. *Hymns*, in praise of Jehovah. (1) Generally, as God of nature and of man, Ps. 8, 104, 145.—(2) As God of nature and of Israel, Ps. 19, 29, 33, 65, 93, 135, 136, 147, and others.—(3) As God of Israel, Ps. 47, 66, 67, 75.—(4) As Saviour and Helper (*a*) of Israel Ps. 46, 47, 48, 75, 76; (*b*) of individuals, Ps. 18, 30, 138, and others. This class contains the most sublime thoughts respecting God, nature, the government of the world, etc. and furnishes the sources of many doctrinal ideas.

II. *National Psalms*, containing allusions to the ancient history of the Israelites, and to the relation of the people to Jehovah, Ps. 78, 105, 106, 114.

III. *Psalms of Zion and of the Temple*, Ps. 15, 24, 68, 81, 87, 132, 134, 135.

IV. *Psalms relating to the King*, Ps. 2, 20, 21, 45, 72, 110.

V. *Psalms*, which contain *complaints* under affliction and the persecution of enemies, and prayers for succour; the most numerous class, comprising more than a third part of the whole collection. These *Psalms* of complaint are: (1) Personal, relating to the case of an individual, Ps. 7, 22, 55, 56, 109, and others. (2) National, Ps. 44, 74, 79, 80, 137, and others. (3) Personal and national at the same time, Ps. 69, 77, 102. From these divisions proceed still others. (4) General *Psalms* of complaint, reflections on the wickedness of the world, Ps. 10, 12, 14, 36. (5) Didactic *Psalms*, respecting the condition of the pious and of the godless, Ps. 37, 49, 73. (6) *Psalms* of thanksgiving for deliverance from enemies, which also pass over into the first class, Ps. 34, 40, and others.*

* Respecting the *'salms of Complaint*, and the order in which they follow each other, see the author's "Beytrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus in: Studien herausgeg. von Daub und Creuzer." III. B. 2. H. p. 252 sq.

VI. *Religious and moral Psalms.* (1) Odes to Jehovah with special allusions, Ps. 90, 139. (2) Expressions of religious conviction, hope, confidence, Ps. 23, 91, 121, 127, 128. (3) Expressions of religious experience, resolutions, etc. Ps. 42, 43, 101, 131. (4) Development of religious or moral ideas, Ps. 1, 133. (5) Didactic poems relating to religion, Ps. 32, 50. (6) Collections of proverbs in alphabetical order, Ps. 119.

The few which cannot be brought under any of the above classes and divisions, either constitute new ones by themselves, or possess an intermediate character. Another formal, rhetorical arrangement into odes, songs, elegies, etc. has been proposed by Augusti,* which, however, borrowed as it is from the poetry of the Greeks, seems to be scarcely applicable to the formless and peculiar character of the Hebrew poetry. Thus the plaintive Psalms deserve not always the name of elegies; for the beautiful melancholy which is the characteristic of this species of composition, is absent from the most of them, and they are rather marked by the presence of more agitating passions.

From this account of the character and contents of the Psalms their importance in a religious respect becomes evident. Among all the books of the Bible there is, perhaps, no one so rich in this particular as the Psalter. Others, as the Pentateuch, or the Prophets, may furnish the religious inquirer with more materials relating to the positive views of religion, symbolic forms, etc. but the Psalter is the great fountain and source of *religious experience*, and on this account, worthy of very special attention in all inquiries into the history of religion. For religion is found in its true life and existence only where it lives in the heart of the individual; no sooner does it pass into the forms of doctrine and symbolic representation, than it becomes in a certain sense ossified—a mere skeleton. What a variety of religious feelings and thoughts is contained in the Psalms! On this point there are some fine remarks of Luther, in his preface to the Psalter. “Where do we find a sweeter voice of joy than in the Psalms of thanksgiving and praise? There you look into the heart of all the holy, as into a beautiful garden, as into heaven itself. What delicate, sweet, and lovely flowers are there springing up of all manner of beautiful, joyous thoughts towards God and his goodness. On the other hand, where do you find more profound, mournful, pathetic expressions of sorrow,

* Einleit. ins A. T. § 159, and Prakt. Einleit. in die Psalmen, p. 11.
Vol. III. No. 11.

than the plaintive *Psalms* contain? There again you look into the heart of all the holy, but as into death, nay, as into the very pit of despair. How dark and gloomy is every thing there, arising from all manner of melancholy apprehension of God's displeasure!—I hold that there has never appeared on earth, and never can appear a more precious book of examples and legends of saints than the *Psalter* is. For here we find not merely what one or two holy men have done, but what the Head himself of all the holy has done, and what all the holy do still. How they stand affected towards God, towards friends and enemies, how they behave and sustain themselves in all dangers and sufferings. Besides, that all manner of divine and salutary instructions and commands are contained therein.—Hence, too, it comes, that the *Psalter* forms, as it were, a *little book of all saints*, in which every man, in whatever situation he may be placed, shall find *Psalms* and sentiments, which shall apply to his own case, and be the same to him, as if they were, for his own sake alone, so expressed, that he could not express them himself, nor find, nor even wish them, better than they are."

But even in a doctrinal point of view also, the *Psalter* is of great importance, although modern historical interpretation has pronounced to be inadmissible, as it is obliged to do, many doctrinal allusions, especially to the Messiah. Of the doctrines respecting God, providence, retribution, and others of that class, many of the *Psalms* contain the chief sources of proof.*

II. *Origin and Cultivation of lyric Poetry among the Hebrews.*

If we follow the titles of the *Psalms* and the common opinion, we must suppose the lyric poetry of the Hebrews, as well as the largest portion of the *Psalms* themselves, a production of David and his contemporaries. The few specimens of lyric composition, which we find before David, scarcely enter into consideration, compared with the fertility of his own period. In the earlier history it is but occasionally that the voice of poetry is heard, as in the songs of Moses at the Red Sea, of Deborah, and of Hannah. We are surprised, after so few attempts in lyric poetry, to see so accomplished and fruitful a poet rise up all at once, with several others in his company. So rapid a progress supposes some adequate occasion, some preparatory steps. Now if we cast our

* For the development of the religious and moral ideas which are contained in the *Psalter*, consult Augusti *Prakt. Einleit. in die Psalmen*, im dritten Theile von Berger's *prakt. Einleit. in das A. T.*

eye over the history of the times immediately preceding the age of David, we are presented with a phenomenon, which seems to explain the difficulty. It is Samuel's school of the prophets. Many, as Herder,¹ Eichhorn,² Nachtigall,³ and Rosenmueller,⁴ suppose that the composition of Psalms was cultivated and brought to perfection in this seminary.⁵ Specious as this conjecture appears, it is hardly reconcilable with the facts of the history. It is not intimated that David, before his unction, had any connexion with Samuel. The former tends his father's flock. Indeed Samuel appears to have had no acquaintance with David, when he comes to anoint him, 1 Sam. 16: 6 sq. Yet David is already a skillful minstrel, and famed for his art, ib. v. 18; he was not, therefore a disciple of Samuel, at least in minstrelsy. But it is well known that music and song at this period were not separated; we must therefore suppose that David was already a poet, and as such, known and celebrated. Sometime afterwards, it is true, we find David in Samuel's school of the prophets, but it is only on the occasion of his flight from Saul; 1 Sam. 19: 18sq. It may be possible, that Samuel had some acquaintance with David, prior to his unction, though no mention is made of it in the account of that transaction, 1 Sam. c. 16. But he might have been an object of attention to the prophet, without being properly his disciple; or perhaps the youth was his own instructor. Natural capacity, in connexion with frequent practice, might produce the same degree of talent, to say the least, as an artificial system of instruction, like that which we may suppose to have prevailed in the prophetic school. At the same time, it would be an error to imagine that lyric poetry arose amongst the Hebrews all at once, as if it sprung out of the ground. David's contemporaries, the women who celebrated with song and joy his victory over Goliath, practised a species of poetry, which, though rude and uncultivated, was truly lyric in its kind; their short pæan,

Saul smote his thousands,
But David his ten thousands,

¹ Geist der hebr. Poesie, II. 301. ² Einleit. ins A. T. IV. § 620.

³ Ueber Samuels Sängerversammlung in Henke's Magaz. VI. 1. 38. reprinted in: Psalmen gesungen vor David's Thronbesteigung p. 3.

⁴ Prolegg. in Psalm. Cap. 1.

⁵ The hint had already been given by Carpzov, Introd. ad Libr. can. Bibl. V. T. Part. II. p. 97. and by Lowth, De sacra Poesi Hebr. Præl. XXV. p. 287. ed. Rosenm.

has already the form of the poetic parallelism, and an original and superior mind might easily advance from such a beginning to the highest degree of excellence. We find also, still earlier, in addition to the examples of Moses, Deborah, and Hannah, which have already been noticed, the practice, particularly among the women, of music and the dance, from which song certainly was not excluded. Jephthah's daughter comes out to meet her father with timbrels and dances; Judges 11: 34. At Shiloh the maidens held a yearly feast with dances; Judges 21: 21. It may be questioned whether Samson was not a minstrel, for he is called out to *play* before the Philistines, Judges 16: 25; which is commonly understood to refer to the dance, but excludes not the accompaniments of song and instrumental music. But even if he was not strictly speaking a musician and singer, yet we meet in him with the first *Mashal* poet, as we have also from the same period the masterly apologue of Jotham. Such facts, though insulated, pre-suppose among a people a considerably high degree of cultivation, or at least of poetical capacity. Indeed, the song of Deborah alone proves, that the poetic art was already arrived at a stage of improvement sufficient to account for the origin of the Davidian poetry. Whether a period produces one admirable poem, or more, is a matter of chance rather than the result of the state of culture. Besides, the times of the Judges and of Samuel constituted the heroic age of the Hebrews, a period peculiarly favourable to the first beginnings and gradual improvement of poetry. "Such times," says Eichhorn, "are poetical under every climate;" but I cannot add with him, "that poetry, in this case, is like the nation, wild and heroic, breathes only in the warlike trump, and knows no field for practice but that of valour and victory with their attendant train." The occasions which first called forth the Hebrew poets were, probably enough, connected with war; but when poetry has once sprung into life, she confines herself to no such narrow limits, and draws still other objects within her circle. With feasts of victory, sacrifices, dances and other rites were united, which might easily have tempered the song to a tone of somewhat softer character. Even warlike songs admit of the gentler emotions, and the song of Deborah is rich in touches of amiable feeling. When it is said they sung to the trumpet, we are certainly not to understand it in the literal sense; the music of the harp, of the flute, and of the timbrel, was the accompaniment even of the songs of war, and these instruments

are adapted to the softest tones. We are not then obliged to trace the origin of the sweet and amiable poetry of David's Psalms exclusively to Samuel's school of the prophets.

Unfortunately we know far too little about the prophetic school of Samuel to determine what influence it had on the cultivation of poetry. The passages relating to it are 1 Sam. 10: 5, and 19: 19, 20. In the first of these it is undoubtedly implied that the disciples of the prophets had music among them, and their "prophesying" (הִתְנַבֵּא) has been understood, not without grounds, in the sense of song; for the word נָבִיא sometimes signifies *poet*, Ex. 15: 20, and נָבִיא *to sing*, 1 Chr. 25: 1 sq.¹ We may suppose, however, that this music was employed simply as a support and accompaniment of the prophetic delivery. The prophets probably delivered their messages, in the earlier times at least, in connexion with music and a vehement action and declamation approaching to a dance. The passage in 2 K. 3: 15 sq. is remarkable. The prophet Elisha is about to pronounce the answer of the Lord to certain inquiries of Jehoshaphat; but before he does it, he asks for a minstrel, and as the latter strikes the harp, "the hand of Jehovah comes upon him," and he utters his reply. The case here it is true, is different; the prophet does not play and sing himself, but submits to the performance of another; still it shows the constant connexion of music with the prophetic office. Neither is it distinctly asserted in the passages above, that the company of the prophets *sung*, themselves. The word הִתְנַבֵּא which is there employed, may not perhaps signify *to sing*, for Saul and Saul's messengers prophesy (הִתְנַבְּאוּ) as soon as they hear the music, without preparation or practice. Their prophesying was perhaps nothing more than a vehement action, dancing, and gesticulation, as we see from the circumstance of Saul's falling down naked. At farthest, they might have joined in the choral song with the company of prophets.² Such choral chants were perhaps sung in the school of Samuel, but only for the purposes of devotion and inspiration; and the proper design of this school was to educate youth for the prophetic office, that is, to give counsel from the Lord to a people under a theocratic government. Samuel was a prophet, and history has preserved no remains of

¹ Com. Pfeiffer über die Musik der alten Hebräer p. 18.

² So Nachtigall, l. c. p. 65.

any poetical works of his.¹ Is it not most probable that he was aiming to educate his disciples likewise for the prophetic office? Now it is true, that the Hebrews drew no accurate line of distinction between lyric poetry and prophetic eloquence; yet these two always differ, particularly in the mode of delivery; for the lyric poem was probably sung, while the prophetic message was only recited. Supposing then Samuel was employed in forming his disciples to be prophetic poets or speakers, what is more natural than to imagine that some of them might feel drawn by genius and inclination to lyric poetry, and succeed in perfecting themselves in this?—Yet it lay out of the plan of the prophetic school, and was a thing quite accidental.² It is hardly correct, therefore, to consider the prophetic school of Samuel simply as an institution for the cultivation of singing and poetry.³

There were other institutions which may have had an influence still more important and decided, than this school of the prophets, in promoting the culture of lyric poetry, especially of the religious kind. I refer particularly to those musical schools which according to the account 1 Chron. 15: 16 sq. were founded by David in aid of the public worship; yet I cannot retract the unfavourable opinion I once pronounced upon these and similar narratives in the Chronicles;⁴ I must rather confirm it. Besides the reasons there alleged, which I may not repeat, it seems to me to be a circumstance particularly calculated to excite suspicion, that the Psalms and fragments of Psalms, represented by the Chronicles to have been sung at the dedication of the tabernacle and on similar occasions, can hardly have been penned by David, but belong rather to the later and less

¹ Nachtigall ascribes to Samuel, Psalms 90. 19: 8—15. 103: 1—18. 145, but without foundation. Uebersetz. d. Psalm. p. 67.

² Respecting the design of Samuel's school of the prophets, learned men differ. Eichhorn considers it to have been merely a work of accident and inclination. Rosenmueller on the other hand regards it as an institution for national culture, and compares Samuel in this respect with Orpheus. Nachtigall views it as a political institution.

³ Ernst Gottlob Bengel (Dissert. ad introductiones in librum Psalmorum supplementa quaedam. Tub. 1806. p. 5) brings a number of good arguments against this hypothesis, particularly in the shape in which Nachtigall presents it, and although he does not wholly reject it, yet insists upon great modifications.

⁴ See the author's *Beiträge zur Einleit. ins A. T. I. B.* p. 85 sq.

pure style of the temple poetry. The Psalm which is sung 1 Chron. 16: 8 sq. is composed of Ps. 105 and 96. But both are productions of a later style, as we shall endeavour to show. If the Chronicles had presented us on this occasion with a genuine song of David, such as the elegy for which we are indebted to 2 Samuel c. 1, this circumstance would have contributed not a little to add weight to its authority; but the insertion of these fragments throws suspicion over the whole of the accompanying narrative. The phrase also, quoted 1 Chron. 16: 41, and elsewhere, respecting the Levites who were appointed to give thanks to the Lord, "because his mercy endureth forever," betrays the later poetry of the temple, an example of which we have in Ps. 136, where this phrase forms a regular refrain. Also Psalms 106, 107, and 118, in which this phrase occurs, appear to belong to a later style of poetry.

We may imagine that a master like David would not be without companions and assistants in the poetic art; and in fact, several of David's contemporaries are named in the titles as composers of Psalms; but these notices, as we shall see, are not always good authority. Solomon, according to the testimony of history, united in himself such richness of lyric invention with the sententious style peculiar to him, that in his time lyric poetry must have attained to a very high degree of perfection. 'Solomon spake three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five;' 1 K. 4: 32. It is singular, however, that with the exception of two which are quite uncertain, no Psalms of Solomon are preserved in our present collection. Nor do we find any Psalm with the author's name belonging to the period after Solomon; not even one which admits of being referred with certainty and of necessity to any particular event in the history of those times; and yet such lyric poems as those of Hezekiah and of Habakkuk clearly evince, that during this period the culture of lyric composition had by no means fallen into neglect.¹ On the contrary, we have many Psalms, which, according to the results of a sound critical exegesis almost universally acknowledged, must be placed in the times of the captivity, and after the captivity;²

¹ Ps. 46, 48, are referred, it is true, to the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib, or to the war of Jehoshaphat; but only from conjecture.

² The supposition that some of the Psalms might belong to the

and these Psalms rank, for purity of language, and for sublimity, beauty, and freshness of conception, in the highest class, and are, in no respect, inferior to the poems of David and his contemporaries, e. g. Ps. 45, 74, 79, 107, and many if not all of the Psalms of Degrees. We are here presented, then, with a singular phenomenon. The lyric poetry of the Hebrews, which was cultivated and brought to perfection in the times of David, after producing abundance of fruit, sunk into a repose of nearly five hundred years, and then all at once, in the most calamitous period of the state, arose again, survived another golden age, and yielded a second harvest;—a phenomenon hardly corresponding with the common course of events.¹ The singularity, however, disappears, as soon as we suppose that the collection of Psalms contains several pieces, either anonymous or incorrectly named, which belong to the period extending from David to the captivity. Indeed, it is in the highest degree probable that lyric composition flourished side by side with the prophetic poetry, and that many of the prophets themselves contributed to our present collection, and might reclaim their own productions from David and others. Some of the prophets, too, are actually named by the Septuagint as authors of Psalms.

III. *Authors of the Psalms.*

The opinion of the Talmud,² of many of the fathers,³ and even of the moderns, as Bartolucci and others, that David was the author of all the Psalms, is contradicted by the very titles, which give the names of several authors of Psalms. Augustine

Maccabean age, to which we were once inclined, is contradicted by the probable history of the Old Testament canon, which would be completed, according to that supposition, at too late a period. See Hassler de Psalmis Maccabaicis, P. I. Ulm. 1827. 4.

¹ Bengel l. c. p. 16, who ascribes several of the Psalms to the Maccabean age, accounts for so late a revival of lyric poetry from the religious enthusiasm of that time. That a loftier spirit animated this period, he appositely proves from the example of Sirach, to whom he attributes the spirit of David, and whose chap. 36 he justly compares with Ps. 74, 76, 80, 83.

² Cod. Pesachim c. 10. f. 117.

³ Augustinus de civit. Dei XVII. 14. Chrysostom. in Proleg. ad Psalm. Euthym. Zigab. Præf. in Psalm. p. 172.

understands these names as referring, not to the authors, but to the individuals whom David, in composing the Psalms, prophetically represented; and the Talmud, in another passage,¹ says: David wrote the Psalms by tradition from, or in the succession or after the manner of, (עַל-יְדֵי, comp. Ezra 3: 10,) Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph, the children of Korah, and others still earlier, even Adam himself.² But Jerome,³ and Aben-Ezra,⁴ considered those persons as the authors, whose names are found in the titles. It has nevertheless been doubted, whether the designation לְדָוִד, לְאַסָּף, as it appears in the titles, ought to be understood as really denoting authorship. Many have taken the ל as synonymous with בְּגִבּוֹר, *on account of, on occasion of, etc.* Others have supposed that it referred to the subject, *of, concerning.* The Seventy translate τῷ Δαυὶδ, τῷ Ἀσάφ. The older divines, as Carpzov,⁵ would supply the phrase, "given by the Holy Spirit." The common opinion that this ל points to the authors, may be supported by numerous passages, in which ל marks a genitive; one of the most pertinent is Habak. 3: 1, הַתְּפִלָּה בְּהַבְקִיטָה הַזֶּבֶבִיא.⁶ Thus the Arabians employ their ج to designate an author.⁷ Consequently the phrase לְדָוִד קָרָה must also be understood of authorship, as Carpzov⁸ justly remarks; but as it is difficult to suppose several authors of one Psalm, Eichhorn understands it,⁹ in this case, as referring to the persons to whom was committed the business of setting the Psalm to music. We may, however, and indeed must, understand it in the sense of authorship, but with the qualification, that in strict propriety the title should have ascribed the Psalm to one of the Korahites only; but as the individual was unknown, it mentioned them all, so that the phrase should be rendered, a Korahite Psalm. When the ל is joined with names which evidently designate, not the authors but the subjects, e. g. Ps. 72 לְשִׁלְמֹה, Ps. 21 לְדָוִד, where probably Solomon and David are the subjects of the songs; we are tempted to ascribe

¹ Bava Bathra f. 14.² Comp. Bertholdt. Einl. I. 1971.³ Ep. ad Sophronium.⁴ Preface to Com. on Psalms.⁵ Introd. II. p. 96.⁶ Comp. Storr Observatt. ad Analog. et Syntax. Hebr. p. 291.⁷ Comp. Chr. Ben. Michaelis Diss. qua Soloecismus casuum ab Ebraismo sacri Codicis depellitur. § XIII. p. 15, 16.⁸ Ad l. c. p. 97.⁹ Einl. IV. § 226.

to it another signification ;¹ but it is still better to suppose that some gross mistakes were committed by the authors of these titles, from which in other respects they cannot be pronounced wholly free. The following are the authors mentioned in the titles.

I. To *Moses*, the 90th Psalm is ascribed ; with what propriety is a question not so completely set at rest as Eichhorn imagines, and which has been doubted by many. The Talmudists ascribe also the ten next succeeding Psalms to Moses, in accordance with the rule that the anonymous Psalms belong to the last mentioned author, a rule which is adopted also by Jerome and Origen. But this supposition is unsupported, and has been fairly refuted by Jahn.²

II. *David* is the most distinguished and fruitful contributor to the collection of Psalms. Seventy four Psalms are ascribed to him ;³ to these the Seventy add ten more,⁴ (or eleven if we count Ps. 10 which they unite with Ps. 9,) and many of the learned⁵ add all, or nearly all, the anonymous Psalms.⁶ But according to the judgment of the best expositors, (Eichhorn, Rosenmueller, Bauer, Jahn, and others,) many of the Psalms which bear David's name cannot be his, as they contain allusions to the siege of Jerusalem, the Babylonian captivity, and similar events belonging to a later age, besides occasional Chaldaisms. To this number belong Ps. 14, 69, 103, 122 and other Psalms of degrees, Ps. 139, and others. But from this circumstance

¹ E. G. Bengel, l. c. p. 19 sq. thinks that דָּוִדִּים especially, when it stands alone or before דָּוִדִּים, denotes the age and the subject rather than the author.

² Einl. II. 706. Ps. 100 mentions Samuel, and cannot therefore have been composed until after Samuel.

³ According to Cod. 39 Kenn. Ps. 66 besides. And according to Cod. 89. 214 Kenn. Cod. 34. (a pr. m.) 874. (corr.) de Ross. also Ps. 67.—Rosenmueller and Eichhorn number only 71.

⁴ Namely Ps. 33, 43, 91, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 104.

⁵ E. g. Carpzov l. c. p. 97.

⁶ This is done upon the authority of 1 Chron. 16: 7, which represents the anonymous Psalms 96-105, as having been sung at the consecration of the tabernacle ; and on that of the New Testament in which (Acts 4: 25) the second, and (Heb. 4: 7) the 95th Psalms are quoted under the name of David. For an answer to this argument, see Rosenmueller Prolegg. XV. Stark Davidis Carmina Vol. I. P. II. p. 405 sqq.

I am led, in accordance with my own principles of criticism, to regard as a problematical question the genuineness of the remaining Psalms which are ascribed to David. It is not enough, that barely the contents and character of a Psalm do not contradict the title; there must be positive grounds of internal probability to remove the suspicion which rests on the title. Still less safe is it to ascribe anonymous Psalms to David; the grounds which are alleged for it are extremely weak and unsatisfactory.—The great number of the Psalms ascribed to David is no argument against their genuineness, though the same cannot be said of their uniformity. Many especially of the plaintive and mournful Psalms, have the same subject matter, tone and situation. No poet repeats himself thus; least of all would one do so, who was capable of composing such an elegy as that upon Saul and Jonathan. Among these Psalms there are certainly many which are imitated from David; comp. Ps. 22 and 69, and others.

The character attributed to David's poetry by almost all commentators is that of sweetness, elegance, grace; they deny it sublimity, a judgment in which I cannot fully acquiesce. Psalms like 18, 19, 60, 65, indisputably claim to be called sublime. Most of David's productions are Psalms of complaint and supplication, and these, it must be confessed, are of inferior poetical merit.

III. *Asaph* is named as the author of twelve Psalms. The one here intended was probably the son of Berachiah, of the tribe of Levi and family of Gershom, who appears in the character of David's master of song, and as a poet, with the honourable title of seer, אֲזַחֵּב, 1 Chron. 6: 24. 15: 17. 16: 5. 2 Chron. 29: 30. With the exception of the 50th and perhaps the 73d, the Psalms ascribed to him cannot have been his, for they contain marks of a later time, allusions to later objects, events and circumstances. Ps. 74, 79, describe the desolation of the temple and of the city; Ps. 80 refers itself to the captivity; Ps. 77 alludes to the later national calamities of the Hebrews, and already presupposes a division of the state. To judge from Ps. 50 and 73, *Asaph* was a master in didactic poetry; the sentiments and language are equally admirable.

IV. To the *Sons of Korah*, a levitical family of singers,¹ are ascribed eleven of the most beautiful Psalms, distinguished for sprightliness of feeling, rapidity of movement, and lofty concep-

¹ Comp. 1 Chron. 6: 33 sq. 9: 19. 26: 1. 2 Chron. 20: 19.

tion. But many, Eichhorn among others, deny their claims to the authorship of these hymns, and imagine they were only committed to the Korahites for the purpose of being set to music. It is the opinion of Carpzov (l. c. p. 106), that a few of the more distinguished of the sons of Korah were the authors; and in this he is followed by Rosenmueller, on Ps. 42. Most of these Psalms belong to a later period—to the captivity or the times after the captivity, e. g. Ps. 44, 84, 85, and others.

V. *Heman*, the Ezrahite, is named in the title of the 88th Psalm; and *Ethan* the Ezrahite, in that of the 89th. They are probably the same who are mentioned 1 Chron. 6: 18, 29, as levitical singers in the time of David, and 1 K. 5: 11, as men of wisdom. Both Psalms, at all events the 89th, are later, and could not have been written by contemporaries of David.

VI. *Solomon's* name is found annexed to two of the Psalms, Ps. 72, 127, which, however, are hardly his; Ps. 72 at least can be referred to him only as the subject.

The Seventy name besides as authors, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Haggai*, and *Zechariah*, probably from conjecture merely.¹ Modern expositors have also attempted to ascertain the authors of several of the anonymous Psalms. This, however, is a matter attended with the greatest uncertainty.²

IV. *Original and imitative, earlier and later Character of the Psalms.*

An inquiry of the greatest importance, involving a thorough understanding of the Psalms, in an exegetical and critical sense, and as works of taste, is that which has for its object to distinguish between what is original and what is imitated in the poetical style of these productions. It is a subject which has hitherto

¹ Comp. Eichhorn, § 622. p. 27 sq. Bertholdt (Einl. V. 1963) thinks that these titles by the Seventy, do not designate the authors, but refer to the liturgical use for which certain Psalms were selected by these prophets.

² It is a conjecture of Augusti (Einl. p. 189. n. 2) that the author of Ps. 45 was Mordecai, and of Ps. 46 Hezekiah. The first is very probable, for this ode may be very appositely referred to a Persian king; less so to Solomon, in accordance with the common opinion.

met with but little attention,¹ and scarcely more than a few hints can be offered at present. There are pieces, which bear in their language, form and matter, the character of originality, and assert themselves as free, living productions of poetic inspiration in certain actual situations of life. There are others, on the contrary, which appear as though they originated from imitation, and their authors wrote without being impelled by their feelings, or situation, or any particular call to the culture of poetry. In many of them, indeed, we remark verbal reminiscences from models evidently before the writer's mind. That very abundant class of the plaintive Psalms contains many pieces, which, to my feeling, are evident imitations. How can we else account for the fact, that they have mainly the same plan, tone, and contents? Eichhorn justly recognizes in Ps. 69 an imitation, perhaps a direct one, of Ps. 22; and so Ps. 25, 35, 88, and others, contain much that is in the same style. Whoever has but once cursorily perused the Psalms of this class, must have been struck with the reiterated and as it were standing thoughts, phrases, and images which they contain. The question why this particular class of Psalms should exhibit so many marks of imitation, may be very easily resolved, if we adopt that mode of explaining them, which I have proposed, viz. if we consider them as referring to the national calamities of the Hebrews, their oppression and persecution by foreign enemies.² How many Jews were thrown at different periods into one and the same situation! They sought consolation in breathing out their sorrow in prayer and song, and eagerly caught at the strains poured forth by the older poets in similar circumstances, and imitated or altered them in accommodation to their own circumstances, feelings, and taste; for as with the Jews a written production in the hand was not considered as the property of another, and seems not to have been regarded with the same respect which we consider to be due to such property, no one hesitated to add to it his own thoughts, and to throw it into any other form which he pleased. Besides these plaintive Psalms, those of the alphabetic and hallelujah class are not without marks of imitation. The class of non-original Psalms which

¹ A few thoughts on this subject may be found in Eichhorn l. c. § 622. Not. o. § 624. Not. b. c. § 628. Not. l.—and in Paulus Clavis über die Psalmen, Einl. zu Ps. 31, 36, etc.

² Comp. Studien l. c. p. 252 sq.

possess the least merit, are such as are composed, either wholly or in part, of others. To this number belong Ps. 108, which is composed of Ps. 57: 8—12, and Ps. 60: 7—14; also Ps. 70, which is only a fragment of Ps. 40. Some of the better class also contain passages borrowed from others, as Ps. 144 from Ps. 18, and Ps. 68 from Deborah's song.¹

Intimately connected with this species of criticism is another which respects the comparative age of the Psalms. I might hazard the assertion, that a Psalm is the older, in proportion to the difficulty and awkwardness of its phraseology, the fulness, freedom and compression of its thoughts,—and the later, in proportion to the ease, elegance and facility of its language, and the perspicuity, plainness, and exact arrangement of its matter.² The later Psalms, for example, are composed in a language acquired by art, not in the language of life. But it is not easy to use a dead language with the freedom and originality which give rise to idiomatic difficulties; the writer is confined to old and known forms. Hence the facility of the language of the later Psalms. Besides, the later poets had an easier task, because their fore-runners had already broken the path for them. The same is true of the subject matter, in which too the preceding models have been imitated. We may expect with a good degree of certainty to find the older Psalms in the first books, the later in the last.³ Their poetical merit, however, is often in an inverse proportion to their age. Many of the Songs of Degrees, the Korahite Psalms, Ps. 45, 137, etc. rank in the highest class as productions of taste, and yet belong to the later period. Purity of language, moreover, is no certain mark of antiquity; for there were those, even after the captivity, who were capable of writing the Hebrew language with great purity, notwithstanding it was no longer the native tongue.

No man can flatter himself with having entered fully into the spirit of the Psalms, if he has not felt the necessity of this previous critical discrimination; it may therefore be recommended

¹ Similar facts occur in the popular poetry of all nations. The popular songs of the Germans, collected by Arnim and Brentano, frequently present such affinities and reminiscences; most of them being imitations.

² Similar is also the judgment of Dathe, *Psalmenübers.* p. 147.

³ It is well known that the interpretation of the first books is attended with far greater difficulties, than that of the last.

to expositors, to bestow the pains which they have hitherto fruitlessly expended on the barren field of historical interpretation, upon this branch of criticism which has been so entirely neglected.

V. *Collection and Arrangement of the Psalms.*

The opinion of the Talmud, that David was the collector of the Psalter,¹ requires no confutation. The Fathers and old expositors, (Jerome, Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Carpzov, Huet, and others,) ascribe the collection to Ezra, in accordance with the well known tradition that the canon of the Old Testament proceeded from him. But even Carpzov² supposes that prior to the last and principal collection, and as early as the time of Hezekiah, a smaller collection was extant, which comprised the first seventy-two Psalms, and concluded with the formula, "the Psalms of David are ended," which we still find at the close of the 72d Psalm. Eichhorn also, and other moderns regard this formula as a proof that Ps. 1—72 once formed a collection by themselves, as it could not have proceeded from the author of the entire collection, because many Psalms of David appear among those which follow. It should seem that these last were not added to the first collection until a later period; and this was done, perhaps, as Eichhorn supposes, in the form of three distinct collections. Another more plausible theory for explaining this formula, is that of Jahn, who proposes the following hypothesis respecting the collection of the Psalms. "In the five books of the Psalms, we have before us just so many distinct collections of Psalms, which were made in the same order in which they follow one another. It was the intention of the first collector to furnish exclusively songs of David; the second annexed his collection to that of the first, and intended to give the gleanings of David's songs, not hesitating, however, to introduce other songs in addition. The collector of the third book no longer had particularly in view the songs of David; and as he wished to annex his own collection to the foregoing, he subjoined to the 72d Psalm the formula signifying that the Psalms of David were ended. The fourth collector confined himself to anonymous effusions; hence he furnishes but one Psalm of Moses and two Psalms of David. The fifth,

¹ Cod. Berachot. c. 1. f. 9.

² L. c. p. 106 sq.

lastly, brought together all the sacred songs which were still to be found."* In fact, the concluding phrase of the second book cannot, as Carpzov, Eichhorn, and others imagine, have been the concluding title of a previous independent collection; for in this case it would not read 'בְּגֵרֹ וְגֵר', *end of the Psalms of David*, but 'אֵלֶּה הֵם פְּסַלְמֵי דָוִד', *these are the Psalms of David*, like similar concluding titles which occur in the Pentateuch, Lev. 26: 46. 26: 34. Num. 36: 13. It is rather a mark of distinction, like the similar phrases Job. 32: 40, 'תַּבְּנִי דְבַרֵי א', *end of the words of Job*, and Jer. 51: 64, 'עַד-הֵנָּה דְבַרֵי יְרֵמְיָהוּ', *thus far the words of Jeremiah*,—which are designed to separate what precedes from what follows, and probably, in the latter example at least, were annexed for the purpose of designating later additions. It is very probable that the first book is the oldest collection. The second book, which seems to have been formed out of a number of separate minor collections and supplements, (for Ps. 42—49 are all from the sons of Korah, and Ps. 51—65 all from David,) was added at a later period. Similar appears to have been the origin of the third collection, in which the songs of Asaph stand together at the beginning, (Ps. 73—83,) and are followed, for the most part, by Korahite Psalms. As it contains but one Psalm of David (Ps. 86), the mark of distinction at the end of the second book was probably inserted by the collector of the third book. The two last books also were collected and added to the others in a similar manner. They contain the greatest number of liturgic pieces, and the peculiar collection of the Songs of Degrees, Ps. 120—134.

At any rate, we must suppose the collection of the Psalms was made gradually. There is a prevailing want of order in it; pieces of like character are not brought together; songs of David are found scattered in all the five books; those of Asaph are separated as widely from each other as those of the Korahites, etc. But again, in the midst of this disorder, we remark a certain order; the majority of David's Psalms stand together, Ps. 3—41. It is so also with the songs of the Korahites, of Asaph, and the Songs of Degrees; a circumstance which evinces that they have been brought together from many separate collections. In this view, we may also account for the fact that one Psalm occurs twice. Ps. 14 is the same with Ps. 53. But less satisfactorily does this account for the recurrence of separate portions of Psalms, as in the case of Ps. 70 and Ps. 108.

* Einleit. II. 718 sq.

It is as little possible for us to know who were the authors of the several particular collections, as who was the compiler of the whole. It cannot be true, as many suppose, that David himself prepared the first collection, because among the first Psalms there appear several of an altogether later date, as Ps. 14, 44, 45, 46, 48. Besides, David would hardly have given himself the honourable epithet of *servant of Jehovah*, which is annexed to his name in two of the titles, Ps. 18, 36. Even Carpzov looked upon the first collection as a private undertaking.¹ The age of these collections may be determined with greater certainty. The two first, Ps. 1—72, cannot have been completed until after the captivity, since pieces are found in them, which belong to the period of the captivity, Ps. 14, 44, 45; but the collection of the whole was certainly not finished until a considerable time afterwards, though it must have been completed before the translation of Jes. Sir. 130 B. C.—as early as which, the collection of Psalms was probably translated into Greek.² As it respects the design of the collection of the Psalms, it may be remarked, that they who suppose it was made in behalf of the musical service of the Temple, entertain too limited views of the object;³ besides that this supposition is irreconcilable with the fact of its having probably originated from private collections. A religious use, however, was undoubtedly the aim by which the collectors were guided, at least in general. The 45th Psalm, which is so entirely secular, must be considered as an accidental exception, unless we are indebted for its insertion to the allegorical method of interpretation, which may also have been the means of preserving from destruction the Song of Solomon.

The collection of Psalms is divided into five books, each of ¹

¹ Comp. Eichhorn. § 624. Carpzov l. c. p. 107.

² Bengel. l. c. p. 21 sq. holds the first book to be the earliest collection, which originated either in the age of David, or soon after (?); next appeared the second book, as a supplementary collection, not earlier than the close of the reign of Hezekiah, perhaps not till the time of Ezra. He sets the second part of Psalms, Ps. 73—150, in the Maccabean age, because they contain so many Maccabean songs. (But comp. p. 455. Note 2.) For the hypothesis of Bertholdt, which goes into very minute details respecting the origin of the several collections, see his *Einl. V.* 2020 sq.

³ Comp. Eichhorn § 626.

which concludes with a doxology. This division is very ancient. It existed in the time of the Seventy. The fathers, too, Epiphanius, Jerome, and others were acquainted with it. The same reason, also, was anciently given for this division, as is done by the present Jews; that as every thing is summarily repeated in the Psalms, which appears in the Pentateuch, the entire work is divided, like a second Pentateuch, into the same number of books.¹ Eichhorn admits this;² but traces the first occasion of the division to the origin of the Psalter out of different particular collections. Jahn, on the contrary,³ justly considers this imagined imitation of the Pentateuch, as a supposition altogether too arbitrary; as well, he thinks, might the proverbs of Solomon, the Prophets, and other books of the Old Testament, be divided into five books for the same reason. The division into five books may be best explained, as he proposes, by referring to the origin of the collection.

In the mode of dividing and numbering the several Psalms, the Hebrew manuscripts, and the Seventy and Vulgate, occasionally differ from the printed Hebrew text. In many manuscripts, the first Psalm is numbered with the second, and in like manner the forty-second with the forty-third, and the one hundred and sixteenth with the one hundred and seventeenth. On the other hand, a new Psalm is commenced with Ps. 118: 5; indeed, Ps. 118 is divided in some manuscripts into three Psalms. The Seventy also formerly numbered the first Psalm with the second; and they still differ in common with the Vulgate from the ordinary method of enumeration, after the tenth Psalm; inasmuch as they join together Psalms ninth and tenth, and thus fall one number or Psalm behind the Hebrew text as far as to the one hundred and forty seventh Psalm, which they separate into two, and thus return back once more to the old enumeration. They also unite Ps. 114 with Ps. 115, but immediately afterwards divide Ps. 116 into two, so that this difference is cancelled on the spot.⁴ It is necessary to be acquainted with this different mode of numbering, because the Fathers quote by it. The Seventy have besides an apocryphal Psalm 151, on the victory of David over Goliath.

¹ Comp. Epiphanius de ponderibus et mensuris II. 162.

² Einl. § 624.

³ Einl. p. 716.

⁴ Comp. Sixtin. Amama Antibarb. Bibl. III. 248. Stark Davidis Carmina, I. 2. 440.

VI. *Titles of the Psalms.*¹

All the Psalms, with the exception of thirty four,² have titles, which designate either their authors, or the superintendents of their music, or their subjects, or their historical occasions, or their style of poetry, or their style of music. The genuineness of these titles is a matter of doubt. By many, they are all unconditionally rejected;³ by others only in part. A comparison of the arguments in favour of their genuineness with those on the other side of the question, will show that the preponderance lies with the latter.

In favour of the titles it may be alleged: 1. That they are very ancient. The Seventy found them as they now are. But in the time of the Seventy these titles were already unintelligible, for the translations which they give of them are often without meaning; they must therefore have had their origin at a period so early, that the tradition of their sense was now already lost.—Perhaps, however, the remoteness of the Egyptian translators from Jerusalem, and their separation from the temple service of Palestine, prevented them from becoming acquainted with devotional music and other matters of that sort, and they failed *on this account* to understand the titles. At any rate, the argument from this ignorance in the Seventy is carried

¹ Comp. *Christoph. Sonntag* חל"ן רנשי h. e. Tituli Psalmorum, in methodum anniversariam redacti, diatribis LXVII philologico-theologico-practicis variisque adeo qua Judaeorum, qua Christianorum, qua veterum, qua recentiorum congestis *ἐμπυρίαις*, collectaneis Medraschicis, et versionibus praesertim antiquioribus, Targumica, Graeca, Vulgata, Syriaca, etc. fideliter illustrati, et ad singula cum Dominicarum, tum Festivitatum praecipuarum Evangelia decenter accommodati, ea quidem lege, ut, subinde quodam habito delectu, in sacris ad populum sermonibus exordiorum instar esse possint. Silusiae 1687. 4.—*Guil. Irhovii* Conjectanea philologico-critico-theologica in Psalmorum Titulos. Lugd. Bat. 1728. 4.

² These are Ps. 1, 2, 10, 33, 43, 71, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 135, 136, 137, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150. The Talmud calls such a Psalm an *Orphan Psalm*, מוזמורא יתומא, Cod. Aboda sara fol. 24. e. 2.

³ So G. J. L. Vogel in his *Dissert. Inscriptiones Psalmorum* serius demum additas videri. Hal. 1767. They were already doubted by Theodor. Mopsvest. according to Leont. Byzant. L. II. contra Nestor. et Eutyech. n. 15.

too far, if it leads us to fix the origin of the titles, as Eichhorn does, at an earlier period than that of Ezra.

2. It is customary with the poets of the East to prefix their names to their own songs. Thus in Arabian poems, after a **قال** follows the name of the poet, as may be seen in A. Schulten's Extracts from the Hamasa in Erpenius' Arabic Grammar. To show that the same custom prevailed amongst the Hebrews, Rosenmueller¹ adduces the songs in Exod. xv. Deut. xxxii. xxxiii. Judges v, where the poets are indeed named, but only in connexion with the narrative, not in a proper title, such as the **قال** of the Arabians actually constitutes; hence no evidence of the existence of that custom is to be derived from these passages. It may be allowed, however, that Is. 38: 9, and the custom of designating the predictions of the prophets with their names, are in favour of it.

3. Many of the titles accord very well with the subject matter.—The number of those, however, which do not thus accord, is greater.

4. If the titles were annexed by later hands, perhaps from mere conjecture, why were not all the Psalms provided with them? The circumstance that many of the Psalms have come down to us without them, is a proof that nothing was given, but what was found already existing.—The argument drawn from this circumstance, to prove the genuineness of the titles, possesses as little force, as the argument which many have drawn from the same quarter to prove their spuriousness. On many of the Psalms the authors of the titles had no conjectures to give.

On the other hand, it has been alleged without ground against the genuineness of the titles, that they are found wanting or varied in many of the ancient versions, for instance, in the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Arabic.² The Septuagint originally translated them with the rest, as the manuscripts, as well as the citations of the oldest fathers, prove. Hence they certainly lay also before the still later Syrian translator, and the intervening Arabian possesses no authority. Besides, the omission of many of the titles in the versions above mentioned, is often merely a defect of particular manuscripts. That the translators, especially the Syrian, occasionally have other titles and longer

¹ Prolegg. in Ps. p. XXXI. ed. 2.

² So Vogel. Against him see Eichhorn § 627; whom we follow.

ones than the Hebrew text, is, to be sure, a most remarkable circumstance; but it may be accounted for by supposing, that wherever the titles were wanting in the original, or were left out in the translation either by accident and the fault of the transcriber, or with the intention of the translator who would not undertake to translate what was unintelligible, (as we may venture to believe the Syrian translator would not,) this defect was supplied by the conjectures of the ancient expositors.¹ A decisive argument against the genuineness of the titles, is the fact that they occasionally prove to be incorrect. Sometimes the author is incorrectly specified, (as when several Psalms are ascribed to David and to Asaph, which undeniably belong to later authors,) sometimes the occasion. Compare the Introductions to Ps. 34, 51, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60.² Many of these titles are taken from the historical books, from which they are sometimes literally transcribed. Why Ps. 56 should be referred to 1 Sam. 21: 11, and Ps. 57 to 1 Sam. 22: 1, is not apparent from their respective subjects; the author of these titles seems to have blindly followed the course of the narrative in the first book of Samuel. But if several of the titles may be proved to be false, who will answer for the genuineness of the rest? This circumstance exposes them all to the suspicion of being spurious.³

Most critics and expositors, Eichhorn, Stark, Rosenmueller and others, take a middle course, and suppose that there have been additions to the ancient genuine titles, of others which are more recent and false, by means of marginal glosses and interpolations. The titles relating to music are considered by Rosenmueller and Stark to be without exception of late origin,

¹ Bengel (l. c.) regards the inscriptions of the first 72 Psalms, in which the Sept. and Vulg. accord more with the Hebrew text than in those of the remaining Psalms, as more ancient than these latter, which seem to him occasionally to rest on mere conjecture.

² In De Wette's Commentary.—ED.

³ According to Gesenius, (A. L. Z. 1826, E. Bl. No. 68. p. 541,) the spurious titles sprung from the particular collections, which *a parte potiori* bore the name of Psalms of David, Psalms of the children of Korah, etc. but contained also other Psalms. When they were all incorporated into the great collection, each song was ascribed to the author after whom the whole collection was named, just as in the Chronicles and in the New Testament the anonymous Psalms are ascribed to David.

due to the temple music. But whether such a selection can be made, in accordance with the genuine principles of criticism and without force, we shall leave undecided. Here follows in alphabetical order a brief explanation of the words and forms occurring in the titles, together with the few technical terms probably of music, which are found to recur in other parts of Scripture.

א.

צֶלֶת־אֶזְרָחַת הַבֹּקֶר, *after Hind of the morning*, Ps. 22. This phrase is supposed either to designate the matter of the Psalm, or to be an indication of time, or the name of a musical instrument, or the title of some other song, to the melody of which this Psalm was sung. This last opinion, which has been adopted after Aben-Ezra by Bochart,¹ Eichhorn,² and Rosenmueller on Ps. 22: 1, seems to me the only one which possesses any degree of probability. I therefore pass over the others, and for this reason, as well as for the sake of the interpretation, refer to Rosenmueller. Probably, the expression denotes the *sun*, to which the Arabian poets give the name *gazelle*. As to the rest, it is not necessary to suppose that this phrase formed the commencement of a song; provided only the first or principal thing mentioned in a song were a "hind of the morning," it would be sufficient to designate the piece; as may be seen in the example of David's elegy upon Jonathan, which is called the *Song of the bow*, simply because it contains the mention of a bow. The same custom still exists amongst the Arabians.³

אַל־תִּשְׁחָח, *destroy not*, Ps. 57, 58, 59, 75, may likewise be best understood in accordance with the explanation of Aben-Ezra and others, as the commencement or title of some unknown song, no longer extant, to the melody of which the Psalms with this designation were sung. For other opinions, see Rosenmueller.

ב.

גִּתִּיתָ, Ps. 8, 81, 84, probably a musical instrument;⁴ per-

¹ Hieroz. P. I. L. III. c. 17. T. II. p. 247. ed. Lips.

² Preface to Jones Poes. Asiat. Comment. p. XXXII.

³ See Jones Poes. Asiat. Comment. p. 269.

⁴ Forkel (Gesch. der Musik. Th. 1. p. 141 sq.) expresses a conjecture, that words of this sort, commonly taken for names of instruments, might rather denote the melody. He says it is improbable,

haps so called from the city of Gath-Rimmon, where (as the Chald. Paraphrast supposes) it was invented, or from גַּת wine-press, because it was used at the wine-press.¹ For other opinions see Rosenmueller.

ה.

קָהָה see הַגִּיּוֹן.

י.

עַל-יְרוּשָׁה אֲנִי רִחֵקִים Ps. 56: 1. *After Dove of the distant terebinth-trees.* Vulgate, *Of the dove of dumbness*, i. e. the mute dove, among strangers, or in distant places; by which David is to be understood. It is better, with Aben-Ezra, to understand these words as the commencement of some other song. Bochart,² instead of אֲנִי, points אֲנִי terebinth-trees, which we have followed in the translation, yet without holding the interpretation to be certain. According to Knapp's interpretation: *On the subjugation of foreign princes*, (אֲנִי mighty men, Ex. 15: 11,) the subject of the Psalm would be designated, and that not unaptly.

יְדוּתוּן (Ps. 39, לְיְדוּתוּן; Ps. 62, 77, עַל-יְדוּתוּן, לְמַנְצֵי יְדוּתוּן) is probably the name of one of David's chief musicians, who is mentioned 1 Chron. 16: 41, 42, and 21: 1,—here used of his family, the musical choir of Jeduthun, which is also mentioned at a later period, 2 Chron. 35: 15. Neh. 11: 17; so that the sense of the whole phrase is: *To the head singers of the Jeduthunites.* In Ps. 39 we had formerly translated, after Kimchi: *To the music master Jeduthun*, because

considering the imperfect state of the Hebrew music, that each song had its separate instrumental accompaniment. He appeals very pertinently to the custom of the German "Master-singers," who gave similar titles to their songs, as "*Jungfrau-Weiss*," "*Grund-Weiss*," etc. It is certainly a weighty objection to the common mode of explaining these words to denote instruments, that in this way we give the Hebrews too many instruments, more than we find mentioned elsewhere in the historical books or in the Psalms themselves, (although many of them, as the one mentioned in the text, might be simply varieties of the common ones, perhaps of the *kinnor*;) and I am not indisposed to adopt Forkel's opinion. Perhaps, however, we should do best also in most cases, to adopt the interpretation which I have given in speaking of the two first phrases.

¹ Vid. Michaelis Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr. P. II. p. 382.

² Hieroz. T. II. p. 548. ed. Lips.

there ל only is found, instead of על; but the difference between ל and על seems not to be so important, as to demand an entirely different interpretation, and the phrase should there also be translated, *To the chief musician of the Jeduthunites.*

וְדִירֹת see שִׁיר .

ל .

לְהִזְכִּיר Ps. 38, 70. *For remembrance*, literally, *to bring to remembrance*. An expression commonly understood to refer to those sorrows in memory of which David composed the Psalms designated by it, or as implying that Jehovah would remember David and help him. Aben-Ezra regards these words likewise as the commencement of some other song. Michaelis interprets it, *at the offering*,¹ which is grounded upon the pretended, but uncertain, signification of הִזְכִּיר, *to offer as a sacrifice*, Ex. 20: 21. 34: 19.

לְזַמֵּר see מְבַחֵם .

לְמַנְצֵחַ occurs in fifty three Psalms. Many consider it as the (Syriac) Infinitive, (in which case, however, it should read לְמַנְצֵחַ,) so that it would mean, *to be sung*,² which would be pertinent in Hab. 3: 19. But according to a more common and probable opinion, it is the Participle of נָצַח *to preside over* any thing, 1 Chron. 23: 4; also used in a musical sense 1 Chron. 15: 21, i. q. *to preside over the singing*, and indicates the *superintendent of the musical choir*, or head singer. The ל denotes the giving over of a Psalm to the chief musician for public exhibition.

לְעִנּוֹת see מְחַלֵּל .

לְתוֹרָה see מְזַמֵּר .

מ .

מְזַמֵּר *song, poem*, with a musical accompaniment, a frequent designation of the Psalms. Respecting the etymology of the word, see above p. 446; as also respecting the signification of the ל which often follows it, p. 457. In Ps. 100, it is connected with לְתוֹרָה *for praise, better, for thanks*. Sometimes שִׁיר is found with it, which is probably only pleonastic.

מְחַלֵּל Ps. 53, 88, in the last case, connected with לְעִנּוֹת *for singing, to be sung*, probably, therefore, a musical instrument, but what one, is doubtful. According to the common opinion,

¹ Krit. Colleg. z. Ps. 40. p. 419, and Suppl. p. 616.

²Targ. *ad laudandum*.

it is a sort of flute, from לַלֵּף to perforate; but the form, at least when thus pointed, is against this interpretation. It may better be taken for the Ethiopic *mahhlet*, song, psalm, *ἠθάρα*. So Gesenius.

מַעֲלוֹת see שִׁיר.

מִכְתָּם, Ps. 16, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, *Writing*. This word is derived by many (Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Sonntag, and others) from כָּתָם gold; and hence is supposed to denote either a Psalm of distinguished excellence, or one written in golden characters, like the Moallakat of the Arabians. But it may be objected, first, that כָּתָם is only a poetical term for gold; and next, it is impossible to see, why these Psalms in particular should be distinguished by this appellation. It is indisputable, that מִכְתָּם, by a change of the labials מ and ב, is the same with מִכְתָּב, which occurs also in Is. 38: 9, in the title of a song. In Ps. 60: 1, this word stands connected with לַמְּנַחֵם, to teach. This is referred to the Levitical music masters, who were to teach their choir; but for a better sense, compare 2 Sam. 1: 18, "And David commanded them to teach it (the elegy) to the children of Israel;" and Deut. 31: 19, "And teach it (Moses' song) to the children of Israel."¹

מִשְׁבִּיל poem, occurs as the title of thirteen Psalms. The common interpretation, *didactic poem*, (from שָׁבַל intellexit,) does not accord with the character of all the Psalms which are thus designated; and if that is its meaning, we should have to charge the author with the error of considering Psalms as didactic poems, which are not. Michaelis' interpretation, *linked or metrical discourse*, from لَمَّكَ ligavit, plexuit,² leans too much upon modern notions of metre; perhaps it would be better to render it *intricate, figurative discourse*, synonymous with הִיָּרָה, riddle, proverb. In accordance with the Hebrew usus loquendi, מִשְׁבִּיל intelligentia, doctrina, may be a general term for poem, in the same manner as the Arabic ^{5c}مَشْرِف stands properly for intelligentia, and afterwards for poesis. Poets were the sages, learned men, of the ancient world, *poetae docti*.³

¹ See Bibl. Repos. I. p. 76 sq.—Ed.

² Comp. Supplem. p. 2323.

³ For a singular interpretation, see Kaiser Histor. Erkl. d. fünf Psalmbücher, p. 118.

ג.

נגינה, Ps. 61, according to the common opinion, in the construct form instead of the absolute. It is better to point it as Plural, נגינות, as we find written in full, viz.

נגינות, Ps. 6, 54, 55, 76, in connexion with ב or צ, *after the music of stringed instruments*, from נגן *to touch, to play on the harp*; perhaps it is a general term for every species of stringed instruments.

נהילות, Ps. 5, in connexion with ל, *after flutes*, probably an instrument. The ל should occasion no trouble; it stands instead of צ, with which it is often interchanged. Perhaps the form is for נחלות, from נחל, like נקבה from נבב, and is equivalent to נחלי. For other interpretations, see Rosenmueller.

ס.

סלה occurs seventy one times in the Psalms, and three times in Habakkuk, commonly at the end of a short strophe; but in Ps. 55: 20. 57: 4. Hab. 3: 3, 9, in the middle of the verse, yet at the end of a member of the verse. Of the various opinions respecting this enigmatical word, all those may as well be placed aside, which assume that it belongs to the text, and is connected with the sense; although the accentuation is in favour of such a supposition.¹ The only correct opinion is that which considers it as a musical sign. The explanation of this sign, however, is attended with the greatest uncertainty. Most of the commentators consider it as a proper word by itself, and explain it either from the Arabic ^{sci}شلو *membrum*, in the sense of *section*;² or from the Hebrew הִשָּׁב i. q. הִשָּׁב *to rest*, whence it would signify *pause*; or from הִשָּׁב *to raise*, (so that the proper form of the word would be הִשָּׁב and the paragoge הִ is subjoined,) whence it would mean *elevation* of the voice, and denote a change of *tact*, or the repetition of the melody with an elevation of tone in the pitch, an interpretation favoured by the Septuagint *διάψαλμα*, i. e. according to Hesychius *μελος διαλλαγή*. Thus Kimchi, Forkel, Herder, Gesenius, with

¹ Augusti, Prakt. Einleit. in die Psalmen, p. 125. Note, finds it not improbable, that it is an exclamation like Hallelujah, with which, besides, (one case excepted,) it does not appear in connexion, a fact worthy of remark.

² Pfeiffer über die Musik der alten Hebr. p. 17.

whom I also at present coincide.¹ A peculiar interpretation of the word is given by Kaiser.² Others, on the contrary, consider it as an abbreviation, because the form of the word is so entirely peculiar, and similar abbreviations are frequent in oriental writers.³ But the process of decyphering this abbreviation is altogether conjectural and uncertain. The following are the most successful attempts: סב לַמְעָלָה הַשָּׂר return back, singer, i. e. *dacapo*, and לְשִׁמּוֹן לְשִׁמּוֹן הַקּוֹל sign to change the tone.⁴ We find ס in Ps. 9: 17 joined with הַגִּיּוֹן, which occurs in Ps. 92: 4 in connexion with certain instruments, and has been taken by many for an instrument, but is better explained *loud music*, from הָגָה to make a noise. The words הַגִּיּוֹן סָלָה would accordingly denote perhaps an *interlude*, as the Septuagint has it, which renders the phrase *ὄμη διάψαλματος*.

ע.

עֲרוֹת see שׁוֹשָׁן.

עַל *after, according to*, designates the kind of melody, or of accompaniment, or the key, after which the Psalms were sung. So also the Syrians use their עַל.⁵

עֲלָמוֹת, Ps. 46, many suppose to be a musical instrument. Simonis compares it with the Greek *άλμος*, a species of flute made of the box-tree, which the Phygians invented.⁶ Better, after Forkel⁷ and Gesenius, the designation of a mode, similar to the "Jungfrau-Weiss," Virgin-mode, of the German Master-singers (עֲלָמָה *virgin*), an interpretation favoured by 1 Chron. 15: 20, where it stands connected with the mention of the instrument (בְּנִבְלָיִם), consequently can hardly itself denote an instrument. Kimchi also considers it as the sign of a mode.⁸ The obscure עַל-מִוֶּה, Ps. 9: 1, should probably read עֲלָמוֹת, and be interpreted in the same manner. Simonis

¹ Kimchi, Lib. Rad. Forkel, Gesch. der Mus. I. 144. Herder Geist. der Heb. Poesie II. 376. Gesenius Lexicon. [At present Gesenius prefers the sense *pause*; see his Lex. Heb. et Chald. 1833.]

² L. c. p. 14 sq.

³ Comp. Jahn Arab. Sprachlehre § 10. p. 21 sq.

⁴ Comp. Eichhorn's Allegm. Biblioth. V. 545 sq. Wahl Habak. Excurs. 4.

⁵ Comp. Assemani Bibl. Orient. I. 80. Eichhorn Preface to Jones p. XXXII. :

⁶ Lex. sub voce.

⁷ L. c. p. 142.

⁸ For other hypotheses see Sonntag p. 620 sq.

explains it by *cantio tibiaram Phrygiarum*, but Abul-Walid by *soft, gentle mode*, from עָלַם to conceal, whence also the Septuagint renders it *περὶ τῶν κρουφίων*.

שׁ.

שְׁגִיּוֹן, *elegy*, Ps. 7. The old interpretation, *ode erratica* (from שָׁגָה *errare*), gives no good sense. It is better to compare it with the Syriac סגא, Pa. *cecinit*, whence it would mean "song;" or with the Arabic شَجِيءٌ *anxious, moestus*

fuil, in accordance with which we have rendered it. This interpretation agrees also with Habakkuk c. iii.

שׁוֹשַׁן Ps. 60, and שְׁשִׁימָה Ps. 45, 69, 80, probably an instrument, since it is joined with צֶל, perhaps so named from its lily-form shape (שׁוֹשַׁן signifies *lily*); perhaps *cymbalum*. With שׁוֹשַׁן in Ps 60: 1, and with שְׁשִׁימָה in Ps. 80: 1, stands the difficult word שְׁדִיחָה; in the first passage, as it seems, in the construct state, but in the second separated by Athnach. The common signification, *testimony*, is unsuitable, unless it is taken in the sense of הַתְּעוּדָה, Is. 8: 16, *revelation, poem*, in so far as the poetic writers of the Psalms often appeal to a revelation; Ps. 40: 7. 60: 8. 62: 12. 81: 6. Simonis in his Lexicon,

explains it from the Arabic شَوْشُ *testudo*, with which the Arabian translator expresses כַּבִּיז. Eichhorn (ad Simonis Lex.) explains שְׁשִׁימָה שְׁשִׁימָה by *hexachordum forma testudinis*, שׁ from שֵׁשׁ *six*; but then it would be necessary to point the word differently, perhaps שְׁשִׁימָה, as Köhler on Ps. 45: 1 proposes; and moreover the accentuation allows not of this connexion. If in Ps. 60: 1, מִכְתָּם did not already stand as the designation of the poem, it would be better perhaps, there also, to take שְׁדִיחָה by itself, and render it *Song for the Lyre*.

שִׁיר, *song, ode*, sometimes joined pleonastically with מְזִמֵּר. שִׁיר יְדִירוֹת Ps. 45, *song of loveliness*, i. e. lovely song, *ἄσμα προσφιλίας* Aquil. The word יְדִירוֹת, properly an adjective (Ps. 84: 2), is here used substantively. Others, *song of love*, from the substantive יְדִירָה, which, however, no where occurs; besides that the matter of the Psalm does not accord with this interpretation. If the first explanation is correct, the title could not well have proceeded from the author.

שׁ הַמְּעִלּוֹת.* The title given to the so called Psalms of De-

* Comp. E. Tillingii Disquisitio de ratione inscriptionis XV Psalmorum, qui dicuntur שׁ הַמְּעִלּוֹת. Brem. 1765.

grees, Ps. 120—134. Great uncertainty prevails about its meaning. The Jews pretend that these Psalms were sung upon the fifteen steps, which led to the court of the Israelites in the temple, a fable spun out the number of the Psalms, and the common signification of מַעְלֵה־שֶׁבַע *step*. It is a generally prevailing opinion that these Psalms are pilgrim songs, which the Jews chanted on their journey to attend the feasts at Jerusalem, or on their return from the captivity. The word מַעְלֵה, it is well known, is used to denote the journey to Jerusalem, and the return from the captivity; and the plural of the word might allude to the two returns, under Zerubbabel and Joshua, and under Ezra. But neither the one nor the other of these definitions accords with the matter and character of these Psalms. On the joyful occasion of going up to attend the feasts at Jerusalem, songs would hardly be sung of so plaintive a tone as belongs to several of the Psalms of Degrees, e. g. Ps. 120, 123, 130; and at the time of the return from the captivity it could not be said, as in Ps. 122: 1, *Let us go up to the house of the Lord!* nor could Jerusalem be celebrated for the compactness of its buildings, v. 3.—Michaelis¹ takes this expression to denote a certain metre, and explains it from the Syriac סכּלה *scala*, which is used in Assemani Bibl. Oriental. I. 62, in reference to poems, and probably signifies a species of poem; but according to Michaelis means something equivalent to *foot*. Others, as Luther, (who renders *Ein Lied in höhern Chor*, ‘a song in higher chorus,’) understand the expression as signifying an elevation of the voice, of the key, etc. but the passage in 2 Chron. 20: 19, *The Levites praised the Lord בְּקוֹל גָּדוֹל לְמַעַל* with an exceeding loud voice, is incorrectly adduced in favour of this interpretation, for לְמַעַל is here an adverb, and means *exceedingly, very*. Gesenius has given the only correct interpretation,² according to which the expression denotes the gradually progressive rhythm of thought peculiar to these songs, respecting which we shall speak more at large in the following chapter on Rhythm.

שִׁיר הַבְּיָהוּהָ, Ps. 30. *Song of the dedication of the house*. If this title indicates the occasion of the Psalm, it probably originated out of a mistake, which is the opinion of Eichhorn,³

¹ Remarks on Lowth Prælect. XXV. p. 581. ed. Rosenm.

² A. L. Z. 1813. No. 205. Comment. üb. d. Jesaja 17: 13. 26: 1.

³ Einl. § 627. p. 52 sq.

viz. from the wrong interpretation of verse 8, or, as Paulus conjectures,¹ from incorrectly referring the dance spoken of in verse 12, to the dance of David before the ark. For whether we understand the dedication of the house to refer to the dedication of the tabernacle, or of David's residence, or to the purification of his house after its desecration by Absalom, there is not a single allusion to either of these events in the matter of the Psalm. Neither can I agree with Rosenmueller in supposing that the title indicates the time when the Psalm was composed, viz. the time when David consecrated the future site of the temple by the erection of an altar, 1 Chron. 21:26. 22: 1, which could hardly be called the dedication of a house. It is better to take the words as a designation of the melody. There was perhaps a song which was commonly sung at the dedication of houses, Deut. 20: 5, after the melody of which this Psalm was sung.

שְׁמִירָה, Ps. 6: 12, according to the common interpretation, an instrument, either with eight chords (as we formerly rendered it), or harmonious to an octave, or the eighth in the arrangement, which last accords best with the form of the word. Better, as Forkel and Gesenius explain it, the designation of a key, perhaps the "Grund-Weiss," fundamental mode, the mode which was sung by male voices in the bass. In 1 Chron. 15: 21, it seems to denote the gravest of three voices.

שׁוֹשַׁן see שְׁשִׁימָה.

תְּהִלָּה, Ps. 145, *song of praise*. So very many of the Psalms might be called. The circumstance that the present alone is thus designated, shows perhaps its later production; for it was by a later *usus loquendi* the Psalms received the distinctive appellation of תְּהִלָּה.

תְּפִלָּה Ps. 90, 142, *prayer*, poem addressed to the Deity, an appellation which would apply to most of the Psalms; why it was given to this one alone, it is impossible to say. We see from this that the titles are not all from one hand. So the ode of Habakkuk is also called. In Ps. 142, it stands in apposition with מִשְׁכִּיבֵי.

VII. Rhythm and Music of the Psalms.

A question which was formerly much agitated, but which

⁵ Clavis zu Ps. 30.

seems at present to have fallen into a good deal of neglect, though far from being without its importance, relates to the rhythmical form of the Hebrew poetry in general, and of the Psalms in particular. Carpzov in his Introduction to the Old Testament, and Lowth in his Lectures, have furnished us with laborious investigations and copious details of facts on this subject; but by modern inquirers the question has either been entirely neglected, or but superficially handled, as if it were one which was now set at rest.¹ It will be necessary to recall to remembrance and review, once more, the investigations of past times.²

The different opinions which have been advanced by the learned men of ancient and modern days respecting the rhythmical form of the Hebrew poetry, may be arranged in the following classes.

I. Many maintained that the Hebrew poetry possesses metrical feet and versification, which, moreover, they specifically defined, or rather attempted to define and restore. But in defining the character of this metre they were again divided.

1. Many held to a versification in the proper sense, after the analogy of the Greek and Latin metres; and in favour of this opinion there are ancient authorities. Philo describes the songs of praise of the ancient sacred poets as trimeter, and composed of strophes,³ and attributes to Moses a knowledge of metre.⁴ Josephus calls the versification of Moses' song of triumph at the Red sea, hexameter,⁵ and so also the farewell song of Moses;⁶ and represents the Psalms of David as consisting partly of trimeter, partly of hexameter verse.⁷ Eusebius calls the Hebrew

¹ Herder (Briefe das Stud. der Theol. betr. I. 164 sq. Geist der Hebr. Poesie I. 22 sq.) and Meyer (Hermeneut. des A. T. II sq.) have entered most fully into the subject. Since the first appearance of the author's commentary, Gesenius, Bellermann, and Saalschütz have investigated it with care.

² Carpzov l. c. p. 3 sq. has made a tolerably complete collection of the older opinions; Saalschütz, a still more complete one in his work: *Von der Form der Hebräischen Poesie, nebst einer Abhandlung über die Musik der Hebraer. Mit einem Vorworte von Dr Hahn. Königsb. 1825. 8.*

³ De vita contempl. p. 901. E.

⁴ Ibid. p. 606. A.

⁵ Ant. Jud. II. 16. 4.

⁶ Ibid. IV. 8. 44.

⁷ Ibid. VII. 12. 3.

poems metrical,¹ and their versification partly hexameter, partly trimeter and tetrameter. So also Jerome in many places. In the *Praef. ad Chron. Euseb.* he represents the Psalms as consisting of iambic, alcaic, and sapphic verse, like the odes of Horace and of Pindar, while the verse of Job is hexameter and pentameter. He pronounces a similar judgment in the *Praef. ad Jobum*, and in the *Praef. in Threnos*. The same opinion is expressed by Isidorus Hispalensis.² But we fail of finding in these authors any more definite account or explanation of the metres, which they thus name. Hence Löscher remarks that the fathers, in these assertions, had no reference to metrical feet, but only to the members of the verse.³ Martianay endeavours to defend and prove the assertion of Jerome, but does it in a manner so vague and confused, as only to involve the subject in still greater perplexity.⁴ Ferrandus also defends the opinion of Jerome.⁵

An attempt to define the laws of Hebrew metre, in prosecuting this assertion, was made by Francis Gomar, in his work *Davidis Lyra*, etc.⁶ a system of the prosody of the Hebrew language, in which he endeavours to point out a distinct versification, analogous to the Greek, in the so called metrical books, viz. Job, the proverbs of Solomon, and the Psalms. He was, however, happily refuted by L. Capell,⁷ and that with great ease. There was no injustice in the pun of one of his antagonists, who said, *Gomari lyram delirare*. Having constructed a system of prosody upon principles supported by no evidence, and at variance with the Hebrew, as well as every other language,⁸ in-

¹ Praep. Evang. XI. 3.

² Originum I. 38.

³ De caus. ling. Hebr. c. XI. § 6. p. 436.

⁴ Proleg. IV. in div. Bibliothec. S. Hieron.—Opp. Hieron. ed. Valars. T. IX.

⁵ Praef. in Psalmos c. 11.

⁶ Davidis Lyra s. nova Hebraea S. Scripturae ars poetica 1637. Opp. III. 388 sq.

⁷ Animadvers. ad novam Davidis lyram 1643, afterwards printed with his Critica S. p. 651.

⁸ One of them is: Vocalis longa (nisi accentus intercedat) ante duas consonas positione mutatur in brevem; which arose from a misapprehension of the shortening of Hholem, by the moving forward of the tone in mixed syllables.

stead of proceeding to establish upon this basis the Hebrew versification, he overturns his own structure, by laying it down as a rule : "Omnia sacrae scripturae poemata Hebraea variis ac promiscuis carminum generibus constant. Eadem absoluta sunt, non relata, hoc est, quae similibus versibus, iis pari numero ac serie respondentibus, carent." "All the Hebrew poems of the sacred scriptures consist of various and intermingled kinds of verse. They are absolute, not relative—that is, they have no similar verses, corresponding to each other in their measure and place in the series." Yet he found some followers, among whom were Const. L'Empereur, Dan. Heinsius, Lud. de Dieu, Hottinger, and the younger Buxtorf.

We pass over the boastful attempts of Marcus Meibom to restore the Hebrew versification, referring the curious reader to Carpzov,¹ and proceed to notice the English prelate Francis Hare, who believed he had brought to light the metre of the Psalms in his work : "Psalmorum liber in versiculos metricè divisus et ope metricæ multis in locis integritati suæ restitutus," Lond. 1736. He met with a short and pithy answer from Bishop Lowth in his "Metricæ Harianæ brevis Confutatio," which is found at the end of his Lectures.² This metrical system of Hare is in the highest degree arbitrary. He establishes the following canon among others : *quantitatis syllabarum nulla ratio habetur*, 'no regard is paid to the quantity of syllables,' a principle upon which every thing could be made out of any thing. According to this scheme דָּבָר is at one time *dābār*, at another, *dābār*. Notwithstanding this, the principles of Hare found an advocate in Christian Weisse, who attempted to add still farther to the structure.³

¹ Carpzov l. c. p. 19 sq. and Saalschütz p. 17.

² Lowth published a larger confutation of Hare, Lond. 1766.

³ Progr. Systema Psalmorum metricum a Francisco Hare nuper adornatum, 1740. I have neither been able to procure this work, nor the tracts of Anton : Conjectura de metro Hebraeorum antiquo, Lips. 1770. Vindiciae disput. de metro Hebr. Lips. 1771. Editionis in qua Psalmi ad metrum revocabantur et recensentur etc. specimen. Viteb. 1780. Salomonis carmen melicum, quod Cant. Cant. dicitur, ad metrum priscum et modos musicos revocavit etc. Viteb. 1800. From the account which Saalschütz gives of it, I perceive that Anton's system is founded on the accent, but is at the same time altogether arbitrary ; for he alters the accent and pronunciation, omits and repeats verses, just as he pleases or finds it necessary.

Sir W. Jones¹ applies to the Hebrew the rules of the Arabic metre. He lays down as rules, that mixed syllables, and syllables with quiescent vowels, are long, as in *בְּנֶשֶׁר*; pure syllables are short, as in *קָטָל* *kātāl*, *כֹּזְבִים* *cōcābim*. After the manner of the Arabians, he proposes to give vowels to letters which have Sheva moveable, as in *דְּרֹשִׁים*, which he reads *dērūshim*, but this last is manifestly at variance with the idiom of the Hebrew language: in the singular *דָּרַשׁ* the first syllable is certainly different from the same syllable in the plural. As to the rest, he falls into very much the same error with Gomar, and quite destroys every thing he has said, by supposing that the Hebrews intermingled their metres, as Pindar does; where however they are repeated.

Unquestionably the boldest attempt of this kind was that of Greve.² After having provided himself with a new recension of the text, chiefly in accordance with the Septuagint, and with a new system of punctuation, following the analogy of the Arabic, he establishes a prosody of the Hebrew poetry, grounded on the analogy of the Syriac and Arabic languages, and proceeds to apply it in an attempt to restore the versification of Job. He repeats the same attempt upon the prophets Nahum and Habakkuk,³ and the prophet Isaiah.⁴ The rules of prosody which he lays down are in general correct, provided no objection is made to the change which he introduces into the Hebrew punctuation. But what authority have we for changing this? The affinity of the Hebrew language to the Arabic and Syriac hardly suffices to justify us in assuming the fact of a like pronunciation, quantity, etc. In fine, Greve makes so

¹ Poes. Asiat. Comment. c. II. p. 72 sq.

² Ultima capita libri Jobi, nempe cap. 38—41 et capituli 42 pars, ad Graecam versionem recensita notisque instructa ab E. I. Greve. Accedit tractatus de metris Hebraeorum praesertim Jobaeis. Pars I. complect. cap. 38, 39. Daventriae 1788. Pars II. complect. 40—42: 6 et libellum de metris. Burgosteinfurthi 1791. 4to.

³ Vaticinia Nahumi et Habacuci. Interpretationem et notas adjecit E. I. Greve. Editio metrica. Amstelod. 1793. 4.

⁴ Vaticiniorum Jesaiae pars continens carmina a cap. 40 usque ad 56: 9. Hebraica ad numeros recensuit, versionem et notas adjecit. 1810. 4.

many exceptions to his own rules, as to render his whole system in the highest degree fluctuating and uncertain.¹

A very elaborate and sensible theory of Hebrew prosody was published by Bellermann.² It is founded on the *systema morarum*, according to which all syllables have an equal *mora*, or time, the only change being that produced by the accent. Accordingly he supposes all syllables destitute of an accent to be short, and all accented syllables to be long (e. g. לֵבִי צִמְרֵי יְרֵקָה לֵבִי צִמְרֵי), very much as in German or English. He has not succeeded, however, in pointing out a proper Hebrew versification, but only in making it probable that the Hebrew poets have occasionally allowed the iambic, the trochaic, or the anapaestic number to prevail.

The latest attempt to form a system of Hebrew metre is contained in the work of J. L. Saalschütz, which has already been mentioned. Like Bellermann, he grounds his system upon the accent, which, however, he places not upon the final but upon the penult syllable; for he considers the accent as the sign of the subordinate (ground) tone, instead of the principal, so that by this means the Hebrew language receives a trochaic accentuation, while according to Bellermann's system it is for the most part iambic. Accordingly אָרַם would form a spondee, דָּבָר a trochee; the words יוֹשֵׁב בְּשָׂמַיִם would be scanned *Yōshēb bāshāmāim*. The Shevas frequently form short syllables, but frequently do not. Those syllables are likewise short which have neither tone, accent, or ictus, as in חָרָהּ *hāārēts*. Those syllables are common which have the ictus, as בָּל־חָרָהּ *cōl-hāārēts*, as also the final syllables which have the accent, אֲנֹכִי *ānōchī*. All Hebrew poems have the same rhythm, resembling, where it is regular, the measure of the Hexameter, except that in addition to dactyles and spondees it allows of the introduction of trochees and the first paeon. The verses consist sometimes of two feet, sometimes of three, sometimes of four and five, and it is but seldom the author succeeds in pointing out a certain uniformity. So by this theory, arbitrary as it is, no metrical system in the proper sense is restored, but only a certain *number*, which is also secured by the common pronunciation.

¹ Comp. Eichhorn's Allg. Bibl. VI. 811 sq.

² Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer. Berlin 1813.

2. Others maintained that the Hebrew poetry possesses a free versification, and strictly speaking, all those who have been mentioned above belong to this class. Michaelis is of this opinion¹ and Leutwein.² The latter with justice makes the essence of the biblical rhythm to consist mainly in the division into hemistichs, tristichs, etc. and in addition to this supposes only that there was a certain metrical harmony, the rule and index of which he finds in the accents.

3. Others believed they found rhyme, or something resembling rhyme, in the Hebrew poetry. Such a supposition is in fact not so absurd, as we might at first imagine, for the Arabic and modern Hebrew poetry are both acquainted with rhyme. This was the opinion of Augustine, Steuchus,³ M. Laurent. Petraeus,⁴ and Le Clerc, who in his Commentary on the Pentateuch points out instances of rhyme in many places, e. g. Gen. 4: 24. 7: 11. Ex. c. 15. Deut. c. 32; but takes unwarrantable liberties in arranging the members of the verse, and quite destroys the *parallelismus membrorum*. Instances of rhyme undoubtedly occur in the Old Testament, e. g. in Gen. 4: 24. Ps. 6: 2. 8: 5. 25: 4, etc. Job 10: 17; they are frequent in the Hebrew language generally, the suffixes and termination forms alone furnishing a vast number of them, but as they are not constant in their occurrence, they cannot be supposed to constitute a law. Buxtorf followed R. Moshe Shem Tobh and other Jews in making the Hebrew rhythm to consist in the numbering of the syllables; the members of the verse were sometimes equal, but for the most part unequal, and the disproportion was supposed to be removed by the mode of enunciation and singing.⁵ So also L. Fabricius,⁶ and G. J. Vossius,⁷ held to a syllabic metre in some poems, as in the proverbs of Solomon, but to a free prose diction in the Psalms.

¹ On Lowth p. 432. ed. Rosenm.

² Versuch einer richtigen Theorie von der biblischen Verskunst. Tüb. 1775.

³ Praef. in Psalm.

⁴ Cant. Cantic. Salom. paraphrasi cum ligata Hebraea et Dapica tum prosa Latina adornatum. Hafn. 1640.

⁵ De Prosodia metrica tractatus, in his Thes. grammat. ling. sanct. p. 628 sq.

⁶ Metrica Hebraea. Viteb. 1623, p. 25 sq.

⁷ De nat. et constit. art. poet. L. 1. c. 13. § 2.

4. To this class also belong those who denied the existence of a proper metre, but at the same time held that the poetry was adapted to certain melodies, which would still imply the necessity of some kind of syllabic measure. Pfeiffer,¹ Van Till,² Mingarelli,³ and among the Jews Abarbanel,⁴ were of this opinion. Carpzov, on the other hand, justly remarks, that this opinion might be held with respect to the Psalms, and other lyrical pieces, but not with respect to the book of Job, and the Proverbs of Solomon. Besides, it would be necessary to show that Psalms which appear to have the same melody announced in the title, e. g. Ps. 57, 58, 59, contain verses of similar length, and of the same number of words, which, however, is not the case.

II. Others, on the contrary, maintained that the Hebrew poetry is altogether destitute of metre and of feet. Most of the learned Jews are of this opinion. Thus in the book of Cosri,⁵ it is boasted of as a peculiar excellence of the Hebrew poetry, that it is not fettered and confined by a syllabic measure, and that it aims not so much at tickling the ear, as at distinctness and force of thought, which are promoted by the freedom of its movement. R. Asaria, in the book מאור עינים, from which Buxtorf furnishes extracts,⁶ holds to a proportion of the members (parallelismus membrorum), not consisting however in the measure of the syllables, but in the thought. The opinion of the book of Cosri was also maintained by R. Samuel Arcurolt,⁷ and R. Samuel Aben Tybbon.⁸ Among Christians, the poetry of the Old Testament was pronounced to be destitute of versification and a regular rhythm, by Joseph Scaliger,⁹ in part by the before named G. J. Vossius, and still more decidedly by Richard Simon,¹⁰ and Wasmuth.¹¹ Among the moderns this

¹ Diatrib. de poesi Hebr.

² Dicht- Sing- und Spielkunst der Hebräer p. 24.

³ De Pindari Odis conjecturae p. 20 sq.

⁴ See Buxtorf Mantiss. ad lib. Cosri p. 407.

⁵ P. II. p. 133 sq. ed. Buxt.

⁶ Mantissa ad lib. Cosri. p. 415.

⁷ In Buxtorf l. c. p. 424 sq.

⁸ Id. p. 429 sq.

⁹ Animadverss. ad Chron. Euseb. p. 6.

¹⁰ Hist. Crit. V. T. L. I. c. 8. p. 57 of the Latin translation.

¹¹ Instit. Accent. Hebr. p. 14.

opinion prevails very generally, and Herder (l. c.) among others, acknowledges it as his own, although he holds to a free rhythm in addition to the parallelism of numbers.

III. Others admit that the Hebrew poetry possesses versification, but maintain that it is lost to us, and can no longer be defined. This is the opinion of Carpzov, and of several other learned men whom he quotes.¹ He goes upon the principle that there can be no poetry without metre. Lowth also² endeavours to show that the Hebrew poetry must have been metrical, but that it is vain to think of restoring its metre since the pronunciation is lost. Similar are the views of Pfeiffer,³ Bauer,⁴ Jahn,⁵ and Meyer.⁶

This last opinion deserves to be taken up and examined more at large. What are the grounds for asserting that the Hebrew poetry must necessarily have a metre?

1. If with Lowth, Carpzov and others, we lay it down as a general principle that all poetry, as such, must possess a metre, the question arises, whether this principle is derived from experience, or from the theory of the poetic art. The example of the majority of ancient and modern languages decides in favour of this principle. Not only the Greeks, and the modern nations, but also the Indians and Caledonians possess versification. But the Hebrew poetry is distinguished by such remarkable peculiarities, that it may well form an exception, to which might be added the Samaritan and Ethiopic languages, which actually have no syllabic metre, but only a metre of lines. From the *theory* of the poetic art the following principle only could be derived, viz. that poetry aims to give more form and harmony to language, than prose; but respecting the kind of form, it prescribes no law. As to this, every thing depends on the character of the poetry. Goethe has disdained the shackles of verse in his boldest flights, and contented himself with a freer harmo-

¹ Löscher, Sonntag, Bartolucci, Kircher etc. p. 6. 23.

² Praelect. III. p. 23, sq.

³ Ueber d. Musik d. alten Hebr. p. xvi.

⁴ Einleit. ins A. T. p. 358 sq.

⁵ Bibl. Arch. Th. I. B. I. § 100.

⁶ Hermen. des A. T. II. 329.

ny.¹ Indeed, there is something more sublime in the absence of form than in a strict adherence to it ; and as sublimity is the character of the Hebrew poetry, the absence of versification in it may be considered as extremely natural.

2. Jones, Bauer², and others, adduce the example of the modern oriental languages, particularly of the Arabic and Persian, in proof of the existence of a Hebrew metre. But with all the etymological affinity of the Shemitish dialects, there is a very great diversity in their pronunciation, style etc. and the Persian language is not related to the Hebrew at all ; consequently it will not do to reason from what may be true in that, to what must be true in this. The serious, sacred poetry of the Hebrews presents a very strong contrast, both in spirit and matter, when compared with the modern oriental, and it may therefore possess also a different and peculiar external form. The Arabic poetry has no parallelism of numbers ; neither has the Hebrew rhyme, like the Arabic : as little as they agree in these particulars, so little is it possible to draw any conclusion from the prosody of the one in favour of a similar form of the other. Besides, the age of the Arabic and Persian metre is very questionable. Jones, it is true, calls it extremely ancient.³ But as he remarks himself, the earliest writer on metre, Ferahid, lived as late as in the second century of the Hegira. In fact, Pococke⁴ regards the Arabic metre as a comparatively late invention, and appeals for proof of it to the testimony of Arabian authors, of Asephad and of Jalaloddin. Eichhorn⁵ is of the same opinion, particularly on the ground that the Arabic poetry depends on the *nunnation*.

3. "The Hebrew poetry was often sung, which could not be the case unless it possessed metre." Thus Carpzov, Sonntag and others. But a metre is necessary in order that poetry may be sung, only in case the melody is repeated ; but if it continues

¹ See Mignon's funeral in Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahren, Prometheus, Meine Göttin, and other lyric productions of his.

² Jones l. c. p. 61. Bauer l. c.

³ L. c. p. 60.

⁴ Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 160.

⁵ Note to Jones p. 61.

along, the words though without metre may be adapted to it at pleasure. Thus with us prose is often set to music. Whether the Hebrews had returning melodies, is a question we cannot decide. Probably they had not. It is a just conjecture that the Hebrew singing consisted simply in cantillation, i. e. in a sort of declamation analogous to song; but this depends not at all upon the number and measure of the words.¹ It is indeed a question whether the tact,² in the strict sense at least, as we understand it, belonged to the Hebrew music. Speidel³ considers the tact as a comparatively recent invention, unknown to the age of David. Finally, if the Hebrews actually possessed a knowledge of tact, and of returning melodies, still they might shorten or prolong at will the words of unequal length, much in the same way as is done amongst us in the ruder sort of popular songs, for instance, in the witch's song:

Wir fliegen über Land und Meer,
Wie das Wind durch die weite, weite Welt einher.

We fly over land and sea,
Like the wind through the wide, wide world, featly and free.

4. "Indications of metre are found in the Hebrew poetry." The poets avail themselves of uncommon, antiquated, difficult words, forms and phrases, and allow themselves many poetical licenses which lead us to the conclusion that they were under a metrical constraint, without which we cannot explain these appearances." This argument is particularly dwelt upon by Lowth.⁴ But I should think that these peculiarities of the poetical language were something more than the offspring of necessity—they are sometimes evidently chosen for the sake of their antiquity, of their solemnity, and of their elegance; sometimes they seem to have sprung forth unconsciously in the fire of inspiration, in the bold flight of thought, and in the struggle with language. The only certain indication from which Lowth justly draws the conclusion that there must have been something

¹ Vid. Forkel l. c. p. 156.

² See p. 493 below.

³ Unverwerfliche Spuren von der alten Davidischen Singkunst etc. bei Forkel p. 157.

⁴ Lect. III.

like a rhythmical division and measure of the Hebrew poetry, is the alphabetical arrangement found in a few of the Psalms and some other poetical pieces. Here we observe a regular periodical cadence and return, somewhat resembling strophes or verses; but whether they are real strophes and verses or not, that is the question.

Were there an Hebrew metre, I believe that the vestiges and proofs, if not the very laws of it might be discovered.¹ There are many, it is true, since the time of Capell, who say that the pronunciation of the Hebrew language is lost. This is the ground upon which Lowth maintains that the Hebrew metre can never be recovered, nor so much as the number of the syllables, much less their quantity, be with any certainty defined. Yet without wishing to obtrude myself as a judge in a controversy conducted by such eminent men, I must confess that I believe in the general correctness of the Hebrew system of punctuation. That it is sometimes pedantic, subtle and inconsistent, cannot throw suspicion over the whole system; and that its present form is recent, destroys not the antiquity of the tradition upon which it is founded. A strong proof of the genuineness of its origin is its peculiarity, a circumstance which distinguishes the Hebrew language from the other Shemitish dialects, especially the Arabic. If it were a bare invention of the Rabbins, it would doubtless have betrayed its origin as an imitation of the Arabic language; for the learned Rabbins have sometimes employed the Arabic to illustrate the Hebrew.² But according to the present Hebrew punctuation there is no metre in the poetry of the Old Testament, nor so much as a numbering of syllables, as may be clearly seen in the alphabetic poems where the several verses are of unequal length. Compare Ps. 25: 1, 2, 5, with v. 4, 18, 19.³ According to the *systema morarum*, which makes all the syllables long and perfectly equal, without any rhythmical alternation of short and long, a versification by syllabic quantity would be impossible.⁴ Yet this pro-

¹ Michaelis is also of the same opinion, l. c. p. 436 sq.

² This view has since been placed beyond dispute by the grammatical investigations of Gesenius.

³ Many verses have hemistichs of an equal number of syllables, particularly in Job, Lam. c. 3.

⁴ For instance, each syllable, whether mixed or pure, has 3 *moras*: one *mora* is given to the short vowel and to each consonant, and two

nunciation would admit at least of the *numbering* of syllables, and consequently of a metre, such as the French and other nations possess; a rhythm is also possible by means of the accent, as in the German and English languages, which is the theory of Bellermann. According to the modern system of Hebrew prosody, which is founded on the *systema morarum*, the letters with Sheva moveable, and its compounds, form short syllables,¹ giving rise to a certain alternation of long and short; which, however, is very trifling, inasmuch as two short syllables never appear in immediate succession, so that there can be no pyrrhichs, anapæsts, or triple time feet of any sort. It would be more conformable to the analogy of the Greek and Arabic prosody to use the pure syllables with the long vowels as short; but then we should be at a loss to know how to dispose of the Shevas; for the common prosody rejects semi-short syllables, and if we chose to join them with the entire syllables it would produce too harsh an effect. Make the experiment in whatever way we please, we find no versification in the Hebrew poetry, and never shall find any. This is evident even by the measurement of the eye. The several verses are often unequal, out of all proportion, one short, another long, without any regularity. But this would not be so, if they were formed upon the quantity and number of the syllables, and arranged according to a periodical rule. We have only to look at English verse, or that of any other language, and see if it does not exhibit a certain proportion even to the eye.² The same would be the case if we supposed the pronunciation to be entirely different; the periodical return of the rhythm would necessarily betray itself; especially as the Arabic or any other Shemitish pronunciation which you may suppose, is not so *very* different from the Hebrew, that one might not form some sort of conjecture at least, respecting the rhythm grounded upon it.

to the long vowel; but two consonants before the vowel constitute also but one *mora*, so that בְּבַבְּ is equal to בַּ and בְּבַ .

¹ Comp. Buxtorf Thes. Gram. p. 631 sqq.

² An artificial and very complex versification, like that of Pindar, where this would not be the case, is not once to be thought of in speaking of Hebrew poetry; for such consummate versification belongs to a higher state of culture than existed among the Hebrews. Besides, the division of the verses as ascertained in the alphabetic poems, decides against such higher versification.

Our own opinion respecting the rhythm of the Hebrew poetry coincides with the second class of opinions which have been exhibited above; and differs in no respect from that of the learned Jewish Rabbins and of Herder. This opinion, moreover, seems to be the one which generally prevails, yet without being sufficiently understood. At least, it seems not to be allowed that the parallelism of members constitutes a real rhythmical form, or else it is one for which there is no taste. We shall attempt to introduce more correct notions on this subject.

The Hebrew poetry is divided into two kinds, the *lyric* and the *epic*. Under the first division I embrace all poetry which is produced under a strong emotion and excitement of the subject or person who speaks, whence it may be called also, *impassioned* or *subjective* poetry: the title of *objective* poetry would be applicable to the latter, inasmuch as its character consists in the calm description of an object. The former includes among the Hebrews three subordinate kinds, *the didactic*, *the lyric* properly so called, and *the rhetorical* (prophetic), for among the Hebrews, these kinds of poetry are nearly related. Didactic poetry, it is true, must have somewhat of an objective character; but among the Hebrews, who had as yet no artificial or scientific culture, reflexion was always connected with inspiration, and was therefore lyric; in the same manner as in all antiquity, the man of wisdom was at the same time musician, poet, and inspired. Besides, eloquence must sometimes aim at being objective, because it very often seeks to operate upon the understanding; but here also every thing lay under the dominion of feeling and of inspiration. In short, would the Hebrew impart instruction, or give expression to his feelings, would he warn, censure or reprove, he always spoke as a lyric poet, in the fervour of inspiration. Now it is this lyric poetry of the Hebrews which has a rhythmical form;¹ the epic adopts the prosaic style. I account to myself for this phenomenon in the following manner. In an excited state of mind, in strong emotion and inspiration, it is natural for the speaker to elevate his voice and his language above the ordinary tone and style. The breast heaves, the inflexions of the voice become more marked, the words are accompanied with more expressive accents, the movement of the discourse is

¹ It evidently arose from a limited notion of rhythm, that none but the books called *מִזְמוֹרֹת*, the Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, and Job, were denominated rhythmical, and received the poetic accents.

more measured and lofty, in a word, the discourse approaches to song. Nay, the inclination soon becomes strong actually to sing. Hence a regular rhythmical structure of language will present itself first and chiefly in lyric poetry. But in narrative discourse the case is different. As the narrator expresses not his own thoughts and feelings, but is occupied with the description of his object, that is, of the thoughts, feelings and actions of another, with which he must allow himself to be affected only so far as may be necessary to impart life to the narration; as he is obliged to place a curb, as it were, upon his own thoughts and feelings, that they may not encroach too much upon the narrative, and detract from the clear perception of the object; repose will be the character of his style, and he will therefore preserve the ordinary, quiet flow of discourse. And thus the style of narrative among the Hebrews always remained free and unadorned. In lyric poetry, on the contrary, the diction was ennobled by a certain rhythmical form. Just so the lyric poems of the Greeks are distinguished by a highly wrought and complicated style of versification from the simple Hexameter, which even among this people, approaches nearer to the language of common discourse. The poetic and musical talent of the Greeks led them thus to reduce even their narrative poetry to the forms of rhythm and music; a thing which the artless Hebrews neglected to do, because it was only in the lofty mood of lyric poetry they experienced that sort of impulse which leads to the forms of art.

The question now arises, What is this rhythmical form of the Hebrew poetry? Before we answer it, we shall endeavour to furnish ourselves with more enlarged and general notions of the nature of rhythm, than seem generally to prevail. Rhythm is a rule of any sort in discourse, a law which aims to reduce its various and resisting elements to unity and harmony. These various elements of discourse consist of the different modifications of its movement, i. e. of the different accentuation, quantity, inflexion, union and separation of words, and of the different divisions or members of the period. These modifications are of two kinds, giving rise to two distinct branches of the rhythmical art, whose object it is simply to raise what is natural and lawless to the sphere of art and rule. The human voice has this peculiarity, that it is subject to continual alteration and change; it never remains for two successive moments on the same key and of the same strength—it may continue on the

same key, but the strength, effort, accent with which it is exerted, will differ. Its movement is wave-like—its alternation like that of lights and shades. This alternation is different in different languages, less distinct in some than in others; in German and English it is indicated by the accent. This is the stamp, so to speak, which introduces lights and shades into language. Now when this alternation, which in common discourse is left to itself, is subjected to a uniform rule, it gives rise to *syllabic measure*, the law of which is the *arsis* and *thesis*, or the *tact*, i. e. a regular rising and falling of the voice. But besides these smaller divisions of discourse, there are others still greater, which arise from the necessity of recovering the breath, and from the winding off of the thought, and which in prose are designated to a certain extent by the punctuation. These also are reduced to regular form by the rhythmical art, giving rise to verses and strophes. That art of versification is complete, which combines these two sorts of members into a well organized whole; but there may also be one which is incomplete, defective in certain respects. There may be a rhythm which consists simply in the regular, harmonious structure of the smaller members; and there is such an one, which the Latins call *numerus*, and to which we give the name of rhythmical prose. In this, the law of the *arsis* and *thesis* will be observed with greater uniformity than in an uncultivated style, though there will be more freedom and latitude than in verse, and particular attention will be paid to the cadence at the end. The structure is carried to a vicious extreme, when one writes with perfect uniformity, e. g. in the iambic rhythm, a case however, which sometimes occurs. The dithyrambic verse also, the *μέτρα ἀπολελυμένα* of the Greeks, belongs to this species of rhythm; each single verse forms by itself a short, metrically arranged whole, but the several verses are not united again into strophes. Here there is more arrangement than in rhythmical prose, but only in details, whence there arises a chaos, as it were, of small rhythmical wholes. On the other hand, there may also be a rhythm in which the order of the smaller members is neglected, and the attention is exclusively bestowed upon the regular distribution of the greater ones. Such is the rhyme, in the *unmetrical* or ruder kinds of verse, like what is found in popular poetry, e. g. in the German Master-singers. Here the larger sections of discourse are marked off by the rhyme, and a certain periodical rule for the ear is furnished by this similarity of sound in the concluding words. That

poetry in which the rhyme falls any where else except upon the concluding word of a sentence or member of a period, is the product of a more recent and artificial culture. An illustration may be drawn from the art of dancing, which will throw some light upon these two kinds of rhythm. The perfect dance is that which combines an elaborate finish of *step*, which answers to the metrical *fooi*—with a skilful arrangement of the general motions, the *figures*, which answer to the *verses* and *strophes*. But as there may be a dance, consisting simply of artificial steps, without any combination into figures and a whole—this answers to *rhythmical prose*—so also we may conceive of one in which the several steps are left entirely to nature and chance, and the only thing aimed at is an agreeable arrangement of the motions at large. This answers to the second species of *unmetrical rhythm*.

To this last kind belongs the Hebrew rhythm, viz. the parallelism of members. This is nothing more nor less than a rhythmical proportion, and that of the simplest sort, between the larger sections or members of a period, the smaller being neglected. Nothing is more simple than the symmetry, the proportion between two parts of a whole,—the proportion between several begins to require more ingenuity and calculation. Thus the relation between parallel lines is the simplest that we can conceive to exist between different lines; the triangle, the square, already begin to be more complex, and the circle is the most perfect of all figures. It might also be remarked, that every period consisting of two propositions, forms a whole, and suffices for a full expression of the voice and satisfying of the ear; while a single proposition is insufficient for either. The breast is still elevated, the ear continues to listen, and yet there is nothing more to be said, nothing more to be heard. In fact, the parallelism of members seems to be a fundamental law of rhythm. It obviously lies at the foundation of the rhyme, where one verse is made to answer to the other. The more complicated forms of rhyme, in the stanza, sonnet etc. were invented at a comparatively later period; but even in these the law of parallelism may still be detected; at least, the *ottave rime* and the sonnet naturally fall into two divisions, each answering to the other.* In like manner the relation of the Hexameter and

* In the former, the two concluding verses are parallel to the six first, and in the second there is the same relation between the 8 first and the 6 last verses.

Pentameter is that of parallelism, and even the lyric strophes admit perhaps of being referred to the same form. The relation of the strophe, anti-strophe, and epode, on the contrary, already indicates the transposition of the parallelism to the more perfect form of the triangle.

But in what does the parallelism of members in the Hebrew poetry consist, and how is it indicated? Here we must forget all the demands which might be made by the delicate, musical ear of the Greeks, so sensitive to the measure of time, or by that of the moderns, so partial to similitude of sound. The Hebrew has neither the one nor the other; he is in general but little given to the external, to what strikes the senses; hence too he was always but a slow proficient in the fine arts. Serious by nature, he loves to withdraw into himself, and to be wholly occupied with his own internal being, his thoughts. And so it was with his rhythm, which belonged more to the thought than to the outward form and sound; and he therefore indicated his rhythmical divisions by the divisions of the thought, and the proportion of the rhythmical propositions by that of the subject matter.

The following circumstances contributed perhaps in some measure, to the formation of this rhythm of thought. The Hebrew, and whoever like him stands at that point of intellectual cultivation where the mind is in a condition to seize only certain general and simple relations of things, is fond of presenting his ideas and feelings in short sentences; these sentences are connected with each other in a manner which possesses but little variety, usually according to the law of resemblance and contrast, (a law which readily presents itself to the observing understanding,) and for the most part only in couplets, because the combination of several sentences implies already the notice of a greater variety of relations. This speaking in short sentences is still further favoured by the impassioned tone of the speaker; for, in the fulness and glow of inspiration and internal feeling, the words are slow to adapt themselves to the thought, the speaker struggles with language, and wrests from it nothing but single short expressions. A peculiar fondness is manifested in this style of speaking for tautology and comparison. There is a want of versatility and variety of expression, and yet there is a wish to express one's self fully, and to present the subject in various points of light; hence the same thing is often repeated in synonymous expressions and figures. Now if a person who

speaks in this way is disposed to introduce into his discourse a regular rhythm, a proportion between the several propositions presents itself as a ready expedient, whose original law will be that of resemblance and contrast, the law by which, in other cases, one proposition is arranged with another.

After these remarks, nothing will appear more natural than the following form of discourse, Job 7: 1.

Is there not a warfare for man upon earth,
 Are not his days like the days of an hireling?
 As a servant he earnestly desireth the shadow,
 As a hireling he looketh for the reward—

where each thought is twice expressed, and after each such repetition there is a pause.

But the parallelism of members is of different kinds. In the first place, it differs according to the different laws of the association of thoughts.* The two principal laws of resemblance and contrast or antithesis, produce the *synonymous* and *antithetic* parallelism, according to the terminology of Lowth; a third is founded simply upon a resemblance in the form of construction and progression of the thoughts, and this we may call with Lowth the *synthetic* parallelism. With the synonymous parallelism belongs also the *identical*, or the repetition with suspense, e. g. Job 18: 13.

There devours the members of his body,
 There devours his members—the first born of death.

Under the term synonymous is included also comparison, subordination, etc. But as we are concerned at present chiefly with the rhythmical form, we shall venture upon another classification, and only retain the logical arrangement in the minor divisions.

I. Thought is represented by words; hence it will frequently happen where there is a perfect resemblance or antithesis of thoughts, that the *words will be equal*, at least in their number; and sometimes, on the account of the similar construction and position of the words, there will also be a certain resemblance of sound. This we may call the *original*, perfect kind of parallelism of members, which coincides with metre and rhyme, yet without being the same with them. Such is the kind of paral-

* This is the basis of the classification of parallelism given by Lowth, Lect. XIX.

lelism in which the song of Lamech is composed, Gen. 4: 23. The translation can present nothing more than the equality in the number and position of the words, the rhyme must be omitted.

Adah and Zillah, hear my voice !
 Wives of Lamech, receive my speech !
 If I slew a man to my wounding,
 And a young man—to my hurt :
 If Cain was avenged seven times,
 Then Lamech—seventy times seven.

Here all is nearly equal, except the places marked with a dash, where the words must be supplied from the preceding member. Similar examples of rhyme occur in Ps. 8: 5. 25: 4. 85: 11. 106: 5. For more see Schindler,¹ and Leutwein.²

Verses similar in their termination, but unequal in the number of their words, and without exact parallelism of thought, occur in the following passage, Job 10: 17.

With new witnesses thou dost confront me,
 And increasest thine indignation upon me,
 Pourest fresh troops against me.

Equality in the number of words together with exact proportion of thought, is a case of frequent occurrence in Job, e. g. chap. 6: 5.

Doth the wild ass bray over his grass,
 Doth the ox low over his fodder ?

Comp. chap. 6: 23. 8: 1.

We have an example of equality in words with antithesis of thought, Ps. 20: 9.

They stumble and fall,
 But we stand and are erect.

Comp. Is. 65: 13.

Also in the synthetic parallelism equality in the number of words sometimes occurs, e. g. Ps. 19: 8.

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul,
 The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.

For many examples of this case in which the number of words is equal, see Leutwein, p. 64 sq.

¹ Tract. de accent. Hebr. p. 81 sq.

² L. c. p. 51 sq.

II. But this external proportion of words is not the essential part of the parallelism of members. It may be adopted, it is true, as a rule, that the number of words is about equal, especially in certain books, as the Proverbs of Solomon, and Job; but in the Psalms a great inequality prevails. This *inequality* is of different kinds, as follows.

1. The *simple unequal* parallelism, in which one of the members is too short compared with the other, e. g. Ps. 68: 33.

Ye kings of the earth, sing God;
Harp to the Lord!

This construction frequently produces a grand effect, e. g. Ps. 37: 13. 48: 5. Job 14: 14; where the conciseness of expression adds in one case to the vividness of the thought, in the other to its emphasis.

Yet in these examples the inequality seems to have arisen from the brevity of the thought—it fell naturally into these words and the poet let it pass. Hence it is still not inconceivable that there might have been a metre. *We* also sometimes sacrifice metre to conciseness of thought, to emphasis, to a pause.

2. But a still more frequent kind of unequal parallelism, viz. the *complex*, admits not of this explanation. It consists in this, that either (a) the first member, or (b) the second member, is composed of two propositions, so that a complex member corresponds to a simple one. This structure arises whenever in addition to the principal parallelism of thought, another subordinate parallelism presents itself to the poet in the full flow of his thoughts and feelings; hence we most frequently meet with it in lively, impassioned passages. It occurs more rarely in the book of Job, commonly in the speeches of Job himself, which sometimes rise to the lofty lyric style; but it is frequently to be met with in the Psalms. Hence there are also different kinds of parallelism according to the logical connexion of the propositions:

α) The synonymous, e. g. Ps. 36: 7.

Thy righteousness is like the great mountains,
Thy judgments like a great deep,
Thou preservest man and beast, O Lord.

Job 10: 1.

I am weary of my life,
Therefore will give loose to my complaints,
Will speak of the sorrows of my soul.

Comp. Job 3: 5. 7: 11. Ps. 112: 10.

2) The antithetic, Ps. 19: 4. 5

In whose eyes a vile person is contemned,
But he that feareth the Lord, honoured :
Who swears to the wicked, and breaks not his oath.

Comp. Job 10: 15. Ps. 49: 11.

2) The synthetic, Ps. 15: 5.

He that putteth not out his money to usury,
And taketh not a bribe against the innocent.
He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

Comp. Job 10: 18. 20: 26. Ps. 22: 25. 14: 7. 18: 31.

3. Sometimes the simple member is disproportionably small, so that the inequality is still more striking, e. g. Ps. 40: 10.

I proclaim thy righteousness in the great congregation ;
Lo, I refrain not my lips !
O Lord, thou knowest.

Sometimes a noble effect is thus produced, e. g. Ps. 91: 7.

Though a thousand fall at thy side,
And ten thousand at thy right hand,
Thee it shall not touch.

Comp. Cant. 6: 4.

Frequently there is a parallelism in each several proposition and member, e. g. Ps. 69: 21.

Reproach breaks my heart—and I waste away ;
I hope for pity—but none is given me ;
And for comforters—but find none.

Here belongs also Ps. 69: 5.

They that hate me without a cause—are more than the
hairs of my head ;
They that would destroy me being mine enemies wrong-
fully—are mighty ;
I must restore what I took not away.

4. Sometimes the complex member is increased to three or four propositions, e. g. Ps. 1: 3.

He is like a tree planted by water-courses,
Which yieldeth its fruit in its season,
And whose leaves wither not ;
And all that he doeth, prospers.

Comp. Ps. 65: 10. 68: 31. 88: 6. This form is particularly frequent in the prophets, who, approaching as they generally do nearer to prose, often allow the parallelism to flow almost

into a free prosaic diction. Members with three propositions occur in Amos 1: 5. 3: 14. Mic. 5: 4. Indeed no less than four propositions sometimes form one member and with a grand effect, e. g. Amos 4: 13.

For lo! he that formeth the mountains and createth the wind,
And declareth unto man' what is his thought ;
That maketh the morning darkness,
And treadeth upon the high places of the earth ;
Jehovah, God of Hosts is his name. †

5. Instead of the full subordinate parallelism we sometimes find only a short clause or supplement, for the most part in the second member, e. g. Ps. 23: 3.

He reviveth my soul,
Leadeth me in a strait path,
For his name's sake.

Comp. Ps. 5: 3. 27: 11, 12, etc.

In these forms of parallelism the proportion is apparently destroyed ; but it is not so, provided we suppose it to consist not in the number of the words, and extent of the period, but in the thoughts. The relation between two thoughts remains essentially the same, although one of them may be more fully developed than the other. As it does not depend in the least upon the measure of the words, a considerable inequality in these makes no difference. It were well, if we could but always forget what was unknown to the Hebrew, the rule which requires a measure of time in rhythm !

III. Out of the parallelism which is rendered unequal by the complexity of one of the members, there arises, in the case of a still greater fulness of thought, another in which the equality is restored by both members becoming complex. Here richness of matter is combined with perfect proportion of form. The modes of combination are again the same—and accordingly we meet with the same species of parallelism :

κ) The synonymous, e. g., Ps. 31: 11.

My life is spent in grief,
And my years in sighing ;
My strength faileth by means of my punishment,
And my bones are consumed.

Sometimes the members have an alternate correspondence, e. g. Ps. 40: 17.

Let them rejoice and be glad in thee,
 All them that seek thee;
 Let them say continually, Great is Jehovah!
 Who love thy salvation.

Comp. Ps. 35: 26. 37: 14. Cant. 5: 3. Ps. 79: 2. Mic. 1: 4.

2) The antithetic, e. g. Ps. 30: 6.

For his anger endureth but a moment,
 His favour through life;
 Weeping turns in at night,
 And joy in the morning.

Comp. Ps. 55: 22.

Sometimes there is an alternate correspondence in the antithesis, Ps. 44: 3.

Thou didst drive out the heathen with thy hand,
 And plantedst those;
 Didst destroy the nations,
 And enlargedst those.

Comp. Is. 54: 10.

3) There are also instances of this double parallelism with the synthetic structure, e. g. Cant. 2: 3.

As the apple-tree amongst the trees of the wood,
 So is my beloved among the sons;
 I long for his shadow, sit beneath it,
 And his fruit is sweet to my taste.

This species of double parallelism occurs with peculiar frequency in the prophets, comp. Am. 1: 2. 3: 4 sq. 4: 4 sq. 9: 2 sq. Mic. 1: 4 sq. 3: 6 sq. Nah. 1: 1. 2: 1 sq. Hab. 1: 13, 16. Indeed, they were not satisfied with the latitude of this form, but gave to one of the members, or even to both, more than two propositions, and sometimes as many as four, e. g. Hab. 3: 17.

Then the fig-tree shall not blossom,
 Neither fruit be in the vines;
 The buds of the olive shall fail,
 And the fields yield no bread;
 The flock shall be cut off from the fold,
 And there shall be no herd in the stall.

Comp. Amos 2: 9. 5: 5. 7: 17. Mic. 2: 13. 7: 3. Hab. 2: 5. 3: 17.

In the better poets these subordinate propositions are short, in the other long, which occasions a sort of dragging, e. g. Zeph. 3: 19, 20.

IV. But we should entertain too narrow a view of the parallelism of members, if we supposed it to consist exclusively in the proportion of the thoughts. For how could we dispose of the numerous passages, where this is entirely wanting—where the thoughts are found to correspond to each other, neither by their resemblance, nor by antithesis, nor by synthesis? The parallelism of members assumed, further a *simply external rhythmical* form, such as rhyme is. Originally and according to rule, it was expressed in the matter; but next it left its impression as a distinct form, even where the matter did not correspond to it. The proportion grew habitual, and hence greater freedom and license in the thoughts was sometimes tolerated: besides, the constant recurrence of resemblance and antithesis would have been tedious both to poet and hearer. This species of parallelism we shall call the *rhythmical*, because it consists simply in the form of the period. Examples of it occur in all the kinds.*

1) With the number of the words nearly equal, e. g. Ps. 19: 12.

Moreover by them was thy servant warned;
In keeping of them there is great reward.

2) With striking inequality in the number of the words, e. g. Ps. 30: 3.

Jehovah, my God!

I cried unto thee and thou didst heal me.

3) With a double and a simple member, e. g. Ps. 14: 7.

O that the salvation of Israel would come out of Zion!
If Jehovah bring back the captives of his people,
Jacob rejoiceth, Israel is glad.

It is deserving of remark, how the rhythmical parallelism makes good its place where three parallel thoughts occur, and there is no internal ground for dividing them into exactly two members, e. g. Ps. 1: 1.

Blessed is the man, that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,
That treadeth not in the way of sinners,
And sitteth not in the circle of scorers.

* It is highly important to distinguish this sort of parallelism, in order to avoid the mistakes, which have so frequently arisen from the abuse of the parallelism of members as an exegetical help.

4) With two double members, e. g. Ps. 31: 23.

I thought in my confusion,
 I am cut off before thine eyes;
 But thou heardest the voice of my supplications,
 When I cried unto thee.

When the members of this rhythmical parallelism are more than double, which is sometimes the case, it approaches very near to prose; it is too loose a form to retain an exuberant matter without passing over into the prosaic style. With good poets this is rarely the case, but it sometimes occurs, e. g. Am. 6: 10; with the later and less correct, it happens more frequently, e. g. Mal. 1: 6. Zach. 13: 3. 10: 6. Zeph. 3: 8. The length of the members contributes, in a special manner, to destroy the rhythmical form. But while this form of parallelism brings us to the utmost limits of the province of rhythm, it also settles the question, that the parallelism of members is really a rhythmical form, which there would be room to doubt, if we had nothing but parallelism of thoughts.

The simply rhythmical parallelism holds the most prominent place in the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Here the parallelism of thoughts is to be reckoned almost among the exceptions, and when it does occur, it is, for the most part, the subordinate parallelism of a member by itself; in general, the rhythm alone predominates, and that too with a regularity which is rare among Hebrew poets, producing here a suitable effect, namely, monotony of complaint. The following orders of rhythm may be traced in the Lamentations.* In chapters first and second, the verses consist of three members, the two first of which constitute one parallel and stand over against the third, as the second parallel. Each member has besides a cæsura, which coincides with the sense and the accent. Still, however, we are sometimes under the necessity of abandoning the accents, because they follow the sense, while the rhythm is independent of the sense. According to the accents the first parallel is sometimes simple, e. g. chap. 2: 6, yet without a valid logical ground. The periods in chap. 1: 7, and chap. 2: 19, are distinguished by having four members. It is remarkable that the length of these verses should so greatly exceed those which elsewhere occur in Hebrew poetry. Lowth is of the opinion

* Comp. Lowth. Prælect. XXII. p. 257 sq.

that these long verses are adapted to lamentation, and it must be acknowledged that they do have a tendency to produce a certain impression of melancholy. Chap. 3 has only verses of one member without parallelism; yet this one member is rhythmically divided in such a manner as to produce, if not a complete rhythmical parallelism, yet a supplementary clause, which conduces to repose. Here again the accents sometimes stand in the way, e. g. chap. 3: 3, where כַּל הַיּוֹם is not enough to form a supplementary clause. Tiphcha, also, sometimes changes place with Zakeph Katon, although the rhythmical cæsura is always the same. Perhaps, however, every three verses is to be considered as a rhythmical whole, as they are connected by having the same initial letters. Chap. 5 is of the same structure with chap. 3, except that it has a real short rhythmical parallelism, which however the authors of the accents did not consider as complete, and therefore have not separated with Athnach. Chap. 4 has double parallelism, but for the most part simply rhythmical.

We must notice one more exception in Hebrew rhythm. There sometimes occur separate propositions of a single member, almost always introduced with design, since the poet lingers upon the thought; we may conceive it to be accompanied with a long pause, e. g. Ps. 23: 1. 25: 1. Here the poet indicates, as it were, the tone and character of the song, and after a pause, again collects himself. Cant. 7: 7 is beautiful :

How fair, how charming art thou, O love, in mirth,
where the poet loses himself as it were in the contemplation of beauty. In Job 10: 22 the voice sinks with two parallel clauses beautifully to repose.

What goes beyond this simple rhythm in the rhythmical art of the Hebrews, amounts to but little. Here belongs

1. The artificial arrangement of the alphabetical Psalms. Thus Psalms 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145, Prov. 31: 10 sq. the Lamentations of Jeremiah, with the exception of the last chapter, are alphabetically arranged by the initial letters of the verses, and this in different ways. Commonly each verse begins with a new letter; in Ps. 37, however, only every other verse, though with interruption and change; in Ps. 119 and Lam. 3, there are alphabetical strophes, as it were, i. e. a series of verses have the same initial letters; in Psalms 111, 112, the half-verses are alphabetically arranged. This arrangement answers for

us the valuable purposes of proving the existence of the parallelism of members, and of confirming the system of accentuation in the division of verses and half-verses, respecting which we might otherwise have our doubts, as well as respecting the whole law of parallelism. The alphabetical arrangement is supposed by many* to have been intended to assist the memory. Michaelis, indeed, was of the opinion, that it was employed in the first place in the funeral dirge as an aid to the mourners, and afterwards employed on other occasions. Lowth supposes, that the alphabetic poetry, "was confined altogether to those compositions, which consisted of detached maxims, or sentiments without any express order or connexion." I consider the alphabetic arrangement as a contrivance of the rhythmical art, an offspring of the later vitiated taste. When the spirit of poetry is flown, men cling to the lifeless body, the rhythmical form, and seek to supply its absence by this. In truth, nearly all the alphabetical compositions are remarkable for the want of connexion, (which I regard as the consequence instead of the cause of the alphabetical construction,) for common thoughts, coldness and languor of feeling, and a low and occasionally mechanical phraseology. The 37th Psalm, which is the most free in its alphabetical arrangement, is perhaps alone to be excepted from this censure, and in truth is one of the best didactic poems of the Hebrews. The Lamentations are indeed possessed of considerable merit in their way, but still betray an unpoetic period and degenerated taste.

In many of the alphabetic pieces we observe certain irregularities and deficiencies, which many (as Capell) have incorrectly imputed to the transcribers, who were the least exposed to commit mistakes in these compositions, since they were confined by the peculiar arrangement itself. In Ps. 25, two verses begin with א, none with ב; yet the word בְּיָהוָה in the second verse (like the interjection of the Greek tragedians ὦμοι) might not have been included in the verse, or (as Bengel conjectures) might have been written in the margin, in which case the following בְּיָהוָה would restore the alphabetical order. Also in this, and in Ps. 34, the ו is wanting; perhaps it should be restored by the ו in the beginning of the second hemistich of the verse commencing with ה; and so also, perhaps, the ק, which is wanting in the 17th verse of the former Psalm, should

* As Lowth, p. 29, 259, and Michaelis on Lowth, p. 562 ed. Rosenm.

be replaced by the ק in קָוִי־קִי־יִי at the beginning of the second hemistich. On the other hand, two verses begin with ר , and after the last letter ר follows another ר . This last we find also at the close of the 34th Psalm. Michaelis supposes the ר is counted twice on account of its double pronunciation, as Pe and Fe. Hasse¹ erected upon it a *paleographical* hypothesis peculiar to himself, which is hardly capable of being sustained, and gives no satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon to be explained. According to this, the concluding ר , with a softer pronunciation, takes the place of the Φ in the Greek alphabet. The conjecture of Bengel² is no better, who supposes that ר and ר both sprung out of the Phenician Vau and Fau, and that the latter stands for the former; then the supernumerary verse with ר must come in the place of ר .³ Rosenmueller (1st ed.) considers both verses as the additions of a later hand, by which these Psalms were prepared for the public service. But this could not be the case in respect to Ps. 34 at least, as the last verse is necessary to the concluding of the whole; the conclusion of the 25th Psalm is also very appropriate, and cannot well be dispensed with.⁴—In Ps. 37, ז precedes ז , ז is wanting, and ז is repeated. Bengel accounts for this not unsatisfactorily from the interchangeable use of ז and ז in Chaldee. Others resort for help to criticism.⁵ The 39th verse begins with $\text{רָחֵם־יְהוָה־עָלָינוּ}$, where perhaps the ר was not regarded.—In Ps. 145 the verse with ר is wanting, which according to Michaelis has fallen out of the text.—In Lam. 2, 3, 4, ר precedes ז , which Bengel explains in the same manner as the similar fact in Ps. 37. The order only is different: it was the custom to place letters of a similar sound together.

Perhaps all these irregularities are to be ascribed to the negligence and unskilfulness of the poets, as we impute to the same causes the many harsh and inelegant rhymes of our older ecclesiastical poets. The hypothesis of Bengel, that of many alphabetical Psalms we have only the first imperfect sketch, amounts to nearly the same thing. The occurrence of the same irregularities in Psalms 25 and 34, proves their relation to

¹ Eichhorn's Allg. Bibl. VIII. 42 sq.

² L. c. p. 14. N. 13.

³ Another explanation of this irregularity is given by Vogel in Capelli Crit. T. I. p. 123.

⁴ See the author's remarks upon Ps. 25: 22.

⁵ Ibid.

each other, and the circumstance that *פָּדוּהוּ*, to *redeem*, forms the conclusion of both, may be regarded as a characteristic trait in these popular elegiac Psalms, (for such I esteem them,) as the later Jews in their oppression were always hoping for redemption.

2. We find in the Hebrew poetry the first beginnings of a complex rhythmical structure, similar to our strophes. In Ps. 42, 43, an odd verse (refrain) forms the conclusion of a greater rhythmical period. Something of the same kind, though not complete, occurs in Ps. 107; where v. 1—9, v. 10—16, v. 17—32, are separated by a nearly similar conclusion. The prophecies Is. 9: 7.—10: 4, and Am. 1: 2.—2: 16, are upon the same plan. Gesenius (on Isaiah) supposes that the same kind of refrain is to be found in a part of Solomon's Song. There is a singular specimen of art in Ps. 49, where the 13th and 21st verses are word for word alike, except that by the change of a single letter, *יִגְיֹן* in the one becomes *יִבְיֹן* in the other, so that a different sense is produced where the sound is entirely similar.

3. The *rhythm by gradation* in the Psalms of Degrees is a remarkable form. It consists in this, that the thought or expression of a preceding verse is resumed and carried forward in the next, e. g. Ps. 121.

- 1 I lift up mine eyes unto the hills :
From whence will *my help come* ?
- 2 *My help cometh* from Jehovah,
The creator of heaven and earth.
- 3 He suffereth not my foot to be moved,
Thy keeper *slumbereth* not.
- 4 Lo! he *slumbereth* not, nor sleepeth,
The *keeper* of Israel.
- 5 *Jehovah* is thy *keeper*,
Jehovah, thy shade, is at thy right hand.
- 6 The sun shall not smite thee by day,
Nor the moon by night.
- 7 *Jehovah preserveth* thee from all evil,
Preserveth thy soul.
- 8 *Jehovah preserveth* thy going out and thy coming in,
From this time forth forevermore.

Gesenius has pointed out the same arrangement in the song of Deborah, and in Is. c. 26, where v. 5, 6, read thus :

The lofty city he *hath laid low*,
Hath laid it low to the ground.

*The foot hath trodden it down,
The feet of the poor, the steps of the needy.*

A form somewhat similar to this in modern poetry is the *triolet*; but it differs in making the whole composition turn upon one principal thought.

As exponents of the rhythmical relation, as a kind of rhythmical notes, the *accents* may be employed. It is well known that they serve at the same time as marks of the tone, of the punctuation, and of the mode of delivery. They indicate the syllable, which is to be distinguished from the others by a greater elevation of voice, that is, which has the tone, and at the same time point out the relation which one word has to another in respect to the rising and falling of the voice, whether or not the word stands in a longer or shorter pause of the discourse. The first law of the accentuation is the sense, and accordingly it may be compared to our system of punctuation. Next it follows the mode of delivery or the enunciation.* Since now the sense and the rhythm in Hebrew poetry usually coincide, and the elocution answers to the rhythm where the sense does not, it follows that, with few exceptions, the accentuation may be used as an index to the rhythm: only the system enters into such minute details, and is encumbered with such a multitude of signs, that a great deal of it is of no use for the purposes of rhythm. All that is of service here, are the more important relations, indicated by the great disjunctive accents; the smaller belong to grammar and elocution; we can therefore dispense with the host of conjunctive accents, and also with many of the subdisjunctives; the principal disjunctives only, which mark the greater sections, are of any important service to rhythm. Moreover, the diversity between the prosaic and metrical accentuation is of no importance to the present purpose; it seems, besides the occasional difference of signs, to consist in this, that the latter aims at producing greater emphasis of pronunciation, and bestows more attention upon the cadence at the end. That this diversity has no connexion with the rhythm, properly so called, is evident from the circumstance, that rhythmical pieces, as the Lamentations, the Song of Solomon, and many passages in the prophets, have the prosaic accents, and

* Hirt justly distinguishes between the *dictamen grammaticum, syntacticum* i. e. the sense, and *rhetoricum* i. e. the elocution. System. Accent. p. 60.

yet there is no difficulty in ascertaining the rhythm. In order to understand the relation of the two methods of accentuation, let one compare Ps. 18 with 2 Sam. c. 22, and he will see that both answer the same purpose.

The following remarks respecting the rhythmical import of the accents may not be out of place. Silluk with Soph Pasuk denotes the close of the full rhythmical period or the strophe, commonly called the verse: Athnach in prose, and in poetry Merka Mahpach, and in its absence the former also, divide the strophes into two halves, into the parallel members; subdivisions are made by Segolta, Zakeph Katon, Rebia, and Tiphcha in prose, and in poetry by Athnach when Merka Mahpach precedes, and by Rebia: by the last, however, not always; it is often placed merely for the purpose of elocution, especially in the second member before Silluk, in order to sustain the cadence.

Since the great accents answer so important and useful an end, we may easily put up with the numerous train of subdisjunctives, vicars and servants, seeing that they are all, by the systems, intimately connected with each other. The smaller disjunctives, too, are often of service to the rhythm, e. g. in the Lamentations. If, in addition to this, we consider that the system of accentuation is grounded upon a mainly correct knowledge of the Hebrew grammar and Syntax, and may also serve as an index in this last respect, we surely shall not acquiesce in the judgment of Capell, "*Accentus, si una litura expurgerentur, nihil inde detrimenti metuendum,*"¹ that no injury would be done, if the accents were all to be expunged at a dash. As little shall we approve of modern experiments in printing the Hebrew text without accents; or be satisfied even with the retaining of the great accents alone, as in the Bible of Münster.

The question remains, whether it is possible and necessary to translate the parallelism of members. Herder very justly decides² that the parallelism ought to be retained in the translation, because with it we should lose a great part of the simplicity, dignity and elevation of the language. He has not himself exactly followed this rule in his translations; and yet to us it seems as natural as it is necessary. It is with the Germans an established principle, in translating every poet, to give him his own

¹ Arcan. punct. p. 156.

² Geist der hebr. Poesie I. 26.

peculiar versification, and we adhere to it even where the greatest difficulties are to be conquered; and why should it be abandoned here, where such difficulties do not exist? It is usually abandoned out of a predilection for syllabic measure, and a false refinement of the ear; no poetry, it is imagined, can be harmonious, which is not written at least in iambics. But, in my opinion, this is a false taste; our free iambics would have afforded but little satisfaction to the Greeks, and the harmony of well written prose might well be preferred to that of the limping, uniform iambus. Of course, in the translation of the parallelism, we must aim at a certain elegance, a sort of *number*, and bestow particular attention upon the form of the period, that it may be full, terse, powerful, with a majestic cadence, and above all, expressed with the utmost conciseness. We shall always, indeed, fall short of the original, especially in conciseness, in which the Hebrew poets are masters; but we may console ourselves with remembering the fate of all translations! The best means, unquestionably of representing the rhythm to the eye, is by a greater or less insertion or indentation of the lines; in the same manner as *we* are accustomed to mark our rhythmical divisions. Such an arrangement of the Hebrew poetry is, indeed, nothing new. In ancient manuscripts, and also in the Latin version, the poetical books are divided into hemistichs; and they are printed in the same manner in some of our editions; nay more, in ancient manuscripts the Mosaic books are also divided off into lines according to the punctuation, and hence many have wished that an entire edition of the Old Testament might be so printed.¹ Jerome, also, in his translation of the prophets and poetical books, has distinguished the verses and half-verses from each other.²

¹ Comp. Löscher de caus. l. Hebr. p. 356.

² I have observed such a method of arranging the position of the lines in my translation. The plan is as follows; for the simple parallelism:

_____ Athnach.
 _____ Soph Pasuk.

for the unequal:

_____ Zakeph K. or Rebia.
 _____ Athnach.
 _____ S. Pas.

Perhaps many will still be inclined to consider the parallelism of members, which we have undertaken to defend, as not constituting a rhythm, because they cannot relinquish the notion of the necessity of the rhythmical arrangement of syllables and words, that is, of such a rhythm as comes under the first head in our classification. We are willing to meet them with the following supposition : The Hebrews certainly had something analogous to such a rhythm ; the accents justify that presumption. They had a certain form of enunciation, after which they were accustomed to recite their poetry ; and by this, perhaps, the poet guided himself, though not so strictly but that he might easily depart from it, whenever the words did not fall into it naturally. In this case the reader or reciter knew how to help the defect ; he dilated (spoke more slowly) where the words were too short ; he abbreviated (spoke more rapidly) where they were too long. The rhythmical pauses, and the last words immediately preceding them, might be particularly attended to in the enunciation ; less so, the words in the middle of the period. Hence we find, that according to rule, a small distinctive accent at the end particularly of the second hemistich, always precedes the great accents, acting, as it were, as a check upon the voice. The number of syllables in the final word is also taken into view, according to which the preceding accentuation is governed.¹ This leads us to the inquiry respecting the musical use of the accents.

That the accents are musical notes, seems to be intimated by one of their names, *גְּיָוֹת*. *Accentus*, however, is a similar

or else :

_____ Merka Mahp. or Athnach.

_____ Athnach or Zakeph K.

_____ S. P.

The plan of the double parallelism is sufficiently evident from the above. A circumstance which evinces the propriety of this arrangement is my unpremeditated coincidence with Leutwein, whose judgments on Hebrew poetry are not without taste, though expressed in an antiquated language.

¹ Comp. Weimari Doctr. Accent. p. 81 sq. Wasmuthi Institut. method. Accent. Hebr. p. 133.

name, and yet has no connexion with music. Our principal evidence of the fact must therefore be the tradition of the Jews, which is found in the Talmud, as well as in the writings of the modern Rabbins.¹ The Jews of the present day actually employ the accents as musical signs. The *Torah* is sung or cantillated by them in their synagogues. The mode of cantillation differs in different places. It is described in the *Sargas*, specimens of which have been published by Jablonsky, Ebert, Kircher, and others.² Excepting a few embellishments, this mode of singing is nothing more than a sort of declamation approaching to song, similar to the intonation of our liturgical forms. Now may it not be, that in this cantillation the ancient Hebrew music is still preserved, and in the accents, the notes belonging to it? The Jews acknowledge themselves, that their genuine ancient music, and the true signification of the accents, is lost—which no one will dispute. I would not, however, on this account, with Wasmuth,³ Carpzov and others, throw aside so entirely the present musical use of the accents; it is certainly grounded upon an ancient tradition, and may perhaps give us a notion of the manner in which the ancient Hebrews recited their poetry. I allow that such experiments in deciphering the musical import of the accents, as have been published by Speidel⁴ and Anton,⁵ are too arbitrary and bold. Yet they ever lead to

¹ Abicht Accent. Hebr. ex antiquiss. usu lectoris vel musico explan. p. 3.—Following this tradition Eichhorn (Einl. ins A. T. I. § 71) concludes that the accents were invented for a musical use. Also Michaelis (on Lowth p. 437) ascribes a higher antiquity to the accents than to the vowel points.

² Jablonsky, Pref. to his Heb. Bible; Ebert Poes. Heb. p. 65; Kircher Musurg. Tom. I. Lib. II. c. 5. According to these the accents are not properly notes, but signs of entire musical phrases. There are three of these *Sargas*, the German, the Italian, and the Spanish. The German Jews (vid. Elias Levita טעם טורב Cap. 2) object to the Italians and Spaniards, that they do not sufficiently distinguish the accents; the latter on the other hand, accuse the former of want of order and distinctness of modulation. Unquestionably the Spanish mode of singing is simpler and in better taste than the German.

³ Vindicar. Hebr. P. II. c. II. obj. 7. p. 325.

⁴ L. c. vid. Forkel l. c. p. 156.

⁵ In Paulus N. Rep. I. 160 sq. and II. 80 sq.

the result, that the Hebrew music was little more than cantillation, which is also confirmed by the custom of the Jews at the present day, and by the probable conjectures respecting the ancient Hebrew instrumental music. The instruments of the Hebrews, for instance, were for the most part, as Forkel well observes, of the rattling, clashing, noisy kind, and therefore evince that their music was in a very imperfect state.

From all this we may form some conjecture to assist us in determining the musical relation of the parallelism of members. In the same manner as we have supposed that there existed a certain form or rule for the enunciation of the parallelism, which always remained the same, let the sentences be long or short; so also we may suppose that there was a similar rule for the inflexions of the voice in cantillation, which admitted, indeed, of being altered in particular instances, but yet always offered a somewhat similar recurrence of sound to the ear. Whoever has visited a Jewish synagogue will understand me; the intonations in our own church also, which probably originated out of the Jewish cantillation, may serve to illustrate my meaning. Thus the difficulty would be removed of explaining how such a free rhythm could be adapted to musical representation. The objection that in this case cheerful and plaintive songs must have been chanted according to the same rule, may be removed, perhaps, by supposing that it was the practice to adopt a change of key and of measure suited to the subject of the piece, so that the cheerful songs might be given on a high key and with a quick measure, while the plaintive ones were in a grave key and in slow time.

Thus we have attempted to exhibit the parallelism of members, as a form of sentence, of recitation, and of song; and to point out its place as a true rhythmical structure by the side of other species of rhythm, which we allow to be more finished and complete; and no one, we hope, will dispute its claims.

The question whether the Psalms were sung by choirs may be distinctly answered in the affirmative, so far as it regards the Temple Psalms, and all which were destined for the public service. It is still the custom in the synagogue for the assembly to respond as a choir to the chant of the chorister; and Miriam with her women formed an alternate chorus, Ex. c. 15. But it by no means follows that we must divide the Psalms themselves into choruses, as Nachtigall, Künöel and others have done in their translations; it is probable that the chorus simply

repeated.¹ But even were this not the case, yet this division is a matter of too much uncertainty to be safely attempted. It is very doubtful whether the singing was alternate or responsive in all cases where there is a change of the person speaking; for the Orientals are extremely fond of such a change of the person speaking, even in poems which are not sung.²

In what way song was connected with the dance, it is impossible to determine. Few of the Psalms which we now possess, probably ever had any connexion with the dance. Songs like that of the women upon David's victory, were performed dancing; it could hardly be the case, however, that the two performances were so connected as to resemble the music and dance of modern times. The dance, perhaps, consisted for the most part, of certain figures which were executed by the files of dancers, chiefly in circles, as the Hebrew name חֲסִידָה seems to indicate, and the step, if not perfectly artless, was free and without rule.³ In this case, the dance of the Hebrews was the same in relation to other modes of dancing, as was their rhythm compared with the rhythm of other nations.

VIII. *Historical Interpretation of the Psalms.*

Before we proceed to the interpretation of the Psalms, we will give our readers some account of the hermeneutical principles, by which we shall be governed in the historical interpretation of this book. We approve of the labours of modern interpreters, who have endeavoured by the aid of history to refer the Psalms to the *situation* of the author, by which they were occasioned, and in which they were composed, and to make this the ground of their exposition. In fact, it is impossible that *any* feeling or emotion should be rightly and fully comprehended, without some knowledge of the individual who expresses it, in his distinct personality, and in his relation to the objects which have occasioned it; it is only by such a knowledge one is placed in a

¹ Such is the present custom in the East. The chorus repeats the melody in a lower key. See Niebuhr's Travels, I. 176.

² Comp. Jahn Einleit. ins A. T. II. 723.

³ Such is still the manner of the female dancers of the East. One of them takes the lead, *extemporizing* the steps and movement, which the others imitate, following in a circle. See Niebuhr's Travels, I. 184. Lady Montague's Letters, Let. 30. For other authorities, see Jahn's Bibl. Archaeol. I. 1. 405.

situation to sympathize in the emotion expressed, and to enter fully into the soul of the poet. But in pursuing this course, expositors have failed in critical exactness and moderation; they have been satisfied with conjectures which were merely possible, and indulged too much in hypothesis. The point to be aimed at in every kind of inquiry, and hence too in interpretation, is absolute certainty; to this a great many other things must be sacrificed. It were better to know a little less, but that which we do know, with greater certainty! It has therefore seemed to me preferable to give no interpretation at all, rather than an uncertain one; at least, the degree of probability which an interpretation has, should always be exactly defined, without yielding one's self exclusively to a single view of the subject.¹

Having established this principle, we proceed in our historical interpretation nearly as follows. In the first place, we give a characteristic sketch of the subject-matter, i. e. a description of what constitutes the peculiarity of the feelings and views contained in the Psalm, and especially of the particular relation of these to each other. We next inquire whether there is any allusion to external relations, objects and occasions, whether personal or of any other sort, and compare the account of the author and subject given in the title, with the contents which have been already ascertained; if the former agree with the latter, we adhere to it, and perhaps endeavour to fill up any deficiency by adducing other probable facts from history. But if this is not the case, we abandon the attempt at a definite historical interpretation, and content ourselves with general references. An elegy of David, a kind of which we have so many examples, may serve as an illustration. We first endeavour to ascertain what were the dangers, sufferings, persecutions, in a word, what was the situation of the poet; we next compare this with the history and relations of David; if they do not correspond we abandon the reference to David as improbable, but make no further attempt to verify the personal and historical allusions, except in a general way, and as a matter of conjecture pointing out the various probabilities. In this way we hope to steer clear of the multitude of hypotheses with which most commentaries on the Psalms abound, which, in many instances, serve only to obscure the sense and prevent the enjoyment of

¹ Kaiser in his "Zusammenhangende histor. Erkl. der fünf Ps. Bücher etc." instead of giving the historical expositions according to this principle, has followed arbitrary hypotheses.

these poems; for there are many subjects which may be understood with greater advantage in a broad and general view, than they can be when considered in a more definite but false point of light.

To conclude, we take our stand, in the interpretation of the Psalms, exclusively upon the historical ground, rejecting every kind of interpretation which is not historical. In this particular we shall need offer no justification of ourselves, since interpretation, as a science, has been advanced to so high a degree of perfection. It is impossible for us to enter into the spirit of the Psalms, or to sympathize cordially with their authors, without transporting ourselves back into their times. The Messianic interpretation which is applied to many of the Psalms, must be historically verified, in like manner with the many prophecies relating to the same subject, (Is. 9: 11. Mic. c. 5,) or we may consider it as nothing more than a particular application of the ideas which lie under the historical facts, the latter being the types and premonitions of the former. This reference should by all means be kept in view, though the full and clear explanation of it belongs rather to the interpretation of the New Testament.*

IX. Exegetical Helps.

The following selection out the multitude of works upon the Psalms, may meet the wants of such as do not wish to embrace the whole literature of the subject, but only to become acquainted with what is best and most useful.

I. As *collections* of comments by different authors, may be recommended :

Critici Sacri s. clarissimorum virorum in sacrosancti utriusque foederis biblia doctissimae annotationes atque tractatus theologico-philologici. Lond. MDCLX. T. III Annotationes ad libros Hagiographos continens.

Matth. Poli Synopsis criticorum aliorumque Scripturae Sacrae interpretum et commentatorum. Francof. ad Moen. MDCXCIV. Vol. II Psalmos continens.

II. Commentaries.

Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary on the Psalms. It may be found in Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible, Venice 1515—17. Pub-

* See the author's Essay upon the symbolico-typical style of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the Berlin, theol. Zeitschrift, 3 tes Heft.

lished separately, Venice, in the year ש"ק 356, i. e. 1596 of the Christian era, and Isny 1542.

R. Solomon Jarchi and R. Abraham Aben Ezra's Observations may be found in Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible, Venice 1523—28. Those of the former also in the edition of 1547—49; also in the Rabbin. Bible of Buxtorf, Basle 1618, and in the Amsterdam ed. of 1724—27.

Hugonis Grotii Annotationes ad V. T. brevibus complurium locorum dilucidationibus auxit G. I. L. Vogel; continuavit J. Chr. Döderlein. Hal. T. III. 1776.

By the same, Auctarium, continens observationes in libros poeticos. Hal. 1779. Also under the title: Scholis in libros poeticos.

Franc. Vatabli Annotatt. in Psalmos subjunctis H. Grotii notis, quibus observationes adpersit G. I. L. Vogel. Hal. 1767.

Libri Psalmorum Paraphrasis Latina, quæ oratione soluta breviter exponit sententias singulorum, ex optimorum interpretum veterum et recentiorum rationibus. Addita sunt argumenta singulorum Psalmorum, et redduntur rationes paraphrascos, adpersis alicubi certorum locorum explanatiunculis. Excerpta omnia e scholis Esromi Rudingeri in ludo literario Fratrum Boemicorum Evangelizii in Moravis et nunc primum edita. In 5 Books. Görlitz 1580. 81. 4.

S. Psalmorum Libri quinque ad Ebraicam veritatem versi et familiari explanatione elucidati per Aretium Felinum (h. e. Mart. Bucerum). Argentor. 1526. fol. 1529. 4. Also reprinted with the real name of the author.

Anton. Agellii Comment. in Psalm. Par. 1611. fol.

Mosis Amyraldi Paraphrasis in Psalmos Davidis una cum annotationibus et argumentis. Salmurii 1662. 4. Ed. 2 Traj. ad Rhen. 1769. 4.

Mart. Geieri Comment. in Psalmos Davidis. Dresdae 1668. T. II. 4. Lips. 1681. fol.

Herm. Venema Comment. ad Psalmos. Leovard. 1762—67. Voll. VI. 4.

Joannis Clerici Comment. in libros Hagiographos V. T. Amstelod. MDCCXXI.

M. Ant. Flaminii in librum Psalmorum brevis Explanatio. Recudi curavit S. Th. Wald. Hal. 1785.

J. Henr. Michaelis Uberiores Annotatt. in Hagiogr. N. T. libros. Hal. 1729. Vol. III.

Joh. Bernh. Köhler's Crit. Remarks upon the Psalms, in the Repert. für bibl. und morgenländ. Literatur. Th. III. IV. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. XIII. XVIII.

Jo. Christ. Frid. Schulz Scholia in V. T. contin. a G. L. Bauer. Vol. IV Psalmos complectens. Norimb. 1790.

Ern. Frid. Car. Rosenmueller Scholia in V. T. Pars IV. Psalm. contin. Vol. I—III. Lips. 1798—1804. ed. 2. 1821. 22.

[Of still higher value is the *compendium* of this work, 1 Vol. 8vo. Lips. 1831. This, and the Commentary of De Wette, are in a philological view the best extant. Ed.

III. Translations.

Psalmi ex recensione textus Hebraei et versionum antiquarum latine versi notisque philologicis et criticis illustrati a J. A. Dathc. Hal. 1787.

John David Michaelis German translation of the Old Testament, Part 6, which contains the Psalms. Göttingen. 1771.

Further: With remarks, by G. Chr. Knapp. 3d ed. Halle 1789. By Moses Mendelsohn, ed. 2 Berl. 1788. With remarks by Herm. Muntinghe, from the Dutch of J. E. H. Scholl, 3 vol. Halle. 1792—93. By J. C. C. Nachtigall, Leips. 1776. With remarks, by J. A. Jacobi, Jena 1796. With remarks by Christ. Gottl. Künöl, Leips. 1799. By M. M. Stuhlmann, Hamb. 1812. By J. R. Schärer, Berne 1812. By M. Lindemann, Bamb. and Würzb. 1812. By F. V. Reinhard, Leips. 1814. By J. J. Stolz, Zurich 1814. By Fr. W. Goldwitzer, Erl. 1827. [The translation of De Wette himself is perhaps the best extant.—Ed.

ART. III. HINTS TO STUDENTS ON THE USE OF THE EYES.

By Edward Reynolds, M. D. of Boston.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

It is well known that no complaints are more common in our colleges and other seminaries of learning, than those which relate to the eyes; and there are probably none by which the studies of young men are more frequently interrupted. It is likewise well known, that the source of these affections is very frequently referred at college to the study of the Greek language; while in other seminaries and at more advanced stages, the blame is in like manner often cast upon the Hebrew. In both cases, the forms of the letters are supposed to produce a peculiar and injurious effect upon the eye. Whether this be true or not, or whatever may be the cause of the malady, the evil itself is so great, that the writer was led to make some inquiries on the subject, of the distinguished Physician and Oculist whose name stands at the head of this article. The views which he took of it seemed so just and important, and the whole path was in itself so novel in our country, and indeed so little trodden in the English language, that the writer could not but urge him to commit his thoughts to paper for the benefit of the public, and especially of those

more immediately concerned—the students in our colleges and in our theological and other seminaries. The present article was written in compliance with this request. It is popular in its character, and level to the comprehension of all, while its positions are founded on scientific principles and long practical experience. It strikes at the root of an evil which has robbed the church of many of her most promising sons; and finds therefore an appropriate place in the pages of a theological journal.—EDITOR.

HINTS ON THE USE OF THE EYES.

The Eye is the most wonderfully constructed organ of the body. It is one of the most important to every individual, who desires to fulfil the great duties of man, as an intellectual and moral being. Its importance rises in value, when it is considered as the channel of most of our knowledge of nature; and through her, of the wisdom, goodness, and majesty of God. It is the window of the soul. The wonders of the beautiful planet which He created for our temporary habitation, and the sublime splendors of the starry heavens, are all laid open to the mind, through the medium of this exquisitely fashioned organ. By the eye, we penetrate the mysteries of the animal and vegetable creation; and are constrained to adore, in delight, the divine hand, which painted the flowers, and breathed the spirit of life, and gave capacities of enjoyment to such an endless variety of beings. The eye opens to the mind a field of observation vast as the creation, in which it may walk forth, and drink as from a living fountain, the waters of intellectual and spiritual life. How did the heart of “the sweet Psalmist” glow with devotion, when he opened the eye upon the starry heavens! How did the mind of Newton expand, when the same glorious object was painted on his retina! The whole universe is a mirror, into which the eye may look, and see with a clearness no where equalled but in the book of Revelation, the wisdom, the goodness, the incomprehensible power, and the unutterable love of its divine Creator!

Milton speaks of the celestial light, that shone inward upon the mind, when the light of the sun was forever withdrawn. But who that has listened to the divine bard, and heard him tell of things invisible to mortal sight,—who that has walked with him, and beheld the now unearthly beauties of his Eden,

“ Her goodliest trees laden with fairest fruit,
Blossoms and fruits at once of golden hue,

—— With gay enamel'd colours mixed
 On which the sun more glad impressed his beams,
 Than in fair evening cloud, or humid bow,
 When God had showered the earth"—

who that has done this, does not know that all these beautiful images were originally brought by the eye to his soul; that nature in her richest scenery and loveliest hues, was once painted on his "quenched orbs;" and that if the blind bard had always been condemned to the darkness of the "drop serene," our eyes would never have been delighted with the unrivalled beauties, which his genius has portrayed to them? The eye is the grand avenue through which science pours her rich treasures into the soul. Who does not know, that if Milton's eyes had not once poured over the classics and sacred page, our minds would never have been elevated and instructed by the treasures of knowledge, which his poem contains?

The spirit of poetry was doubtless the living being of his soul. It was implanted there at his birth by nature's liberal hand. It was a portion of himself; and though his eye had never opened upon the holy light, its stirrings might have been felt within, and poured forth in song. But we should have looked in vain for the image of the moon wandering through heaven's pathless way; the flaming of the night lamp in some lonely tower; the arched walls of twilight groves; the religious light thrown through the cloistered windows; and the many other beautiful specimens of poetic imagery, which are crowded into his inimitable *l'Penseroso*.

Sanderson, though blind from his first years, reached the heights of mathematical science, so that he could comprehend and rejoice in the giant efforts of a Newton's genius. Yet it must be remembered that by the organs of others, he laid the foundations of his fame. Had West and Littleton also been blind, his name would probably have never been enrolled among the mathematical prodigies of his age.

It is, however, unnecessary to attempt to prove the importance of the eye to the happiness and improvement of man; yet it may be well to be reminded occasionally of the value of blessings, which, from being the common property of all, are wont to be undervalued. God's greatest works are often the least regarded. The sun in the firmament shines upon the world, dispensing heat and life and beauty over its surface. We rejoice in its life-giving beams. Our eyes gaze in delight upon the endless forms of beauty ever springing up under its genial

rays. How seldom do we pause, to direct our regards to this great source of them all! We forget the blessing, because we have never felt its want. "Optima fit pessima;" if I may render it liberally, "The greatest becomes the least." So it is with the eye. Through it the mind receives its chief stores of knowledge, and many of its purest streams of joy; but too often we first awake to a true sense of its value, when disease has clouded it in darkness.

The art of printing has added a tenfold value to this organ; as the knowledge of the uses of steam has to the mechanical powers. By the aid of this noble invention, the mental treasures of ages have been gathered together, and brought before the mind. It is now only necessary to open the eye upon these, and the mind may drink from all the fountains of human experience; and learn lessons of wisdom, which were formerly denied to it. The art of printing opens a high and broad way, where the whole human family, however widely dispersed, may walk, and hold the most intimate interchange of thought and feeling. It brings the present and the past into such close contact, that each generation rises, as it were, out of the past. In one sense, the promise may be said to be fulfilled, that "the child shall (be born) an hundred years old." *1826/27*

Science, art, literature, all expand, as the eye surveys, on the historic page, the labours, errors, and achievements of the past. But it is in Theology, that the eye appears in its surpassing value. By it, we read the word of life; and through it, the light of heaven shines into the soul. To the man that cannot read—to whom the eye is useless as to books, the opportunities both of intellectual and moral cultivation are exceedingly diminished. How important then to the ministers of religion, who are expected to devote their lives to the study of the sacred page; to priests whose "lips keep knowledge;" who are to hold forth the light of truth to a dark world; on whom thousands depend for all they will ever learn of it on this side the grave,—how important to them is the free and perfect use of this organ!

The abundant facilities for intellectual cultivation, which form the glory of the present age, render those who devote their lives to study, peculiarly liable to diseases of the eye. It may emphatically be called *the reading age*. Reading is the fashion of the day. It commences with the child in the nursery; constitutes the chief business of boyhood and youth; and con-

tinues through manhood and old age. No period is considered too tender for the all important business of education to be commenced. No threatening evils are of sufficient moment to stand in its way; no acquirements sufficiently great to permit repose. As one advances in his course, new demands for exertion present themselves; new temptations multiply; new sources of information are thrown open to him. His eyes begin to manifest the alarming signs of inordinate use; but they are too often disregarded, until incurable disease numbers him among its victims;—and he learns, when too late, that he has closed the widest door of knowledge to the soul; and is left to mourn, with many a kindred spirit, the premature sacrifice of his usefulness and power.

It cannot have escaped the notice of every medical observer, that an unusual prevalence of diseases of the eye marks the period in which we live. Indeed, they are so prevalent, that they may be considered one of its common and peculiar trials. How many cases of afflictive, often of incurable weakness of the eyes, daily present themselves among the studious portions of the community! How many clergymen are annually compelled by this cause, to abate their exertions, or to discontinue them altogether! Among those who devote themselves with ardour to the cause of literature and science, what numbers are obliged by the failure of these organs, to proceed heavily on their course, to abandon its pursuit! Among our statesmen and public officers, how many, from the same cause, perform their duties with impaired energies, and diminished usefulness! How often are religion and learning called to mourn the loss of strong men, to whose valuable exertions the church and the world looked up with hope and confident expectation!

It is highly important, therefore, that the causes which lie at the foundation of this fearful amount of evil, should be clearly ascertained; and the means pointed out, by which they may, as far as possible, be prevented or remedied. In this age especially, which presents such numerous temptations to commit errors that may prove fatal to sound vision, perhaps no better service can be rendered to the cause of religion and letters, than to ascertain these causes and point out these remedies.

It is a prevalent opinion, that a studious course of life almost necessarily produces, sooner or later, debility of the eyes. We believe this to be a mistake; and we appeal to the history of studious men to bear us out in the opinion. Many may be cited

of all professions, and in all times, who have used their eyes, to what would almost seem an incredible amount ; but who have enjoyed, notwithstanding, perfect and sound vision, from childhood to hoary age. We do not believe that the great prevalence of weakness of the eyes, among the clergy and others who devote themselves to study, is a necessary consequence of their labours. The eye, notwithstanding the extreme delicacy of its texture, is so constituted as to be capable of great endurance. The Creator evidently formed man to be an intellectual being. He endowed him with mind to be cultivated, and to grow in knowledge. He prepared the eye to be the great instrument for acquiring knowledge. Would it be in harmony with the perfection of his other works, if he had so formed it, as to be easily unfitted for its end ? We cannot believe that the most noble organ of the body,—noble because fitted to the noblest end,—is the weakest and the most liable to be deranged and disqualified for the purposes for which it was designed. Its very structure, as well as the history of thousands of the most devoted friends of learning, prove the contrary. Observe the wonderful contrivances with which the Creator has guarded it ; the extreme care with which he has provided for its security against the smallest injury. Examine the strong, bony cavity in which it is lodged, and the stronger arches of bone, that serve to shield it in the moment of danger. See the eye-brows and the muscles which screen it so effectually from the injurious effects of too dazzling light,—the two curtains, the eye-lids by which it is covered, and protected during sleep, and continually cleaned and polished, to be rendered more fit for the ready transmission of the rays of light ; the cartilaginous edges, which keep them in shape ; and the eye-lashes which guard them from so many dangers, and by the interception of unnecessary light, render the image of objects more distinct and lively. Examine the firm, elastic, insensible membrane, which keeps the delicate interior so secure ; the power and obedient activity of the iris, ever standing, as before the inner temple, a faithful sentinel, to guard its delicate texture from the intrusion of every ray of unnecessary light. Consider too, its universal sympathies with every other part of the body, in which it possesses another strong tower of defence ! When we reflect on all this ingenuity and skill employed for its security, and its extreme importance to the mind as well as the body ; we cannot feel that the eye is necessarily so weak, as to be, as often seems to be the case, the first organ to fail in its

duties. And we are constrained to seek for other causes by which to explain the melancholy fact.

These are to be found not in the use, but in the abuse of the organ. Here is the foundation of most of its diseases. It is an unwise, extravagant expenditure, instead of a wise husbandry of its powers, that occasions the frequent failures, over which literature and religion have so much cause to weep. It is because this most perfect of all optical instruments is not treated according to the optical principles, upon which the Creator evidently formed and arranged it. The strongest men, by excessive, unscientific, or too long protracted action, lose those energies prematurely, that were destined to endure to old age. So it is with the eye. It is the firmest organ of the body; but it will not and cannot bear, with impunity, the unscientific or extravagant uses to which, through ignorance and unjustifiable ambition, it is so often subjected. It was the unnatural, protracted, midnight lucubrations of Milton, that "quenched his orb in darkness;" and not their ordinary, natural, and reasonable use. Had he made the eye the subject of proper reflection, and regulated its employment according to the principles of reason and common sense, he would probably have never known the privations of blindness; and though the world might have lost his beautiful Address to Light, he would have continued to gaze with delight, on the beauties of nature and the productions of kindred minds, to the end of life.

But the extravagant use of the eyes is not the only way by which they are injured. There are various other bad habits, in which studious men continually indulge; and many mistakes, which they constantly commit, through inattention to this important branch of physical education, that lie at the foundation of ophthalmic diseases; and which only require to be known that they may be avoided. Perhaps no subject so intimately connected with the vital interests of learning, has been so much neglected, as that of the preservation of the sight. There are very few, about which such general ignorance prevails; and none perhaps, that more imperiously demand the attention of all who devote themselves to study. It will be the object of this essay to point out some of these bad habits; to show, in as simple a manner as possible, some of the means by which their baneful influence may be counteracted; and to insist upon the necessity of care and attention in the use of the eye.

The narrow limits and brevity to which the following remarks

must be confined, permit this to be done only in a very general manner. The magnitude and importance of the subject demands rather a volume, than an essay. But if the few hints that are to be presented, effect nothing else, we are not without the hope that they may awaken the mind of some who read them, to a sense of the importance of the topic ; and perhaps induce them to institute a more faithful examination of it.

I. Few considerations are more important in treating of the preservation of the sight, than that the student should have correct ideas upon the degree and proper adjustment of the light by which he studies ; and perhaps none, about which greater mistakes are continually made by studious men,—mistakes which, although by almost imperceptible degrees, most surely lay the foundation of serious weakness of the eyes.

One of the most prolific and least suspected causes of weakness of sight, is the exposure of the eyes to the frequent alternations of weak and strong light. It has caused the destruction of many eyes. Very few are endowed with sufficient strength, to endure such changes, when often repeated, with impunity. When the eyes are closed, and the light wholly excluded, the sensibility of the retina becomes exceedingly elevated ; so that it bears immediate exposure to strong light with great difficulty. The effects are analogous to those occasioned by great and sudden changes of temperature in other parts of the body. If an individual thrusts the hand for a few minutes into ice-cold water, and immediately transfers it into water in a lukewarm state, its sensibility is so increased, that he will be hardly persuaded to believe that the water is not hot. It is just so with the eye. By long continuance in darkness, the nerve becomes highly excitable, and the blood vessels easily assume an undue action, which may be readily converted into dangerous disease. The experience of every person affords proofs of this. How unpleasant the sensation, when a lighted candle is suddenly brought into a room, where one has been sitting in previous darkness ! How uneasy the sensations occasioned by going from a dark room, where one has been confined for a short time only, to the bright light of day ! What protracted debility of the eyes frequently results from long confinement in the partial gloom of the sick chamber ! When the exclusion of the light has been complete, and continued sufficiently long, a sudden influx of light to the eye may so injure the nerve, as to produce incurable blindness. Dionysius the Tyrant recognized this principle, and acted upon

it, in gratifying his revenge upon his miserable captives. Regulus was cruelly blinded by the Carthaginians in the same way. Instances are on record of prisoners, who, when restored to liberty, after long confinement in dark dungeons, have been urged by the sufferings occasioned by being brought into the light, to beg that they might return to the comparative comfort of their abode of captivity. The story of Caspar Hauser, the interesting but unfortunate victim of a mysterious cruelty, affords another striking example of this principle.

When we reflect upon the fatal consequences of the changes in these extreme cases, and consider how morbidly sensitive the retina becomes by confinement in darkness, we shall be less surprised to hear, that similar changes, though in a less degree, may, when often repeated, as they are by the injudicious habits of students, seriously injure the sight.

The manner in which nature pours the light of day upon the earth, is in beautiful harmony with this principle or necessity of the eyes. She never does it suddenly. The approach of the sun is ushered in, long before he appears above the horizon, by the faintest possible light; which very gradually increases in strength, until, at last, he appears in his full splendour. This beautiful accommodation of the light to the nature of the eyes, affords a useful lesson on the art of preserving the sight. It secures the organs in the most perfect manner, from the danger of being injured by a sudden change from darkness to bright light, as they would otherwise be; and as indeed they often are, in those countries where the sun remains so short a space of time below the horizon, that a short twilight is exchanged for the full brightness of day. The inhabitants of those regions are obliged to make an artificial night, by excluding every ray of light from their sleeping chambers; and when they leave these they are of course immediately exposed to the bright glare of the sun. Blindness from amaurotic* affections is a very prevalent disease among them.

A knowledge of these facts, confirmed by the experience of every careful observer, directs us to some very important rules for the preservation of the eyes. A very slight reflection upon our modes of life, discovers many ways, in which we continually depart from the above rule; and lay the foundation of serious, and often incurable weakness of the eyes. For instance: We

* *Amaurotic, Amaurosis*, from the Greek ἀμαύρωσις, *dimness, weakness of sight.*—ED.

carefully exclude all light from our sleeping rooms, that our sleep may be less disturbed ; and long after the full light of the sun has been shining about our dwellings, we arise, and opening the eyes, suddenly expose them to its bright glare. The bed is placed in such a position, that though the room may not have been thus carefully closed, our eyes are opened, on awaking, upon a bright window. We select, with little judgment, the darkest room for our study ; and expose the eyes suddenly, in the various duties of life, to the stronger lights of the other rooms and of the open day. We not unfrequently sit in our rooms after twilight, with the eyes closed, for the purpose of giving them what is considered a salutary repose ; and then suddenly expose them to the strong artificial light of candles and argand lamps ; never dreaming that the uncomfortable sensations momentarily experienced, are the result of injury to the organ. The student is in the habit of surrounding the lamp with thick shades, which darken every part of the room, except the book or paper upon which he is reading or writing ; and alternately turning the eyes from the brightly illuminated surface of the one, to the dull gloom of the other.

These examples are sufficient for our purpose. Many others of similar character, all obvious infringements of this law, will present themselves by considering the habits of studious men. The injury occasioned by each act of disobedience to the plain dictates of nature, is exceedingly slight ; so that it does not arrest the attention. But is it wonderful, that in the course of months and years, these often repeated injuries, however small, produce diseases ; that the retina thus treated, should begin to manifest symptoms of irritability ; and finally, when persisted in, refuse to perform its functions ? Indeed, is it not rather wonderful, that the sight is not oftener destroyed ?

The relation of the following case here, may be useful, in impressing this important principle on the mind.* “A young traveller, of robust constitution and sound health, arrived late in the evening at his lodgings in an inn. Being fatigued, he fell into a profound sleep, from which he was awaked on the following morning, in the most disagreeable manner, by the rays of a bright sun, which were reflected by the wall and floor of the chamber upon his face. He immediately arose and closed the window curtains, which were unfortunately white, and fell

* Beer, *Pflege gesunder and geschwächter Augen.*

asleep a second time. But the sun soon aroused him more rudely than before; for its direct rays now shone through the thin curtain, full upon his face. A free secretion of tears, united with a slight redness and a troublesome tension of the eyes, were the immediate consequences of this occurrence. These would have soon disappeared, if the sufferer had not on the following morning exposed himself, in the same manner, to the rays of the sun. On the next day he was attacked with a violent ophthalmia, which for a time resisted with great obstinacy all curative measures; and finally left the eyes with a considerable debility and such a predisposition to inflammation, that for a very long time after, he was unable to bear the slightest wind, or the least heating of the body, without suffering from red, weak, and watery eyes."

Another case in point is related by Himly, from a small tract entitled "*Fabric of the Eye.*"* "A lawyer took lodgings in Pall Mall. The front windows of the house faced the street, and were exposed to the full blaze of the meridian sun; while the back room, having no opening but into a small, close yard, surrounded by high walls, was very dark. In this room he performed all his labours and studies; but came into the other to his breakfast and dinner. His sight soon became weak; and at last, he was troubled with a continual pain in the eye-balls. He tried glasses of various kinds, and sought counsel of various oculists, but without obtaining relief. At last it occurred to him, that the frequent alternation of light, in going and coming suddenly from the dark study into the bright blaze of the dining-room, might be the cause of his disorder. He immediately hired other lodgings in a different quarter of the city, more favourably situated in regard to the light; and discontinued reading and writing for a while in the evening. This was sufficient, and soon effected a cure."

These cases are very instructive. They show the great danger of sudden changes from weak to strong light, and prepare us to feel the importance of the following rules.

1. No man who is desirous of securing the advantage of sound, healthy eyes, should suffer himself to expose them suddenly to a strong light, on awaking from sleep.

* Himly, *Ophthalmologische Beobachtungen und Untersuchungen, oder Beyträge zur richtigen Kenntniss and Behandlung der Augen im gesunden und kranken Zustande.*

The surest mode of avoiding all danger from this source, will be found in a habit of early rising. It is doubtless a law of nature, that we should retire with the evening twilight, and arise when the morning dawns. If all students, especially those who have weak eyes, could be persuaded to conform to this rule, they would be amply rewarded by a sounder and more permanent vision. But when from indolence, the power of habit, or other unavoidable causes, this cannot be done, nature's mode of illuminating the earth should be borne in mind, and the same advantage secured, by a judicious arrangement of the sleeping apartment. A room should never be selected for the sleeping chamber, if it can be avoided, which faces the rising sun. A western location is always preferable, and will be attended with less hazard. Where this cannot be done, other arrangements may be made, by which all the above-mentioned evils can be avoided, and the advantages of a western location secured. Let the bed, for instance, be so situated, that the day-light shall never break in a direct line upon the face; but fall backwards over the head. If the windows are opposite to the rising sun, let them be guarded by curtains or blinds of sufficient thickness to soften and modify the intensity of its rays, and render the light agreeable to the eyes. A simple curtain suspended at the side of the bed, next the head, will be sufficient for this purpose.

2. The apartment selected for the study should be a well lighted room.

This also is a very important direction to all whose professions demand a great and continual use of the eyes. Not only are sudden changes from darkness to light, injurious immediately after awaking from the sleep of the night; but as appears from the above case, they may, if often repeated, be equally injurious in the day time. Very few who study much, can neglect this caution, without impairing sooner or later, the strength of their eyes. Instances are numerous, where such neglect has induced a degree of irritability that has prepared the way for fatal weakness and disease. Indeed, it can seldom be borne for any length of time, without inducing a painful sensation in the organ, which if not removed by more judicious management, degenerates into troublesome disorder, and wholly unfits the eye for long continued, close application. The frequent habit of going from a dark study into the brightly illuminated streets, almost invariably generates a high degree of morbid

sensibility of the retina, and intolerance of light, very obstinate and difficult of cure.

3. The individual who devotes the evening to study, should never precede his labours by sitting an hour or more in darkness.

Many are in the habit of doing this, with the belief, that they are giving the eyes rest, and performing an essential service to them; and preparing them the better for the duties of the evening. But it is a great mistake, as will at once be perceived, by bearing the preceding observations in mind. There can be no more certain mode of inducing all the evils of sudden changes of light.

4. The room in which the evening study is performed should be well lighted.

An error almost fatal to enduring strength of the eyes, is very prevalent on this subject. Some from avarice, some from mistaken economy, others from ignorance of the true principles which should regulate the degree of light proper for the labouring eye, are in the habit of studying whole evenings, in large rooms very inadequately lighted. We have often seen the student poring for hours over his books and papers, and straining his eyes, by the dull glimmering of one poor candle or lamp. Nay, as if more anxious to save oil than eye-sight, we have seen others, whose lamp was provided with double burners, carefully pull down the wick of one, that there might be no unnecessary waste. When the smarting lids and watering eyes have compelled them to extinguish the other, we have felt more disposed to charge them with avarice, or censure them for ignorance, than to sympathize in their sufferings. Others provide what is considered by many as the best evening light—the argand lamp; but covered with so thick a shade, that the only part of the room sufficiently illuminated, is the book or paper over which they are occupied. This is a great mistake. A moment's reflection shows that both these are subjected to the dangers above described. In the first case, the eyes become accustomed to a degree of darkness, which, compared with the brighter light of the succeeding day, is very detrimental. In the second, they are exposed to continual alternations of light during the evening; as they are necessarily so frequently obliged to turn the eyes from the highly illuminated surface of the book, to the comparative surrounding darkness of the room.

Nothing exerts a more favourable influence in preserving a healthy condition of the student's eyes, than a proper adjustment

of the light during the hours of labour. Perhaps nothing tends more certainly to injure them, and to induce serious debility, than neglecting to secure the advantages of such an adjustment.

Too little light debilitates the eyes, not only by the alternations above mentioned, to which every one who studies by such a light is constantly liable; but it also strains them, by compelling them to inordinate action, in order to obtain distinct vision. The uneasy sensations occasioned by attempting to read or write, for a short time only, by an inadequate light, are sufficient evidence of this. Whenever they are perceived, they should be regarded as the premonitory signs of more serious evils, to which such a habit may lead.

Too much light, on the contrary, dazzles and confuses the eyes. If they are continually exposed to it, as they are in apartments injudiciously selected and lighted, a degree of morbid sensibility will, sooner or later, be induced, and unfit them for the purposes of study.

In northern countries which are almost perpetually covered with snow, instances of blindness are exceedingly frequent from the great exposure of the eyes to the strong dazzling light, occasioned by the reflection of the sun from their white surface. In these cases, the powers of the retina are suddenly exhausted by the stimulus of extreme degrees of light. The same effect not unfrequently takes place more gradually, but with equal certainty, when the eyes are exposed, for a series of years, to labour in rooms too much lighted.

From these observations we draw the following rules:

5. The eye both in reading and writing, should always have that moderate degree of light, which is best suited to its powers; which produces easy, distinct vision; and which is wholly unattended with any unpleasant sensations.

6. The light of the room in which we study should be, as much as possible, equally distributed. It should never be a reflected or concentrated light. Both these kinds of light, when the eyes are long and frequently exposed to them, are very injurious. Nothing can be more dangerous to the health of the eyes, than exposure to a highly concentrated light. The late eclipse of the sun occasioned many melancholy examples of the pernicious consequences of such exposure. The writer has seen two cases of incurable blindness, in individuals who ignorantly watched its progress with the naked eye; and many others, in which vision was seriously impaired. These are extreme

cases; but it is not difficult to perceive, that the same cause in a less degree may, in the course of time, prove highly debilitating to the vision. They are mentioned to impress the mind with the importance of the direction. The neglect of it has laid the foundation of many a dangerous ophthalmia, followed by weakness of sight, that unfitted the individual, during life, for diligent study.

Nothing, for example, can be worse than the habit of studying at an open window, which receives the strong reflection from an opposite wall, against which the sun shines. The light of a room, where the windows reach to the floor, is also injurious. In this case, the light is reflected from the floor up to the eyes, and the apartment is unpleasantly and unnaturally illuminated. It is almost impossible that the individual who studies continually in such a light, can preserve sound, healthy eyes. An apartment into which the direct rays of the sun shine, is much more easily endured by the eyes, than one where they are thus tormented by his reflected rays.

Nature's light is uniformly and equally diffused. Wherever the eye turns, over the broad surface of creation, this harmonious distribution is pleasing to it, and in perfect harmony with its functions and powers. Perhaps the man, who in the pursuits of literature is ever immured in his study, especially in the city, surrounded by houses which are continually annoying him by reflected light, cannot, on many accounts, be considered as living in a state of nature,—certainly not, so far as the health of the eye is concerned. Therefore, when he is compelled to occupy such a room, he will, if he sets a proper value upon the unspeakable blessings of a sound, permanent vision, imitate as far as possible nature's method of illumination, and adopt such measures, as will prevent the introduction of both the direct and reflected light.

This is easily done. The light of such an apartment should be softened by placing green or blue curtains before the windows. Even the furniture of the study should be such as does not offend the eye by occasioning a concentrated light. It should not be adorned, for instance, with any bright or brilliant objects, upon which the eye cannot repose with pleasurable sensations. The walls should be painted with a soft blue or green colour. The carpet should be of green. This is the colour which nature, who in all her works seems to have provided with much care for the health and comfort of the eye, has so univer-

sally painted the world. The nearer her plan can be imitated in the little world, where the student is destined to pass such a portion of his days, the less liable he will be to suffer from weakness of the eyes.

The expense of this is trifling. But who that reflects upon the value of the eyes, and the unspeakable loss which every one suffers, when deprived of their use by disease or weakness, does not perceive at once, that all pecuniary considerations deserve the name of madness rather than a praiseworthy economy?

7. A few words may be proper upon the quantity of light that is best adapted to evening study. It should always, as in the day, be sufficient to enable the student to see easily and distinctly, and without occasioning any effort, labour or straining of the eyes. Here, very fatal mistakes are often made. How many students sit for whole evenings, straining the eyes, even till midnight, by the light of one dull lamp! How many think, while they do it, that they are performing an important service to the eyes! How many wonder, that with such prudence and care, they should be obliged to retire from their labour by the itching, painful sensations of the organ; by the watering, redness, and other symptoms, which speak a language so plain, that one would think the most stupid might understand its meaning. The eyes are strained—they have been labouring in darkness; and this is their mode of begging for more light, or repose. They have no organs of speech. If they had, they would make the request long before compelling obedience by the smarting and pain. How many have continued to commit this error, until incurable weakness of the eyes has left them to mourn, when too late, their ignorance and folly!

If the common lamp is used, *two* would, to most eyes, be better than one; since the light of a single lamp, especially if the print is small, is insufficient for easy, distinct vision.

But common lamps and candles are the worst possible means of lighting a study; and cannot be recommended. They are bad, in the first place, because they occasion an irregular, flickering light. The flame is unsteady; especially in the heat of summer, when the windows are open; and in the winter, when so many strong currents are blowing about them. The eyes are often seriously incommoded by this. If candles are used, the best kind are the wax or spermaceti, because they are more

pure, and the flame preserves a more uniform length, and a more steady, perpendicular direction. They are also better, because they emit no smoke, and do not deteriorate the atmosphere of the room, like burning oil and tallow. Beer, the distinguished German oculist, recommends four wax candles as the most preferable light for evening study.

In the opinion of the writer, the common argand study lamp, now so much in use, but without the dark shade, for reasons already mentioned, affords the most appropriate light for the health of the eyes. It yields a sufficient light. Its degree can be more easily graduated to the sensibility of the eye than any other. The flame is perfectly steady and uniform, and unaffected by currents of air. It occasions no smoke, and consequently, is better adapted to secure all the desiderata demanded on the principles by which our rooms should be artificially lighted for evening study. The ground glass shade, however, is not the most appropriate, because it produces too concentrated a light, and is therefore injurious to the eye. The best shade is one of oiled paper, which diffuses a sufficient light round the room, and is not, by its glare, offensive to vision.

Before leaving this branch of our subject, there are several other habits, which, in the course of time, may injure the eyes, and are therefore of sufficient importance to be noticed. Their importance perhaps is greater, because they are so common; and because their injurious effects are produced in such an insidious manner, and by such imperceptible degrees, as to be easily overlooked.

1. In connexion with the above remarks upon the injurious consequences of reflected and concentrated light, we would enter a protest against the practice, so common among studious men, of wearing shades before the eyes, when they read by candle light. The majority who do this, with the belief that they are protecting the eyes, and securing them from danger, commit a serious error. This will be seen at once, by bearing in mind the facts upon which some of the above mentioned rules are founded. They keep the eyes in an unnatural degree of darkness, that unfits them for the stronger light to which they are exposed when the shade is removed; and thus they are exposed to the evil consequences described when speaking of the effects of sudden changes from weak to strong light.

But there are exceptions to this rule. They are those in-

dividuals whose eyes are prominent, and stand out far from the head; and whose eye-brows and eye-lashes are weak and deficient. These are deprived of nature's shade; and require an artificial one. The best is a shade of thin green silk, which does not wholly exclude the rays of light, but only softens them. The worst are varnished shades of leather, or any other bright, impervious material. They are improper and ill adapted to the end, because they screen the eye too much, and cause the pupil to be too widely dilated; by which more light is permitted to enter it from the highly illuminated surface of the book or paper, than consists with its healthy condition. The effects are not dissimilar here to those produced by exposing the eyes to a too concentrated light.

2. But we would enter a louder protest against another habit, wholly at variance with all the above principles, and which has prematurely ruined the eyes of hundreds and thousands; and robbed religion and learning of many an able friend. It is the habit of reading and writing by twilight. Nay, some have been mad enough to ruin the eyes by attempting the same by moonlight! They have done both to save time; a most miserable, senseless economy, by which, in the hope of gaining a few minutes, months and years of useful labour have been thrown away. This folly has laid the foundation of many cases of weakness of the eyes, for the removal of which, all medical treatment proved unavailing.

3. Another habit requiring a cautionary notice, is that of gazing, for a long time, at the bright moon. The history of astronomy points to a number of its followers, who were forever blinded by this habit. The disagreeable feeling of tension, and the inexplicable, unpleasant sensation experienced, by looking for a few minutes at the full moon, with the naked eye, will, on experiment, convince any one, that it is a habit dangerous to vision. A little reflection explains it. It is a highly concentrated light; and the dilated evening pupil permits it to pass to the eye in full quantities.

4. There is another habit in which the strongest eye cannot indulge without danger; and which to weak eyes, has proved fatal. It is that of looking at the lightning, especially in the night time. There is a sublimity in a thunder storm by night, which affords a great temptation to the lovers of nature, to commit this error. It is one of nature's grandest spectacles; but let it be remembered, that it is one of the most sudden and extreme

alternations of light and darkness that can be presented to the eye—and to a weak eye, would be full of danger.

5. The habit of reading and writing by a side light should also be avoided. This is an error, into which many reading men constantly fall, and by which not a few have impaired their vision. Most men do it without thought. Some, who pay great attention to the care of the eyes, do it from principle. To avoid the injurious consequences of the bent position while leaning over the table, they are in the habit of sitting upright, and holding the book in their hand, in their evening studies, and arranging the light so that it shall shine upon them sideways.

It is a general remark of those oculists who have enjoyed the most ample opportunities for observation, that the left eye is much more frequently the subject of disease than the right; and that when both are diseased, the left is the most affected. They explain this fact by the habit that most men adopt, of reading and writing by a side light, and generally the left side.

The consideration of the nature of the iris and the laws which regulate its actions, explains the manner in which this habit injures vision, and predisposes to disease.

The iris, as every one knows, is that delicate curtain provided by nature to protect the tender retina from the injurious action of unnecessary light. When the light is in sufficient quantities to injure the nerve, this curtain closes for the purpose of excluding it. When there is too little light for distinct vision, it dilates to admit more.

But the sympathy existing between the iris of the two eyes, is so perfect, that they always act, more or less, in concert. When one is in the shade, (as it is, for instance, while reading by a side light,) the other being influenced by it, will be unable to preserve that state of contraction, which the necessity of the retina requires. Consequently, the individual, while engaged in reading or writing in this position, exposes one eye to the admission of a greater degree of light than is consistent with its healthy condition. With this fact in view, it will appear less surprising, that the student, who continues this injurious practice day after day, and night after night, for a series of years, should, in the end, injure the eye, and expose it to weakness, if not disease.

The bad consequences of this habit are sometimes manifested very early in those individuals whose eyes are weak, by the uneasy sensations produced in the exposed and unshaded eye.

Himly informs us, that in early life, when he was in the habit of reading much by this sort of light, he was not unfrequently annoyed, even in sleep, by the pain which it occasioned in that eye.*

The above facts account for the uneasy sensations occasioned by looking intensely, for a long time, through telescopes and perspective glasses, with one eye, while the other is closed.

Of course, these observations are less applicable to the day than to the evening light. The light, in the day time, is so equally and universally diffused, and so much more in harmony with the healthy functions of the eye, that reading by a side light, is attended with comparatively little danger. The case is very different in the night, especially with men who fall into the unwise economy of saving oil and candles; and who sit, for whole hours, reading by a single poor lamp, which shines indeed, upon two spots, the left eye and the book, but excepting these, sheds only light enough upon the other parts of the room, to render the surrounding darkness visible.

But what is the direction that is best suited to the eyes, and is the least liable to injure them? It is that light which is sufficient for distinct vision; and which falls over the left shoulder, in an oblique direction, from above, upon the book or study table. Every study, however situated, may, with little trouble, and very trifling expense, be accommodated with such a light. The advantages arising from it in a long life of study, may be incalculably great.

6. The above remarks show the impropriety and the evil consequences following another bad and very common habit; viz. that of sitting with the back to the window, and holding the book or paper before the eyes, in order to see more distinctly. Whoever does this constantly, will sooner or later experience, whether he believes it or not, the evils of exposing his eyes to a concentrated light, while the pupil is in an unfavourable state for its reception.

7. Another bad habit, which if much indulged, cannot fail to injure the eyes, is the practice of holding a candle between the eye and the book, for the purpose of obtaining more distinct vision. They only, however, are in danger of falling into this error, whose eyes from natural decay require the aid of glasses.

* Himly, Ueber den Nachtheil der Beleuchtung von einer Seite her.

When the eyes begin to fail from age, and the individual is obliged to remove the book farther off than he has been accustomed to, in order to obtain distinct vision, the image painted upon the retina is proportionally smaller; and of course, the farther the object is removed, the less light comes into the eye. Consequently, the image will be also fainter. These facts, with another, that the pupil is smaller, and admits less light, when increasing years have occasioned long-sightedness, explain the reason, why at that period of life we require a more intense light. A true economy of the eye consists, not in thus exposing them to a concentrated light, but in having recourse to spectacles, by which these evils are so simply and so easily remedied.

8. With one observation more, we close the subject of light. The student should protect the eyes in summer from the direct rays of a burning sun. The best remedy against this is, that the rim of the hat should be of sufficient breadth to shield the eyes. *Eye-destroyers* would not be an unappropriate name for the narrow things, which, by some of the more recent fashions, are called hats.

II. The above remarks are, perhaps, sufficient, to leave upon the mind some of the most important principles in regard to light, in the management and preservation of the eyes. We now proceed to the consideration of some other points, of equal consequence. It is very important to ascertain the periods of the day, when the eyes are capable of bearing severe labour with the greatest impunity. By possessing clear, definite ideas upon this, and acting upon them, much may be effected during a long course of studious habits, in securing the blessings of sound, healthy vision.

1. The morning, after moderate but sufficient sleep, is the most favourable period for study. The eyes, as well as other parts of the body, have been rested and strengthened by the repose of the night; and come with renewed vigour to their task. They are less easily fatigued, and are able to bear greater exertion at that period, than at any other. The exchange of midnight for morning lucubrations, would confer, through the beneficial action upon the eyes, an essential benefit upon the cause of literature and religion. We earnestly recommend all, to whom these interests are dear, and who are called upon by the circumstances in which they stand, to labour in this service, to avail themselves of its advantages. Few changes would con-

duce more to a diminution of the prevalence of diseases of the eyes among students, than the habit of early rising, and securing the advantages of nature's best, purest, and softest light, for the performance of the more arduous portions of duty. They especially would secure an ample reward by it, whose eyes have been rendered unfit, either by constitutional weakness or imprudent management, for long continued, diligent efforts. The advantages to such individuals, of morning over evening light, are incalculably great.

One precaution, however, is necessary to be observed; otherwise, the eyes may be injured by morning light. It is impossible to go, as some do, immediately from the bed to the study table, while the eyes are but half opened, and the student may be said to be half asleep. This is an extreme from total repose to instantaneous exertion. All extremes are injurious to the animal frame; especially to parts of such peculiar delicacy of structure and functions as the organ of sight. Let the morning student, therefore, not be in too great haste, on first awaking from sleep, to be at his books. He should move about for a little space, until his eyes recover from the first weakness, that is generally experienced on awaking, before he goes to his studies.*

2. Much use of the eyes immediately after a full meal, is injurious, and should be avoided by all students; especially those, whose eyes are not remarkably strong. Every feeling of the system shows, that nature requires rest from all exertion at this time. Especially does the disposition to sleep, the little inclination for thought, and the heaviness of the whole head, prove that there is a tendency to congestion there, and a peculiar impropriety in tasking the brain or eyes at such a time. The florid look, the turgid, straggling vessels that appear on the *conjunctiva* of the eyes of those who continually commit this error, are sufficient evidence, were there no other, of its dangerous tendency.

* The above directions, however, are not applicable to all. There are some individuals who suffer more inconvenience from using the eyes in the morning, than at any other part of the day. Indeed this is not uncommon, with those who have weak eyes. Such persons should carefully avoid all straining of the eyes at this time. They should commence no labour, until the feeling of uneasiness about the eyes, and the slight haze which is spread before them, have disappeared.

3. All labour or study, which strains the eyes much, when the body is from any cause in a heated condition, should also be carefully avoided. The reasons just urged against using the eyes immediately after eating, are equally binding here. There is a general increased arterial action at such times; and with deep thinking men, public speakers and others, with whom the brain is in a constant state of activity, a peculiarly increased tendency to congestion of the head and eyes. Consequently, they should not be subjected to any intense action, until the body is rested and cooled, and the general arterial circulation equalized. Whoever has been warmly engaged in public speaking, either from the pulpit or bar, when his feelings have been excited, and he has been animated with a strong desire to infuse the spirit of his own mind into his hearers, is conscious, by his feelings afterwards, that the head is unusually crowded. If he tasks the eyes immediately after by a strong effort, he will be conscious that they are less calculated for it than at other times.

Beer tells us, that he could mention many melancholy examples of distinguished orators, who, from the neglect of this rule, by putting the eyes to an unwise use immediately after delivering their orations or sermons, have in a short time brought on a weakness almost fatal to vision; and who were, ever after, wholly incapacitated for the performance of the duties of their station.

4. The straining of the eye-sight should also be carefully avoided by artificial evening light. The day time, as we have said before, is the proper period for hard study. The evening is the period for repose or amusement. Nature has provided a light by day, which, if not spoiled by man's device, acts rather as an agreeable stimulus than as an injury to the organ of vision. It is impossible, when she has withdrawn it from the earth, to substitute an artificial light that is equally agreeable, and equally innocent. If the student will be content to study only by the light of nature's lamp, and to repose, when she, for his good, has extinguished it, he will diminish exceedingly the chances of weakened vision. More eyes have been injured by Saturday night sermons, than by the week's study that preceded them. The prevalent error that "a man cannot write until the spirit moves," has unfitted many a ready writer for much useful labour. Through man's native indolence, it will probably destroy many more; for the spirit seldom will move the procrastinating, lazy

man, until the setting sun compels him to light his candles for the evening and midnight toil.

5. When the student is obliged to use the eyes much by candle light, he should select such reading or study as is not necessarily connected with great mental effort; since this always increases the tendency of the blood to the head, and augments the danger of injuring the eyes.

6. When there is no necessity in the case, and the choice is free, writing is preferable to reading as an evening employment, provided it is not attended with any mental effort. It will be found on trial, to strain the eyes less.

III. The eye has been denominated by a distinguished German writer, a *microcosm*.* "As man," says he, "is to be considered a little world (microcosm) in relation to the earth upon which he lives, even so must the eye be considered a microcosm in regard to the individual man." There is great propriety in the term. An examination of the structure of the eye, presents us with the striking fact, that a perfect specimen of each of the different membranes which go to form the whole body, enters into its composition. Each of these various membranes and parts of the organ possesses the same properties and peculiarities, is endowed with the same vitality, and governed by the same general laws, with those to which it is akin. Consequently a mutual sympathy of the most intimate character, is constantly maintained between them. Neither is independent of the other. This sympathy, this mutual dependence, is the subject of constant observation in health and disease. Hence the reason, why the eye is so sure an index of the state of health and disease of the body. Hence its clear, bright appearance, when the harmony of health pervades the general system; and hence its dull, heavy look, when disease has entered the citadel. This similarity of structure and function, can alone explain the great variety of diseases with which the eye is affected. It is the frequency with which this fact is overlooked, that renders their treatment so difficult, and the results so unsatisfactory. There is no organ whose vigour depends more upon the general health of the body than the eye,—none, whose diseases arise more evidently from the derangement of the general health,—and none which displays more numerous sympathies with every part of the body.

* Beer, *Lehre von den Augenkrankheiten*.

These important facts present a wide field of thought, which the appropriate limits of this essay forbid us to enter; since it embraces, legitimately, the whole circle of medical pathology. We must be content, therefore, with a few general deductions, such as appear most important to our present design. It is evident from these cursory remarks, that the man who desires to preserve healthy eyes, and sound, permanent vision, has done but little, and will be in great danger of failure, if he does nothing more than to secure the advantages of proper light, and such periods of time as are most appropriate for study.

Whoever would gain and preserve this blessing, must constantly bear in mind, that the eye is a microcosm; and neglect nothing that is necessary to the preservation of general health. The vigour of the eye-sight depends quite as much upon that, as upon a proper adjustment of the light by which he studies, and a wise accommodation of his labours to fitting hours. No law of physical education can, with safety, be neglected by the man who is desirous of sound, healthy, permanent vision.

These considerations naturally lead us to the following rules, as among the most important preservatives of the sight.

1. The enjoyment of free, pure air, is indispensably necessary to the preservation of healthy eyes.

Who are the individuals that suffer most frequently from diseases of these organs? They are the children of want, who are almost of necessity confined in an impure atmosphere. This undoubtedly makes an important item in the account. The daily enjoyment of pure air is absolutely necessary to sound health; and sound health, while it continues, is one of the surest guarantees of sound eyes. But independently of the beneficial effects of pure air upon the eyes, through the medium of the general health, it exerts a very happy influence upon them locally. It is one of the most agreeable and salutary local applications. Whoever, therefore, is called upon to make great use of the eyes, ought to bear this in mind. He should carefully avoid sitting a long time in an impure atmosphere. The doors and windows of his study should be daily opened, that it may be freely ventilated. The lights by which he reads or writes, should be of such a kind as do not deteriorate the air of the room, by emitting a great quantity of smoke. He should also daily afford the eyes the benefits of the pure external air.

2. The studious man should, daily and regularly, when the weather permits, secure the advantages of such an amount of

exercise as is necessary to maintain a healthy, vigorous condition of the body.*

Exercise is absolutely necessary. It is necessary for strength. It is necessary for easy digestion. Above all, it is necessary to maintain an equalized state of the circulation. Nothing contributes more than this to secure the eyes from that determination of blood to the head, to which students are so subject; and which is one of the most common causes of diseases of the eyes. The sitting posture of the studious man constantly tends to excite a determination of blood to the head and eyes, by the bent position of the body which he is often obliged to assume for hours, and which obstructs the free circulation of the abdominal viscera. It excites also by the disproportionate amount of action which the brain is called upon to perform. It is not therefore enough, if he would preserve the eyes, that he takes his daily walk in the open air. He should frequently change his position, while engaged in study; and alternate the sitting for the standing posture. He should also occasionally, during his labours, moderately excite the general action of the vessels, and thereby diminish the tendency to a local determination, by taking a few turns round the room.

While upon this subject, several other circumstances, all tending to produce the same effect, require particular notice. We observe therefore further:

3. That the student should be particularly careful, that no part of his dress is so arranged as to interfere with the perfect freedom of the circulation.

He must ever remember, that a congested condition of the vessels of the head and eyes, is one of the common dangers to which sedentary men and deep thinkers are subject. He must, therefore, never conform to any of the fashions which may increase this tendency. The cravat, for instance, should sit loosely about the neck. Every part of the dress should be so easy as not to make undue pressure upon the abdominal organs, even though it be at the sacrifice of some of the modern, false notions of taste. It will be at the risk of much good health and good eye-sight, if men of studious habits permit the tailors of the present day to be the supreme arbiters of taste.

4. Let the student, for the same reasons, carefully avoid a confined condition of the bowels. Nothing exerts a more un-

* See the writer's *Essay on Physical Education in this Journal*, Vol. II. p. 174 sq.

salutary effect upon the eyes than this. It lays the foundation for obstructions of the abdominal circulation, and consequent congestions of the head and eyes. Hence the dull headache and heavy spirits of the constipated man. Hence the cloudy vision, so frequently attendant upon this state of the system. Hence also the motes and various anomalous deviations from perfect vision, sometimes amounting to actual loss of sight, which present themselves in the costive man; partly from congestion of the vessels of the eye; and partly from its intimate sympathies with these distant organs.*

Costiveness is the peculiar danger of sedentary men. It is one to which their habits, especially their neglect of exercise, renders them exceedingly liable. Its injurious operation upon the eyes is so great, that it cannot be avoided with too much care. It has undoubtedly unfitted the eyes of many scholars for continued labour; and not unfrequently constituted the principal cause, that has numbered others among the blind.

The great pressure and straining that the constipated man is obliged to make in evacuating the bowels, produces a determination of blood to the eyes, which every such individual must have noticed. Hence, the dark appearance before the organ, if the act takes place in the day time; and the bright orb which floats before them, if it is in the night. It is caused by a crowded state of the vessels upon the exquisitely fashioned retina, a part capable of bearing less pressure with impunity, than any other part of the body. Let it be always regarded as a warning, that the eyes are in danger; and that, if proper precautions are not forthwith taken, amaurosis may be the mournful result. Let it also secure the object for which it is now presented—to impress strongly upon the mind of every lover of sound eyes, the immense importance of guarding continually against this dangerous state of the body.

5. Strict temperance is an indispensable requisite for the preservation of healthy eyes. All who devote their lives to hard study, must bear this continually in mind. Whoever aspires after literary honours, or seeks the rewards of learning, must remember that they are to be found only in the paths of temperance. The pleasures of the mind have no concord with the

* The bare mention of the fact, that the *tunica conjunctiva*, a membrane covering the surface of the eye, is a mere continuation of that which is spread over the internal surface of the whole alimentary canal, may serve to impress these truths on the mind.

pampering of the body. To what are we to attribute the clear heads of the ancient philosophers? Their works are not the productions of congested brains. Their eyes looked out upon nature with a clear vision, to the end of life. Unlike the students of the present day, they exercised their limbs as well as their minds. They studied and thought in the open air. The brain was not the only organ that was tasked; and therefore, it was not oppressed with the blood belonging to other parts of the body. Again, they were obedient to the wholesome laws of temperance. Therefore, their vessels were not filled, as is the case with too many of our students, to almost apoplectic fulness. Among the multitudes of our hard students, who complain of weakness of the eyes, a vast proportion may attribute the misfortune to a total neglect of these first principles of health. We pity them when we see them growing blind over their books; and are almost disposed to regard it as among the discouragements of learning.

But a closer examination of their history presents a very different result. Our sympathy may grow cool, if we regard them with a more physiologic eye. It is a love of the flesh, more than a love of the spirit, that too often clouds their vision. It is too much food, crowding with unnecessary blood the tender vessels of the retina. It is too little exercise, allowing these accumulated fluids to settle down into fatal congestion. It is positions wholly at variance with the freedom of the circulation; and various other imprudences, which are the result of carelessness or unjustifiable ignorance. "The day-labourer may eat what he will, provided it is wholesome, and his eyes will not suffer. But let the student who is called upon to devote, not only his eyes, but his brain to severe labour, live upon highly nutritious food, and such as is difficult of digestion, and we shall soon see how his vision will be impaired, through the vehement and persevering determination of blood to the head, which such a course must inevitably occasion." So speaks Beer; whose extensive opportunities of observation have perhaps never been exceeded. The daily practice of every observing oculist, is filled with coincident experience.

6. Sleep exerts no inconsiderable influence upon the health of the eyes. To the man whose profession demands constant use of these organs, it is a subject of great importance. The experience of every observing man affords abundant evidence of this truth. The sleep of the night is as necessary to the health

of the eyes, as it is to the health of the body. It is one of the great means provided by the Creator, for the daily renovation of both. A constant, diurnal alternation of activity and repose of all the organs of the body, is founded in the necessities of our nature. Of none of them is this more true than of the eyes. Nothing wears down their powers more certainly, and induces a morbid state of sensibility of the retina, than the deprivation of sleep, continued for a sufficient length of time. Few things promote their health more, than regular sleep.—Hence they reason very wrong, who think they gain time, and bring more to pass, when they steal it from the hours of sleep. Those scholars are best able to appreciate the importance of a sufficient amount of sleep to the eyes, who have been for years indulging the pernicious, unnatural, and unphilosophical habit of pursuing their studies far into the hours of night, and depriving these noble organs of its soothing influences. They can best describe its consequences; for nature has warned them by the watering of the eyes, the redness and heat of the lids, and the sense of oppression about the eye-balls, that they are treading upon the borders of annoying weakness; and that, like Milton, unless they learn wisdom by experience, they may at some future time feel the woes of incurable blindness.

But the eyes may be injured by too much sleep, as well as by too little. This fact is also proved by the experience of those indolent students, who, like the sluggard of Solomon, find their happiness in “a little more sleep and a little more slumber, and a little more folding of the hands to sleep.” The red and weak eyes with which they arise in the mornings, prove that immoderate and too prolonged sleep is unfriendly to sound vision, as well as to sound mind. The experience of every one who is willing to give the subject the consideration it deserves, will, while it enables him to avoid both extremes, direct him to the medium rule of health and safety. Its importance, so fully established by daily observation and experience, and also by a multitude of melancholy facts, proves that in common with all the laws of physical education, which exert so manifest an influence upon health, it should not be disregarded by the individual, who is desirous of securing sound, healthy eyes.

IV. In order to secure the advantage of healthy, enduring vision, the eyes must be subjected to a proper and sufficient amount of use or action. Many men daily impair or destroy their eyes by immoderate use; not a few have done the same by too

little. The eye is not exempt from the law of the system, which requires, that each organ must be called upon to exercise its natural functions, in order to obtain its full development, and to secure the advantage of its full powers. It was exercise, action, that developed the muscles of Hercules. No man can expect the eyes of an Argus, unless he subjects them to the amount of action for which they were destined by nature. Oculists daily act upon this principle, when they perform an early operation for cataract, where only one eye is affected with the disease. Although it is unnecessary for the immediate purposes of vision, yet they dare not defer it; because they know that the retina from want of use, is liable to become seriously debilitated; so that at a more distant period, the efforts of surgery may prove unavailing. This important fact is illustrated by many daily occurrences. To this in part, a want of use, may doubtless be attributed the frequent instances of weakness of sight, in consequence of long continued diseases of the general system. It is also illustrated by cases of Strabismus. The squinting eye, after a long continuance of the disease, is always a sightless eye, or nearly so. The patient never makes use of it for the common purposes of vision.

The statement of these facts explains the reason why a total inactivity of the eye occasions debility of the organ. They are sufficient to show that too much repose is one of the most improbable and least philosophical modes of securing strong vision.

Too much use of the eyes, on the contrary, is to be avoided with equal care. How many men ruin their sight by extravagant use! How many gifted men, to whom the church is looking with fond expectation—how many on whom the friends of learning repose with confiding hope, are annually numbered among the weak-sighted and blind by this cause! In our schools and seminaries, how many boys and youth, urged on by a blind ambition, and the folly which is surnamed the "Spirit of the Times," thus lay the foundation of weakness of sight, which, in after life, destroys half their usefulness, and buries their brightest expectations in the dust! Among our literary men and best citizens, what numbers destroy their usefulness in society, and lay the foundation of bitter disappointment, by deferring, until it is too late, a timely consideration upon a wise economy of the eyes.

Nothing would exert a more important influence upon the in-

terests of religion and learning, especially at the present period of the world, than that just apprehensions of this subject should be disseminated among the studious portions of the community ; that its importance should be duly appreciated, and acted upon ; and that each one should ascertain the medium path where he may walk with safety.

There is a great diversity in the original power of the eyes. Some are so strong that they are able to endure, through a long life, the most incredible labours. Others are wearied and fatigued by comparatively small exertions. The eyes of some individuals receive a shock from the imprudences of youthful study, before the organs have attained their maturity, and while they are growing ; when, like all other organs thus conditioned, they cannot be fully tasked without danger. They never wholly recover from this in after life ; and are altogether unfitted by it, for extraordinary duty. In some, the eyes are continually sympathizing with a feeble, diseased frame. Others seem to have iron frames, and consequently iron eyes. Some persons can employ the eyes for days together in the examination of the smallest objects, without the least difficulty ; others, on the contrary, cannot endure the same one hour, without excessive fatigue.

It is very evident that the amount of use to which the eyes are subjected, must be varied by these varying conditions. If all attempt the same degree of labour, a certain proportion must fail. The dyspeptic will bend under the burthen, which the day-labourer might carry as an amusement. The amount of study which the eyes of one man are capable of enduring without the least difficulty, will induce incurable weakness or blindness in the eyes of another. It is to the neglect of this simple fact, that we are, in a good measure, to attribute the incredible number of weak eyes among the ranks of our literary men, at the present day.

But happily, amid this great diversity of eyes, modified in power, as they are, by various circumstances and conditions of the system, there are certain signs resulting from undue use, common to all. A little attention to these will enable each one to ascertain, when he is liable to pass over the bounds of safety, and when it has become necessary that he should begin to relax his efforts, and think of a wise economy of the eyes. They are the following :

1. The focus of vision, (*punctum distinctae visionis*;) is brought nearer to the eye than usual—in other words, it is shorter—so that small objects must be brought closer to the eye than the individual has been accustomed to, in order to obtain distinct vision.

2. There is a sensation of painful distension of the whole region about the eye, especially after continued labour which has been attended with any straining of the sight. This, however, soon disappears, after a short repose from study. Let the student close the eyes, and rest them for a quarter of an hour, and he will feel it no more.

3. When the labour has been of long duration, and accompanied, not only with considerable straining of the vision, but also of the mental powers, in addition to the above mentioned sense of distension, the student perceives an unusual feeling of increased heat; there is a peculiar warmth of the eye-lids, with a difficulty in raising them, and also of moving the eye-balls with their usual facility.

4. If while labouring with the eyes, he attempts to look accurately at some distant object, they involuntarily fill with tears, or at least are more moist than common.

5. A moderate but uncomfortable headache, more particularly about the region of the eye-brows, accompanied by an unpleasant sense of weight, will be felt during or immediately after labour.

6. If the subject is young and plethoric, in addition to the above symptoms, the edges of the lids become red, and somewhat thickened; and the conjunctiva, the membrane covering the white of the eye, appears more turgid and vascular than in its usual, healthy condition.

7. Finally, a thin cloud suddenly comes, for a few moments, before the eyes; objects for a short space appear confused, and unless the eye-lids are closed, a vertigo follows. The moment however, that the eyes are opened again, all objects are seen as distinctly as before.

This last mentioned symptom is more common with full, plethoric subjects, after misuse of the eyes, than with others. The wise, prudent man will regard them as premonitory signs, that call upon him to think seriously of taking some measures to preserve the health of his eyes. If he does not—if under the influence of a senseless ambition, of avarice, pride or any other improper motive, he disregards these friendly warnings, and con-

tinues to strain and use the eyes,—abused nature will utter a louder voice, in the following additional changes.

8. The circumference of all objects appears to be surrounded by a sort of rainbow halo. They will also seem to be in motion, and suddenly veiled with a troublesome glimmer, which changes its situation very rapidly from above downwards; and as the eye continues to look at objects, they will run confusedly into each other.

From this period, he can go forward no longer with impunity. It is a condition of the eye, which, unless arrested by prudent management, may easily degenerate into a weakness of vision that will unfit the individual for extensive usefulness in life; or terminate perhaps in incurable blindness. He has now arrived at a point, at which all delay is replete with danger; and a continued perseverance in study is downright folly.

He may yet be safe. It is not yet to be considered disease; but a sort of middle state between health and disease; in which such a predisposition to the latter exists, that the smallest exciting cause is sufficient to call it into action. The combustible materials have been prepared and collected together; a spark only is required to blow them into a flame.

In the following directions, will be found the surest and speediest mode of arresting its progress, and restoring the eyes to a healthy condition.

1. The student should permit the eyes to have a season of repose. His books, sermons, and papers must be laid aside. He must be deaf to the voice of ambition, avarice, or pride; nay, the pressing calls of duty, even be they those of the pulpit, must be suspended, or modified. We do not mean, however, by repose, a sudden and total inactivity. This may be as injurious as too much activity. But all extravagant use of the organs must be relinquished. Great and fatal mistakes are often made by ignorance of the physiological principles of the eye, when it is in this condition. The patient has often been shut up in a dark room, until the organs became so debilitated that the smallest ray of light, which is their natural stimulus, acted afterwards, when admitted, like an unnatural stimulus, and occasioned an increase of disease. The repose here meant, would be better accomplished by a change, than by a cessation of labour. Where this cannot be done, let the objects about which the eyes have been exercised, be exchanged for others that are less fatiguing to them, and more agreeable.

2. The eye should be often closed during labour, and a few turns made round the room, or what is still better, in the open air. If this is done only for a few minutes, it will be attended with essential benefit.

3. There is generally in these cases an unnatural determination of blood to the eyes. Some benefit may be derived by exciting a deviation to the feet, by immersing them frequently in warm salt water, or water with which a sufficient quantity of mustard or some other stimulant has been mixed, to occasion a slight irritation or warmth of the skin.

4. Perhaps the best of all remedies would be, to abandon books altogether; to leave the city and the study, and journey in the country; to exchange the confined position of the student for the unrestrained movements of the traveller; to excite the whole body by moderate motion; to wander in the woods and meadows, and refresh the misused organ by the green fields and trees, and the endless alternations of nature's works.

5. The eyes, when in this condition, should never be used at all immediately on awaking from sleep in the morning, after meals, or by candle light.

6. In addition to the above, they should be washed frequently in the course of the day, in cold water; which is an excellent means of strengthening the eyes. We do not mean, to open them in cold water, as some do. This is a bad practice, and often does injury, by abstracting too much heat from the eye, and occasioning irritability and weakness. Simply washing them with the hand is a better and more appropriate way.*

* The practice of washing the eyes with cold water, is one of the best known and most invaluable means of strengthening the eyes, and preserving the sight. The opinion is very prevalent that it is always useful. But there are states of the organ in which the application of cold water is highly improper, and warm or tepid water would be more appropriate. An ignorant use of it, therefore, might in some cases prove injurious rather than beneficial. To the healthy eye it is always serviceable.—There is very often with individuals who have weak eyes, a peculiar disposition to close the lids, and a difficulty afterwards of opening them again; also an involuntary contraction of the lids, occasioning a sense of pressure upon the eyeballs, with a feeling of heat, itching, and irritability of the *tarsi*. When such symptoms are present, the local application of warm water will produce more grateful sensations than cold, and do more good. There is no need of erring however on this point, if the effects which follow the application are observed. They should always be grateful and pleasant—if not, they may be injurious.

Such are the simple means necessary to restore the eyes to their original condition ; to avert the impending danger ; and to enable them to return to their ordinary duty. For want of supposed opportunity, through mistaken economy, or from an unwillingness to adopt them, many lovers of learning have been compelled, in bitterness of soul, to retire from its pursuit, and to relinquish all its honours and pleasures. Many have gone down blind to the grave, before half their appointed days of usefulness were fulfilled, little dreaming that loss of vision was only the bitter reward of reprehensible prodigality or unjustifiable ignorance—self-satisfied, perhaps, as martyrs in a glorious cause ; when they should have been humbled at the recollection of a precious talent wantonly abused.

When by the timely adoption of these measures, the eyes have again become sound, too much care cannot be taken that similar imprudence does not again bring them into the same condition. The recovery should make a person more cautious, and not more bold. A second attack or relapse is seldom followed with equal success. Whoever is so unwise as to trespass a second time against the eyes, after the above warnings, should not indulge even the hope, that they will again possess that degree of strength and endurance, which fits them for active, continued labour.

Beer states, that those individuals to whom nature has given brown or black eyes, require more caution in the use of their sight, than such as have blue or gray eyes.* “Whoever,” says he, “has observed for a number of years the very different degrees of power of different eyes, in a great number of men, will find, as I have done, the irrefutable confirmation of the above truth. By a careful collection and comparison of facts, he will arrive at the same strong conviction that I have, viz. that gray and blue eyes will bear, under the same circumstances, much greater straining than brown or black eyes. Consequently, the acuteness and durability of sight is in a very accurate relation to the varying colour of the eyes. Its power always increases in proportion to the degree of lightness of the iris ; and on the contrary, diminishes in proportion to its degree of blackness. For example, dark blue eyes support much less expenditure of vision than the gray ; and brown eyes can en-

* *Pflege gesunder and geschwächter Augen.*

dure much less straining than the dark blue. Every one may easily satisfy himself of the correctness of this universal observation, by the fact that of an hundred men who have black eyes, scarcely one can be found who is altogether contented with his sight; and also, that dark coloured eyes are subject to amaurotic affections; from which light coloured eyes, under the influence of the same exciting causes, much oftener remain free.

“Since there is no general rule without an exception, so here, we sometimes find individuals with gray or blue eyes, which are from the birth very weak; and vice versa. But these exceptions are nevertheless very rare, and do not in the least degree militate against the truth of my assertions.”

If such is the fact—and the authority of its author must, upon this subject, be considered very high,—it is certainly worthy of serious consideration; and deserves a place among other cautions upon the subject of the preservation of the sight.

V. There are some very prevalent habits among studious men, by which the eyes are liable to be injured; especially when they are predisposed to debility and inflammation; and which are indulged in without the least idea that they constitute a cause of danger.

1. The first of these which I shall mention, is the practice of rubbing the eyes on awaking from sleep in the morning, in order to relieve the uneasy sensations experienced at that period of the day—the feeling of stiffness and weight, that is so apt to be present in the much used eye. It occasions irritation; produces a determination of blood to the organs; and not unfrequently slight degrees of redness, which, by frequent repetitions, may easily degenerate into troublesome disease. If much force is applied in this way, it may so derange the functions of the nerve, as to occasion permanent and incurable blindness; of which the following case, related by Beer, is a striking and melancholy example. Its relation may not be without its use, in impressing the importance of the above caution upon the mind. “I was once called,” says he, “to a man who had enjoyed a remarkable vision, and who, but a short time previous, had suddenly become ‘stock blind.’ He was in the company of some familiar friends, when a stranger suddenly came behind him, and covered both his eyes with the hands. Now he was to tell who was behind him. Whether he knew or not, I cannot say; but without speaking a word, he endeavoured to free himself from the pressure. But the more he endeavoured, the more

firmly did the other press with his hands ; until, when they were removed, he found on opening his eyes, that the sight was forever gone."

Many cases are on record, and many annually come under the observation of physicians; which exhibit the injurious and fatal consequences of pressure upon the eyes. It is, therefore, very easy to conceive, that even a moderate degree of pressure, if frequently repeated, as in the above mentioned habit, may not only increase the tendency always existing in many eyes to irritation and inflammation ; but may sometimes actually produce it, and lay the foundation of weakness that might otherwise have never occurred.

2. The eyes, especially when they are predisposed to weakness, are not unfrequently injured by exposure to strong currents of wind. Many date the first attack of what they consider serious disease, to this cause. All whose eyes are weak, are rendered uncomfortable by it. It should therefore be avoided, especially by those who are subject to ophthalmic diseases. When it cannot be wholly avoided, such individuals ought to adopt some measures to modify the impression of the wind upon the eyes. A neglect of this precaution has often converted simple weakness into acute inflammatory disease.

3. Another bad habit is the custom of reading while the body is in a recumbent position. It is a lazy posture, as inconsistent with the health of the eyes, as with the graceful propriety of the scholar. The blood, while the body is thus conditioned, flows more readily to the head and eyes, and subjects them to increased danger, especially when the reading or study is combined with mental labour.

4. The eyes are often seriously injured by being put to too early or too great use after the system has been affected with grave and important disease ; as acute inflammations of the vital organs, nervous fevers, or any disorder accompanied with great depletion. Such affections often leave the eyes exceedingly debilitated. The convalescence is very slow ; time hangs heavily on the hands of the student ; he is weary with the labour of idleness ; and the temptation to lighten the burden by reading is very strong. But it cannot be done without danger of increasing the weakness of the eyes, and converting it into obstinate if not incurable disease. There is no condition where the safety of the eyes stands in greater need of all the patience and self-denial of the student. He should not return to study, until the body has recovered a good measure of

strength, and the eyes have sufficient power to be used without any uneasy sensation. The best economy of the organs consists in withdrawing them from all study, and exercising them only with such objects as are pleasing to them; in accustoming them gradually to bear a full light, and adopting the use of such measures as are necessary to reestablish the general health. The old adage, "the more haste the less speed," is peculiarly applicable to the eyes, when the body is recovering from the consequences of serious disease. An unwillingness to conform to it, has condemned many to months and years of diminished usefulness.

5. The habit of exercising the eyes in the examination of very minute objects, is also very injurious to vision. Its debilitating and fatal consequences are not unfrequently seen in those mechanics who are continually obliged to strain the sight in this way, in the manufacture and manipulation of very small and very delicate objects. It is this that renders so many of them amaurotic in advanced age. The student who is ever reading small print, is subjected to the same danger. Indeed his danger is greater, since there are few, perhaps none, of the objects about which the former is occupied, that strain the sight so much as the small type of the latter. For this reason, while we rejoice at the abundant facilities for acquiring knowledge, which constitute one of the peculiar features of the age, we cannot help regretting the multiplication of books printed with very small type, as among its dangerous errors. It has made our eyes ache and water, to see the spirit of a dozen reviews crowded into the narrow space, formerly needed for one. Much as we should rejoice to know, that the poor student, for a small pittance of his earnings, can secure an amount of literature, once attainable only by the more favoured sons of fortune,—yet when we consider the unspeakable value of sound, permanent eye-sight, we feel that the privilege may be purchased at too high a price. The constant habit of reading very small print, is dangerous to strong eyes. To weak eyes, it may be fatal. It should therefore be carefully avoided.

6. The use of green glasses so common of late among those who have weak eyes, is another bad habit, wholly contrary to the nature of the organ, and to the true principles of treatment in such cases. Their very general adoption is probably founded on the fact, that nature has spread this colour so profusely through her works; and the very natural inference, that the

colour provided by her, and so eminently beneficial to healthy eyes, must of necessity be useful to those which are weak. It has been proved, however, by the experience of thousands, that this opinion is incorrect. Instead of diminishing weakness, in a vast proportion of cases, they increase it. They throw a sombre, melancholy, and disagreeable hue upon all objects, wholly unlike nature's soft and pure colour. The eye is strained by them. When they have been worn for a long time its sensibility becomes morbidly elevated, and it is unfitted to bear the light, which is its natural, healthy stimulus, without uneasiness or pain.

They are only useful, when the individual is obliged to be exposed to a bright glare of light, for any length of time, which cannot be moderated in any other way ; as in travelling over snow when it is highly illuminated by the rays of the sun, or in sailing upon the water, where he is subject to the dazzling and dangerous reflections from its surface. The weak-sighted therefore should only have recourse to them on these and similar occasions, and beware of crippling his eyes by their continual employment.

7. Among the habits of students, which exert an unfavourable effect upon the eyes, the use of tobacco ought not to be passed over unnoticed. There can be no doubt, that this powerful poisonous narcotic, is highly detrimental to the health of sedentary, studious men. It has been stated by writers, that it exerts no inconsiderable influence in the production of amaurotic affections. When its debilitating effects upon the nervous system generally, are considered, we see no reason why the retina, that most exquisitely delicate nerve of the eye, which is allied to all the other nerves of the body by such intimate sympathies, should not partake in the infirmity produced by this disgusting practice. One thing is certain, that of the vast number of amaurotic patients annually presented to the observation of medical men, a great proportion of them indulge in the use of tobacco. It may do for the sailor, and the day-labourer—for most of the duties of their lives are, in some sense, a practical fulfilment of the principal laws of physical education, which ever tend to strengthen the system, and fortify it against the encroachments of nervous diseases. But it is far different with the student—all his habits are sedentary. His modes of life present a continual series of temptations to break these laws ; and render his nervous system peculiarly liable to be injured by all unuatu-

ral and unnecessary stimuli. Many other important reasons might be urged against this practice. But the bare possibility that the above opinion may be correct, will be sufficient to the lover of good eyes. "Sat verbum sapienti."

8. Before leaving this branch of our subject, let me warn my readers against another practice that has aided in the destruction of thousands of eyes. It is the ignorant and injudicious use of eye-waters. None know the amount of this evil, except those physicians who have had extensive opportunities of observing the diseases of the eyes. It is so great, and its consequences are often so melancholy, that the very word eye-water occasions pain almost as often as it meets the ear of an intelligent oculist.

When from neglect of any or all the above directions, the eyes have become weak and irritable, crowded with blood, and requiring only a little more action to run on to serious disease, nine men out of ten, nay, nineteen in twenty, have an unhesitating recourse to some nostrum, which goes under the name of an eye-water. In other words, they use some stimulating application, whose only legitimate operation is to give additional irritation to parts already too much irritated. Under its employment, as might be expected, disease increases. But the ignorant notion is so prevalent among high and low, rich and poor, the wise and the unwise, that a diseased eye cannot be cured without eye-water, that it is commonly the least suspected cause of difficulty. Men abandon that trusty friend, common sense, in diseases of the eyes, as they do on many other subjects. The singular dependance on the use of eye-waters in the diseases of the eyes, is so universally embraced, that it will perhaps be one of the last of the follies of the dark ages that will be abandoned.

The indiscriminate employment of these as a remedy, is, in nineteen cases out of twenty, unscientific and unphilosophical; and wholly at variance with the simple principles of disease. The experience of every sensible observer proves, that in an equal proportion of cases, they produce or keep up disease, instead of alleviating or curing it. Among the host of specific eye-waters, in such general use, there is not one that has not done infinite harm. There is no specific for diseases of the eyes; I had almost said, for any other disease. The only rational mode of treatment in these, as in all other diseases, is that which looks to their causes, and removes them; and afterwards applies such remedies as are in accordance with the simple,

philosophical principles, which regulate the removal of disease in all other organs. To trust to such means, therefore, when the eyes begin to be diseased, is to lean upon a broken staff. To lose time by such trust, while the causes of disease continue, and to neglect the only proper remedies, is to trifle with one of heaven's best blessings; and perhaps, to squander a gift that may never be regained.

The practice of every physician who has possessed opportunities for observation, is filled with the melancholy consequences of this prevailing error. Since the interests of religion, science and humanity depend so much upon the eyes, perhaps no better service could be rendered to them, than a history of eye-waters, with a full exposure of all the mischiefs they have occasioned, as universally prescribed by the hand of old women, grave divines, lawyers and doctors; and a general diffusion of correct ideas upon the principles of their employment, in the very few cases for which they may be considered appropriate remedies.

Among the various nostrums vended and used under the name of eye-waters, to the injury or destruction of much good vision, there is one, however, which forms an exception to the above reprobations, and which, should it supersede all others, and be introduced into the same general practice, would doubtless, till the people gain a better light, prove a blessing. This is the famous Paris collyrium.* "An old lady of Paris, whose husband had become famous for an eye-water, had the misfortune to lose her spouse and his secret together. In this dilemma, harassed by applications for the nostrum, she had recourse to the water of the Seine, and was not more gratified than surprised, to find that the collyrium had lost nothing of its virtue. After having enriched herself by a successful traffic, it so chanced that she fell sick; and conscience stricken at the prospect of death, she applied to an eminent professor of surgery instead of a priest, to relieve herself of the burthen of sin with which her soul was encumbered. 'Soyéz tranquille, mon amie,' said the professor, 'de tous les medecins vous êtes le plus innocent: vos remèdes n'ont fait du mal à personne.'"

From the above observations the following important inference is drawn, viz. The student whose eyes are affected, should never use a collyrium stronger than good river water, without the counsel of some skilful, well informed physician.

* Travers on Diseases of the Eyes.

VI. It is a well known fact, that the distinct vision of near and remote objects requires corresponding changes in the conformation of the eye. One office of the muscles attached to it is to effect these changes, in order to adapt it accurately to the ever varying distances of objects.

That such changes actually take place, however unconscious the mind may be of them, is proved by many facts which come under our daily observation. This explains the reason why, when several objects are placed at different distances before us, they do not appear equally distinct at the same time, though both may be in the same axis of the eye. It also accounts for the fact that distant objects appear indistinct and somewhat confused, when we first look at them, after the eyes have been attentively occupied in examining minute objects, and vice versa; though by continuing to look at them, they soon present their ordinary distinct shape and appearance. It explains also the fatigue experienced by looking intently at minute objects. It is because the muscles of the eye are wearied, like all other muscles, by intense and long continued contraction.

It is a law of the muscular system that its power, facility, and readiness of action are increased by exercise, and diminished or finally lost by disuse. Hence, the difference in the size and agility of the muscles of the day-labourer and dancing master, and the studious, sedentary man. The muscles of the eye are under the influence of the same law. The more they are used, the greater the sphere of activity which they acquire. When they are seldom or never used, they become weak and rigid; and are finally incapable of strong, vigorous action. Like all other muscles, too, they become best fitted for that kind of action to which they are most accustomed, and less for an opposite action. Hence, the eyes of the student who is continually poring over his books, are best calculated for seeing near objects distinctly; while the eyes that are continually exercised in examining distant objects, are least fitted for the distinct vision of such as are near and minute. This is the reason why sailors, for example, are generally long-sighted; and watch-makers, students, etc. are so apt to be short-sighted.

These facts are by no means unimportant; since they lead us to another direction which may be of some consequence in preserving the sight. It is this. The student whose duties oblige him to be for the most part intently occupied with his books, should not neglect to exercise the eyes also in the examination

of distant objects. He should guard against poring continually, or almost without intermission, over his books and papers; and occasionally look abroad upon more distant objects. When his circumstances permit, let him select a room for his study which is provided with a distant view. By looking out upon this, and exercising the eyes alternately in this manner, he will in the best and most agreeable way relieve the muscles from the fatigue of continued action; preserve them longer in a natural, perfect state; and diminish the danger of being obliged to have too early a recourse to the aid of spectacles.

But whatever care has been taken of the eyes, however judiciously they may have been managed, they must, after a certain period, begin to be imperfect. As age advances, one of its inevitable consequences is a change in the conformation of the eye, which will, in some measure, impair vision. With the progress of years, its humours diminish, its form becomes flattened, and the pupil grows narrower; so that the image is removed to a greater distance from the retina; less light is admitted to the eye; and the muscles have not sufficient power to adapt it to the difficulties of its new condition.

Happily, art has provided an admirable remedy for this difficulty, in the invention of spectacles; by which the student may continue his labours and prolong his usefulness.

Some incorrect opinions prevail respecting the period when recourse may be had to the aid of spectacles. Many, influenced by these opinions, have seriously injured vision by deferring them too long. Not a few have laid up cause for repentance by using them too soon. It is therefore important to lay down some directions, by which each one may determine with accuracy the rule of safety, and ascertain with correctness when his sight may be assisted by spectacles.

The proper period is various in different individuals. Some men require them in very early life. Others enjoy perfect vision without them even to old age. Therefore the question cannot be determined, as has been supposed, by the number of our years. Whether they are to be used earlier or later, depends upon a variety of circumstances, upon the original structure and conformation of the eye, upon the care with which it has been managed, upon its wise or unwise use in youth, and upon a great number of peculiarities and diseases, ever varying in a thousand different degrees, in different individuals.

But fortunately, whatever are the precise nature and variety

of these, there are certain signs uniformly presented in every case, by which each person may determine accurately the precise time when the use of spectacles will be consistent with wisdom and the preservation of his sight. They are the following.

1. The focus of vision is farther removed from the eye. In other words, in order to see small objects distinctly, they must be removed farther from the eye than the student has been accustomed to view them. The usual length of this focus of vision in a sound, healthy, perfect eye, is from sixteen to twenty inches.

2. More light is required than formerly for distinct vision. Hence the habit of old men, of holding the candle between the eyes and the paper when they are reading.

3. Very small objects, when they are closely examined, appear confused, and run into each other. This is especially the case when they are of bright, brilliant colours.

4. The eyes are very easily fatigued by slight efforts and straining which would not have affected them previously. There is a sense of weariness on viewing near objects, with watering of the eyes, and headache, and sometimes redness of the eyelids—so much so that there is a necessity of directing them frequently to other objects, in order that they may obtain repose.

5. The sight is generally weak on awaking from sleep, and does not fully recover its accustomed power until some hours after—until it has been, in some degree, aroused by the action of light and air.

6. There is always more difficulty in reading small print by candle light than by the light of day.

Whenever any or all these signs are present, the assistance of spectacles is not only proper but necessary. The prevalent opinion, that the longer they are deferred, the longer the vision will retain the strength of youth, is a mistake. It is a mistake, which has often brought extreme old age prematurely on the eyes. As soon, therefore, as the eye has become sensibly flattened, and the above mentioned inconveniences arise, not a moment should be lost. This is especially important to the studious man, who is obliged to use the eyes much. It is to be considered the voice of nature calling for aid. Either study must be relinquished, or the aid provided; otherwise the eye will be seriously injured by the increased efforts which have become necessary for distinct vision.

Many persons thus injure the eyes by deferring the use of

spectacles too late. But this is not the only mistake that is made. They may be also seriously injured and premature old age induced, if the glasses are not properly adapted to the actual condition of the eyes. If the glass is bad, in other words, if it be not accurately conformed to the actual condition of the eye, the vision will be in greater danger of being injured with it than without it.

Let the principle then be well understood. Many mistake by obtaining glass of too great magnifying power. But this is wrong. A proper glass is not one which magnifies the object, but which presents it as nearly as possible of its natural size—which shews it in a clear, distinct manner, and at the same distance at which the person was accustomed to distinguish objects when the eye was in its most perfect condition. The lens is always too convex, if in order to procure distinct vision, the object must be brought nearer to the eye than before the sight became impaired.

By bearing in mind the natural length of the focus in a perfect eye, we may always find the safe rule. It is, as before observed, from sixteen to twenty inches. That glass is proper which enables us to read fine print, or which procures easy, distinct vision, at about that distance, and improper when it departs much either way from it. The surest proof that the glasses are too convex, is when the book, for distinct vision, must be brought nearer than formerly to a sound, healthy eye, e. g. eight or nine inches. Let the glass always be selected on this principle and no other. From ignorance of it or from inattention to it, many have weakened vision and deprived themselves of the blessing of years of useful labour. If glasses of too great magnifying power are chosen at first, the eye will endeavour to accommodate itself to an improper focus, and become so much flattened that it will be difficult, sometimes impossible, as age advances and the sight grows more imperfect, to find any spectacles which will benefit. On the contrary, if they are selected on a right principle, if the focal distance is sufficiently long, so as only to relieve the sight and render it natural, it sometimes happens that the individual is able in future life to diminish rather than increase the power of the glasses; and at last to give up the use of them altogether.

Short-sighted persons require also the assistance of glasses; and by a judicious choice, these will, on several accounts, aid the preservation of the sight. They prevent the straining of the eyes,

and save much unnecessary labour. They enable a person also to avoid the unfavourable position of the body and head, which the short sighted man is obliged to assume ; and which renders him more liable than others to congestion of blood about the head and eyes. The following are the signs by which he may determine whether he needs the aid of glasses.

1. There is an inability of distinguishing small objects, as common print, at the distance of fifteen or twenty inches ; and larger objects at two feet distance from the eye.

2. There is a disposition to keep the eye-lids half closed while looking at distant objects.

3. The short-sighted man distinguishes near objects in twilight, better than other men. He can read the finest print, for instance, with facility, when the long-sighted man, whose eye is sound, is unable to distinguish the capital letters.

4. He feels a sense of weariness, straining, and distension of the eye, by a long examination of distant objects.

With the existence of these signs he should not delay the use of spectacles ;—but like the long-sighted student, he should be careful to make a judicious choice, and select such as are exactly suited to the actual condition of the eye. The glass should never be so strong as to diminish the size of objects, but merely to represent them clearly, distinctly, and of their natural size. If they are not selected according to this principle, they will increase the short-sightedness, strain the organs, and augment instead of diminishing the weakness.

The long-sighted man, as already observed, will perform an essential service to the eyes, by accustoming them, as he advances in age, to the frequent examination of minute objects. The short-sighted man, for the same reason, should be accustomed to the examination of more distant objects. By these means, each will diminish the tendency to an increase of the changes, which are ever taking place, in the course of time.

Such are the principal facts necessary to be mentioned here. There is much other valuable information in books upon this branch of our subject, well worthy the attention of those whose eyes are the subjects of either of the above mentioned imperfections, and which if well understood and obeyed, will essentially promote the preservation of the sight.*

* Consult "Wells and Adams on Vision ;" Kitchener's popular little work on "Economy of the Eyes ;" Winkler on the "Preservation of the sight, on optical principles ;" and various others.

Great complaint is often made among students, and especially theological students, of the injurious effects of Greek type and Hebrew points. Since they have been frequently regarded as the chief origin and cause of diseases of the eyes, they seem to demand a few observations in this place.

With respect to the former, I would barely remark, that if the type of the author and of the lexicon is sufficiently large and clear, there seems to be no good reason why the study of the Greek language should occasion injury to the eyes. But while Polymicrian editions of the Greek classics, and such copies as those of Schrevelius' Lexicon are in use, we may expect that weakness of the eyes will be the inevitable consequence. Let the student expend his money wisely, in the purchase of such text books as are printed with a clear, handsome type, and he will not be compelled to suspend his studies for want of sight, and obliged to repeat to himself in bitterness of heart, as he looks over his miserable, closely crowded volumes; the old maxim, "Penny wise, and pound foolish."

Perhaps I may be allowed to suggest, with all due deference to the scholarship of the present day, another cause, to show that the study of the Greek language, is not as the lawyers say, *malum in se*,—not necessarily hurtful to the eyes. There is nothing more trying to the sight than to be forever learning—in other words, nothing is more difficult than the practice of a half formed habit; which through want of application or energy, on our part, never becomes natural to us. What is more difficult for example, than to be practising a half learned tune, or attempting to sing an air of which we know next to nothing?

I suspect this principle may be applied to the subject before us. The student often does not become sufficiently familiar with the Greek to read it with ease. This at once explains the mystery. Obligated to pore over a certain quantity every day; to examine words with which his eyes are but little acquainted, and his heart still less—continually shifting his eyes from the page to the lexicon, and from the lexicon to the grammar; his mind in the mean while, perplexed, provoked, and feverish—no wonder that his eyes grow weak! A thorough scholar is delivered from much of this drudgery. At the commencement, when he begins the study of the language in youth, he proceeds gradually, and makes steady but gentle progress; until at length, the Greek letters are as familiar to him as those of his mother tongue.

This leads me to mention another cause, which though unus-

pected, may occasion weakness of the eyes. Many of our young men fit themselves for admission to the university in a hurry. Almost every thing is done in hurry in our country; perhaps nothing more so than the business of education. Thus they are compelled to study day and night, in order to be prepared for the approaching examination. Eyes that have been accustomed to but little use, are suddenly called to steady and laborious action. Can any one be surprised at the result, that such immoderate use of the organ should weaken it? And how easy and natural the inference, since the mode of preserving the sight has been such a neglected subject, that a full amount of the blame should be thrown upon the Greek type! The wonder is rather that so many escape uninjured, than that here and there the eyes of a student are made weak and become unfitted for labour.

Those who are fond of the study of the Greek literature, may undoubtedly injure the eye-sight by immoderate reading, however familiar their eyes may be with text; just as one who is fond of novels or any other reading will weaken the organ by reading too long, by an improper light, immediately after meals, etc.

This word meals, suggests another cause of weakness. Some students, who are in the habit of postponing their studies till the last moment, when the recitation, for instance, is to take place in the afternoon, will go immediately from dinner to their books. If instead of such procrastination, they could be persuaded to become familiar with the lessons a day or two beforehand, so that an easy review at this unfavourable hour might be substituted for hard study, the eyes would be less injured; and their progress in knowledge more sure and rapid. All good rules seem to harmonize to produce one result. Their eyes and their minds, if this improvement were adopted, would be strengthened.

So much for the Greek. We cannot believe that the study of it is peculiarly injurious to the eyes. Hundreds, whose eyes appear to be originally possessed of no extraordinary strength, are in the daily habit of reading it, with impunity. The injurious effects therefore, which are attributed to this, should be ascribed to some of the other causes above mentioned. Were it studied wisely, acquired gradually, learned thoroughly, and not in a hurry, were the type of sufficient size, and not read by improper light, we should probably hear little complaint of the dangerous consequences of the study of the Greek language.

With regard to the Hebrew, having never studied it, I can speak only from analogy and observation.

From a slight examination of the Hebrew text, which indeed appears to an unpractised eye, "horrible and grim," I should say that the language ought to be studied by beginners with great care. I apprehend that much evil has been created by the neglect of this rule. I have been informed that the young men who enter the Seminary at Andover, are much in the habit of making the study of the Hebrew, which is preparatory to their examination for admission, the work of only a few weeks. Hence, they are no doubt hurried. Sufficient time is not allowed for obedience to the good old maxim, "festina lente." They pursue their studies perhaps to a late hour of the evening, or directly after meals. That which should have been the work of months, is made the work of a few days. No wonder that the eyes by such unwonted action, are strained and weak!

Hebrew points doubtless require a closer attention than the common English letters. Yet there is nothing in them peculiarly calculated to injure the eye, if a knowledge of them is acquired slowly, if the period of study is at first short, and lengthened gradually.

From an observation of facts also, I should conclude that the study of Hebrew is not necessarily hurtful. So far as I can learn, the best scholars in that language are not troubled with weakness of sight.* Unless then those who complain of Hebrew, can prove that some idiosyncrasy exists in their power of vision, rendering them exceptions to the rule established by this fact, they must attribute their weak eyes to some other cause than the Hebrew.

Perhaps they will find, on a more impartial examination, the real sources of evil in some of the above mentioned causes of weakness. No man whose eyes are originally weak, or injured by disease, can expect to put them to great use in the study of any dead language, with impunity. Neither if his knowledge of Hebrew is slight and superficial, so that the text always appears a mystic page, or if it has been studied at improper times, or too intently, or while neglecting the general health, is it fair that its little points should be compelled to bear the blame. It is a maxim in law, that every man is innocent until proved guilty.

* This is certainly true of the most distinguished scholars in Europe and America.—ED.

And while so many other causes of mischief are implicated, Hebrew points may well be acquitted under this equitable rule. Especially if some of the best scholars stand ready to give in their evidence, and testify that the Hebrew language is inoffensive to the eyes, its character must go clear, notwithstanding the complaints of other men.

Let the language be more thoroughly studied—let the eye be made perfectly familiar with it, (and to this end the mind must be master of it,) let the rules laid down for the preservation of the eyes, in their ordinary every day use, be observed with care; and I should not be afraid to prophesy, that the reproach will ere long be wiped away from the Hebrew—and that it will cease to be regarded as one of the decided enemies of strong and healthy vision.*

We have, thus, in a very general manner, attempted to go over this important subject. We have endeavoured to explain the principles upon which the light under all circumstances is to be regulated, so as best to suit the labouring eye; to shew the periods of the day in which the organ may be used with the most advantage, and the least danger of injury; and the amount of labour to which it should be subjected, in its varying conditions in different individuals. We have adverted also to its in-

* In a note accompanying the manuscript, the author remarks: "It is certain that not a few of the young men from Andover, who have applied for advice, confidently attributed all the woes of their poor eyes to Hebrew; though it never appeared to me so much to be blamed, as costive bowels, want of exercise, and various other mistakes and follies." If it be indeed the peculiar forms of the Greek and Hebrew characters, which thus occasion weakness and diseases of the eye, we must of course expect to find the Greeks and Jews, and also the Arabs,—or at least the learned among these nations,—the victims of these maladies, a sore-eyed, blinded race. The fact, however, is just the reverse; and we may therefore properly acquit the Greek and Hebrew letters of any intrinsic malignity. The truth seems to be, that any species of characters to which the eye is unaccustomed, and which therefore demand a closer attention than ordinary, tend in a greater or less degree to strain the eyes, and thus ultimately produce disease. Thus a page of Italic is read with much less facility than one in ordinary type; the eye must rest upon it with more intentness, and may thus be overstrained; in the same way that the eyes are strained by the exertion requisite in order to read at twilight.—Ed.

separable connexions, and consequent sympathies with the general system; and pointed out some of the important rules necessarily arising from those connexions. We have alluded to some of the bad habits in which students indulge, to the great injury of the eyes; and directed the attention to some of the plain simple means, prophylactic and remedial, which were naturally presented by the views that have been taken of the subject.

If we mistake not, the secret but least suspected causes of much of the suffering and privations of studious men from weakness of the eyes, may be found in the neglect of some of the above principles, or the indulgence of some of the above mentioned errors.

It is obvious that the present occasion has only permitted a very superficial examination of the subject. Its vital importance to the cause of literature and religion demands a more thorough investigation. But perhaps enough has been said, to impress the mind with its importance; and to induce some who may read these pages, to give it the more accurate examination which it deserves.

In conclusion, we would urge this as a solemn duty upon all who regard their individual happiness, or desire to render their usefulness as extensive as possible, by bringing all the powers which God has bestowed upon them, into full and permanent activity. Especially is this duty binding upon the clergy. They, be it ever remembered, "are not their own, they are bought with a price." They profess to be devoted "body and soul to the service of the Lord." They therefore, above all men, are least excusable, if they wantonly suffer any of these powers, from ambition, neglect, or unjustifiable ignorance, to be squandered or lost.

ART. IV. AUGUSTINE ON THE ART OF PREACHING.

From his Work : " *De Doctrina Christiana*," Lib. IV. Translated from the Latin, by Oliver A. Taylor, Res. Licent. in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following treatise, which is a translation of the fourth book of Augustine's work, *De Doctrina Christiana*,¹ and belongs to the department of homiletics, has often been quoted, and recommended to the young minister's attentive perusal.² This fact alone would furnish a sufficient apology for its appearance in an English dress. There is however no need of such an apology. It may, indeed, have in part derived its celebrity from that of its author, and not altogether from real merit. That it does not contain some things of doubtful utility is not pretended, nor that it contains many specific directions for the composition of a sermon. Taken as a whole, however, it is characterized by good taste and sense, and must be looked upon as a valuable treatise. The author certainly appears to have understood his subject,—far better indeed, than he did that of the three preceding books,—and he certainly writes better respecting the rules of preaching, than with all his piety he can be admitted to have preached.³

In addition to this, the treatise derives high value from historical considerations. From the time of Paul down to the reformation, it was the only work that appeared, which, strictly speaking, deserved the name of a homiletical treatise. Much indeed was written which had a greater or less bearing upon the sacred office ; but it was generally adapted to a monastic mode of teaching, and contained little or nothing substantial. Chry-

¹ The title of the work does not exactly correspond to its contents, as may be seen by comparing it with Augustine's introductory paragraph, below. See Schröckh, Chr. K. G. Th. XV. p. 351.

² See Milner's Church Hist. Vol. II. p. 302 sq. Bost. 1822. Also, Fenelon's Dialogues on the Eloquence of the Pulpit, and his Letter to the French Academy, both of which are to be found in the Young Preacher's Manual.

³ See Schröckh, Chr. K. G. Th. XV. p. 361 sq.

sostom's six books *On the Priesthood*,⁴ rich as they were in many respects, were mostly destitute of remarks of a homiletical character. The same is true of the work of Gregory the Great, *De Cura Pastoralis*, notwithstanding it enjoyed great popularity in its day, was almost immediately translated into Greek, was circulated throughout the churches, and, in the ninth century, translated into English by Alfred the Great for the use of the English clergy.⁵ The works which emanated from Arnulph archbishop of Lisieux,⁶ William archbishop of Paris,⁷ Humbert de Romanis,⁸ and John Reuchlin,⁹ were still less perfect. Augustine's treatise stood alone, and was the work from which Luther himself drew his first directions respecting preaching.¹⁰ It has often been drawn from by writers upon homiletics, since his time, and together with the rest of the work, been translated and published in various modern languages.

So far as I have succeeded in exhibiting the spirit of Augustine in English, the following treatise may be considered as a fair specimen of the writings of him of whom Erasmus says, "Ingenii felicitas, prorsus erat incomparabilis; sive acumen spectes, vel obscurissima facile penetrans, sive capacis memoriae fidem, sive vim quandam mentis indefatigabilem;" and whom in another place he

⁴ See Opp. Chrysost. Par. 1718, Tom. I. p. 362 sq. Schmid, Anleit. zum Kanzelvortrag, Th. III. p. 141 sq.

⁵ Schmid, p. 190 sq. Milner, III. p. 72. comp. p. 143 sq. Also Bower's Lives of the Popes, Tom. II. p. 542.

⁶ He died about the year 1182. The work of his referred to, is a sermon delivered in a council at Tours. It is to be found in the Biblioth. Max. Pat. T. XXII. p. 1323 sq.

⁷ He died about the year 1240. The work referred to is called, *Rhetorica divina*, or *Ars oratoria eloquentiae divinae*. It was published at Paris, 1516, in 8vo. There is also an old edition extant without date or place.

⁸ Humbert de Romanis in Burgundy, General of the Dominican order. He died in the year 1274. The work of his referred to, is a treatise in two books, entitled, *De eruditione concionatorum*, and is to be found in the Bibl. Max. Pat. T. XXV. p. 424 sq.

⁹ He died in 1521. The work referred to, is entitled, *Liber congregatorum de arte praedicandi*, and has gone through several editions. Comp. Schmid, p. 271 sq.

¹⁰ See Schuler, Geschichte der Veränderungen im Predigen, 1 ster Theil, p. 39 sq.

declares, "In docendo sedulus, in redarguendo nervosus, in exhortando fervidus, in consolando blandus, ubique pius, et vere Christianam spirans mansuetudinem." To do this however is not an easy task, for few of the fathers write in a more perplexed style. His long and involved sentences, the incessant and sometimes not very nice use he makes of particles, and the various subtleties and witty turns, render him difficult to be understood; while his numerous quibbles, alliterations, and antithetical expressions, render him difficult to be translated. On this subject let the same author already quoted, be judged. "Habet Augustinus," says he, "suum quoddam dicendi genus, argutum et periodis in longum productis multa convolvens; quod lectorem et familiarem, et acutum, et attentum, et bene memorem requirit, denique taedii laborisque patientem; quales non ita multos reperias."¹¹ To obviate some of these difficulties, and exhibit the spirit of the original to as good advantage as possible, several of those passages in which Augustine indulges in a play on words, are inserted in the notes. It is scarcely necessary to add, that the reader who would do full justice to the merits of this treatise, must throw himself into the circumstances of the age in which it was composed.—TRANSLATOR.

AUGUSTINE ON PREACHING.

THIS work, inscribed *De Doctrina Christiana*, I divided into two parts, at the very outset. Having in a proem responded to some who would be likely to find fault with it, I proceeded to say: "There are two things in which the proper mode of treating the Scriptures mainly consists; namely, the mode of finding out the things which are to be understood [interpretation], and the mode of exhibiting what has thus been discovered [preaching]. Of each of these we will treat in succession." As I have already had occasion to speak much at large respecting the mode of *discovering truth*, and have occupied three books, I here propose, with the divine assistance, to say a few things concerning the *exhibition of the truth to others*, confining myself if possible to one book, that the whole work may be comprised in four parts.

In the first place, I must check the anticipations of the reader, who may suppose that I am about to deliver rhetorical precepts,

¹¹ See Cave's *Histor. Literar.* Vol. I. p. 292.

such as are learned and taught in secular schools ; and must admonish him not to anticipate from me, any thing of the kind. Not indeed because they are of no use ; but because, however useful, they are to be learned elsewhere, by those who have leisure to improve by them ; but they must not be sought for in this or any other production of mine.

By means of the rhetorical art, men are persuaded of things both true and false. Who then will presume to say that, as opposed to error, *truth* should rely unarmed upon her defenders ? that he indeed, who attempts to persuade his hearers of what is false, may properly have learned how to render them favourably disposed, attentive, and docile, in a proem ; while he who desires to persuade them of what is true, must not have learned how to accomplish this ? that the former may utter what is false as if it were true, in a brief and perspicuous manner ; while the latter must utter what is true, in such a way as to render it tedious to hear, difficult to understand, and unpleasant to believe ? that the one may assail the truth with false arguments, and may maintain error ; while the other is unable either to defend the truth or refute falsehood ? that he whose object it is to move and compel the minds of his audience to embrace error, may terrify, depress, excite, and exhort with fervour ; while the advocate of truth must be sleepy, sluggish, and frigid ? Who can be so tasteless as to relish this ?* Since then the faculty of eloquence, which proves of such efficacy in inculcating either right or wrong, truth or falsehood, stands thus on common ground, why should it not be employed by the good in contending for the truth, as well as usurped by the bad in sustaining the vain and fatal cause of iniquity and error ?

But whatever observations and precepts there are respecting this subject, beyond the scope of the present work ;—precepts, which, in connexion with that skill which results from extensive and habitual exercise in speaking and the constant use of elegant language, go to form what is called eloquence ; they are to be learned at a suitable and convenient age and in a time set apart for the very purpose, by those who can learn them with

* Augustine, in all his works, exhibits a fondness for playful turns, alliterations, and antithetical expressions. In the above there is in the original something of his playfulness : "*Quis ita desipiat, ut hoc sapiat.*"—Tr.

facility. Indeed, the princes of Roman eloquence have not hesitated to affirm, that whosoever does not acquire this art with facility, will never acquire it at all.¹ Whether this be true or not, we need not inquire. Even upon the supposition that it is possible for those who are slow in acquisition, ultimately to become masters of the rules of eloquence, I do not think these rules of so much importance as to render it necessary for men who have arrived at years of maturity, or even the sober period of life, to spend their time in acquiring them. It is enough that they be made the study of youth; not of all those indeed whom we could wish to have educated for the church; but of those among them who are urged by no necessity more pressing, or more deserving of preference. If a man have an acute and fervid mind, he will more easily acquire the art of eloquence by reading and hearing the eloquent, than by following the precepts of eloquence. Nor are there wanting ecclesiastical productions, in addition to the sacred canon savingly deposited in the ark of authority,² of themselves sufficient, without any such aid, to furnish a man of a ready and capacious mind, with the very eloquence they exhibit; provided he read them and carefully attend to their contents, uniting therewith exercises in writing, dictating, and speaking, on such subjects as are agreeable to the requisitions of faith and piety. If, on the other hand, a man have not such a mind, he will either be unable to acquire the precepts of eloquence at all; or, if after having been inculcated with much labour, he acquire them in part, he will derive no benefit from them. Of those even who have learned them, and speak with copiousness and elegance, it is not all that can think of them in speaking, and regulate their discourse accordingly, unless these precepts are the very object of discussion. Nay, I imagine there are very few able to speak well, and think at the same time of the rules for doing so; inasmuch as caution must be exercised, lest, while the mind is intent upon speaking by art, it forget what was to be expressed. And yet the speeches and discourses of the eloquent are found full of the precepts of eloquence,—precepts, of which they never once thought for

¹ See Cicero, *De Oratore*, Cap. 25 sq. p. 42 sq. Bost. ed.

² “*Præter canonem in auctoritatis arce salubriter collocatum;*” that is, the authority of councils or the church. The original evidently contains an allusion to the manner in which the law was preserved in the ark.—TR.

the purpose of becoming eloquent, nor while exhibiting their eloquence; and this too, whether they have learned them or totally neglected them. These precepts are found there as the result of eloquence; they are not put there as the cause of it.

Infants learn to talk merely by learning of those who talk; and why cannot men become eloquent without the agency of art, merely by hearing and reading the discourses of the eloquent, and imitating them, so far as it can be done with effect? Do we not find by examples that this is possible? Indeed we have known many, without rhetorical precepts, more eloquent than multitudes who had learned them; but none who were eloquent, without having read and heard the speeches and discourses of the eloquent. Thus boys would not need the aid of the grammatical art, the object of which is to teach one to speak with purity, were they permitted to live and grow up with those who always spoke with purity. In this case, being ignorant of what is faulty, they would, with their correct habits, immediately detect and avoid whatever they heard that was faulty from the mouths of others, just as a citizen, though unlearned, detects errors of speech in a rustic.

He then who handles and teaches the word of God, should be a defender of the true faith, and a vanquisher of error; should both teach what is good, and unteach what is bad; and in accomplishing this, the object of preaching, he should conciliate the adverse, excite the remiss, and point out to the ignorant their duty and future prospects. When however he finds his audience favourably disposed, attentive, and docile, or succeeds in rendering them so, then other things are to be done, as the case may require. If they are to be instructed, then, to make them acquainted with the subject in question, narration must be employed; and to establish what is doubtful, resort must be had to reasoning and evidence. If they are to be moved rather than instructed, then, to arouse them from stupor in putting their knowledge into practice, and bring them to yield full assent to those things which they confess to be true, there will be need of the higher powers of eloquence; it will be necessary to entreat, reprove, excite, restrain, and do whatsoever else may prove effectual in moving the heart.

All this, indeed, is what most men constantly do, with respect to those things which they undertake to accomplish by speaking. Some, however, in their way of doing it, are blunt, frigid, inelegant; others, ingenious, ornate, vehement. Now he who en-

gages in the business of which I am treating, must be able to speak and dispute with wisdom, even if he cannot do so with eloquence, in order that he may profit his audience; although he will profit them less in this case, than if he could combine wisdom and eloquence together. He who abounds in eloquence without wisdom, is certainly so much the more to be avoided, from the very fact that the hearer is delighted with what it is useless to hear, and thinks what is said, to be true, because it is spoken with elegance. Nor did this sentiment escape the notice of those among the ancients, who yet regarded it as important to teach the art of rhetoric; they confessed, that wisdom without eloquence profited states very little, but that eloquence without wisdom profited them not at all, and generally proved highly injurious.¹ If therefore those who taught the precepts of eloquence, even though ignorant of the true, that is, the celestial wisdom 'which cometh down from the Father of lights,' were compelled by the instigations of truth to make such a confession, and that too in the very books in which their principles were developed; are we not under far higher obligations to acknowledge the same thing, who are the sons and daughters of this heavenly wisdom? Now a man speaks with greater or less wisdom, according to the proficiency he has made in the sacred Scriptures. I do not mean in reading them and committing them to memory, but in rightly understanding them, and diligently searching into their meaning. There are those who read them and yet neglect them—who read them to remember the words, but neglect to understand them. To these, without any doubt, those persons are to be preferred, who, retaining less the words of the Scriptures, search after their genuine signification with the inmost feelings of the heart.² But better than both is he, who can repeat them when he pleases, and at the same time understands them as they ought to be understood.

It is necessary, therefore, for him who is bound to speak with wisdom, even what he cannot speak with eloquence, to have the words of Scripture at command. Indeed, it becomes him, in proportion to the poverty he discovers in his own words, to enrich himself with the expressions of Scripture; in order, that whatever he expresses in his own language, he may, by their aid,

¹ Cicero, *De Inventione*, L. I. c. I. p. 186.

² "Cor earum sui cordis oculis vident;" a play upon the word *cor*.

prove; that thus he who is weak in his own declarations, may acquire strength, as it were, by the testimony of the mighty. Indeed, he who is less able to delight by speaking, can yet delight by proving.

Moreover, I enjoin it upon him who would combine eloquence with wisdom, by which he will certainly become more effective, to read and listen to the eloquent, and imitate them in exercises, rather than apply to the teachers of the rhetorical art; provided those whom he hears and reads, were, or are now, justly celebrated, not merely for their eloquence, but also for their wisdom. To hear those who speak eloquently, is delightful; but to hear those who speak with wisdom, is salutary; and hence the Scripture says, not that 'the multitude of the eloquent,' but 'of the wise, is the safety of the people.'¹ As, however, bitter remedies must often be taken, so injurious sweetness must always be avoided. But what can be better than the union of the salutary with the delightful, or the delightful with the salutary? for in proportion to the delight created in this case, will be the ease with which the salutary becomes profitable.² Accordingly, there are ecclesiastical writers, who have handled sacred subjects, not only with wisdom, but also with eloquence; for the reading of whose productions time itself would not suffice, any more than they can with propriety remain wholly unknown to persons of study and leisure.

Here perhaps some one will ask, Whether the authors of the inspired writings, which, agreeably to authority upon which we may most safely rely, constitute our sacred canon, are to be pronounced wise only, or also eloquent? It is a question easily answered with me and those who agree with me as to the subject before us. So far as I can understand the Scriptures, there is not only nothing more wise, but also nothing more eloquent; and I presume to say, that every one who rightly understands what they express, immediately perceives, that they ought not to have expressed it in any other manner. Indeed, as there is one kind of eloquence appropriate to youth, and another, to old age, and eloquence ceases to be eloquence when it loses this

¹ Wisd. of Sol. 6: 26, Eng. version, verse 24.

² Another instance of Augustine's mode of playing upon words: "Sicut autem saepe sumenda sunt et amara salubria, ita semper vitanda est perniciosa dulcedo. Sed salubri suavitate vel suavi salubritate quid melius? Quanto enim magis illic appetitur suavitas, tanto facilius salubritas prodest.—Tr.

personal congruity ; so also there is a kind of eloquence appropriate to those dignified with the highest authority and manifestly divine. This eloquence the sacred writers possess ; nor would another kind become them, nor this become others ; for to them it is appropriate, but for others it might seem too humble, just in proportion as it excels in solidity, rather than in empty show. Where I do not understand them, the eloquence of the Scriptures is to me, indeed, less apparent ; but still I do not doubt, that they are as eloquent in this case as in the other. The very obscurity in which their divine and saving words are involved, must have been mingled with such a degree of eloquence, as that our intellects may profit by it, not only in invention, but also by exercise.

Did time permit, I might, in those sacred productions which Divine Providence has provided for our instruction, and for our guidance from this world of wickedness to a world of bliss, point out all those ornaments and fine qualities of eloquence, of which those feel so proud, who esteem their own language above that of the sacred writers, not on account of its grandeur, but of its turgidity. It is not, however, those qualities of their eloquence which delight me more than words can express, that are common to them with the orators or the poets of the Gentiles ; but what attracts me most, and fills me with astonishment, is the fact, that they have so used the eloquence of this latter class of writers in connexion with another kind of their own, that it is neither wanting in their productions, nor yet rendered prominent. It became them, indeed, neither to disclaim its assistance, nor yet to exhibit it by way of ostentation ; the first of which they would have done, had they wholly rejected it ; and the second they might be thought to have done, had they left it easily discoverable. In truth, in the passages where it is recognised by the learned, the things spoken are such, that the words in which they are uttered, seem not to be employed by the speaker, but as it were spontaneously furnished by the things themselves ; as if you perceived wisdom coming forth from her habitation, that is, the breast of the wise man, and eloquence, like an inseparable handmaid, following unsolicited in her train.

Who does not perceive what the apostle intended to say, and how wisely he has expressed himself :* “ We glory in tribulations ;

* Rom. 5: 3—5.

knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us?" Should any one, unskillfully skilled (if I may so express myself) in the art of rhetoric, contend, that the apostle here followed the precepts of the rhetorical art, would he not excite the smiles of Christians, both learned and unlearned? And yet we here discover the figure of speech called in Greek *κλίμαξ*, *climax*, but by some of the Latins *gradatio*, rather than *scala*; a figure in which the words or meanings are successively connected together, and arise one from another; as in this case, where, from tribulation we have patience; from patience, experience; and from experience, hope. Here we also discover another beauty; for after the enunciation, with a certain quantity of voice, of several short sentences, such as we call members and clauses, *caesa*, but the Greeks *κῶλα* and *κόμματα*, *colons* and *commas* in the original sense of the words, there follows what we call an *ambitus* or *circuitus*, but the Greeks, *περίοδος* a *period*, in the enunciation of which, the voice of the speaker is suspended till the close.* In the above quotation, for instance, in what precedes the period, the words, *for tribulation worketh patience*, constitute the first member;—*and patience, experience*, the second;—*and experience, hope*, the third. Then the period itself is added, or the whole is concluded with three members; of which the words, *and hope maketh not ashamed*, is the first;—*because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts*, is the second; and, *by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us*, the third. Now these and all

* To have a full apprehension of the above, and some remarks which follow, it should be recollected, that by the ancients a very short member was called a comma, whether simple or compound; and a longer one a colon; or in Latin, *caesa* and *membra*; also, that a very short sentence was likewise called a comma, whether simple or compound, and a longer one, a colon. A sentence composed of more words than would consist with either of these two terms, particularly, if so put together in corresponding parts, as to be easily distinguished by a proper elevation and cadence of the voice, was called a *period*, from *περίοδος*, that is, a sentence, the sense of which is complete in itself. Such a period can never contain less than two members, and rarely more than four. Hence, the above terms are to be carefully distinguished from each other. See Ward's System of Oratory, Vol. I. p. 344.—TA.

such sentences are delivered agreeably to the rhetorical art. While, therefore, we do not say that the apostle followed the precepts of eloquence, we deny not, that eloquence is found in the train of his wisdom.

In his second epistle to the Corinthians, he rebukes certain false apostles who were of the Jews and had been calumniating his character; and as he was thus obliged to speak of himself,—while attributing this very thing to his folly, with what wisdom, and what eloquence does he speak! Yea, he stands forth as a companion of wisdom, a leader of eloquence; following the one and preceding the other, not rejecting her that follows!¹ “I say again,” says he,² “Let no man think me a fool; if otherwise, yet as a fool receive me, that I may boast myself a little. That which I speak, I speak not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly, in this confidence of boasting. Seeing that many glory after the flesh, I will glory also. For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise. For ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face. I speak as concerning reproach, as though we had been weak. Howbeit whereinsoever any is bold, (I speak foolishly,) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they the ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches. Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not? If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things which concern mine infirmities.” With what wisdom this pas-

¹ Comes sapientiae, dux eloquentiae, illam sequens, istam praecedens et sequentem non respiciens.

² 2 Cor. 11: 16—30.

sage is expressed, the wakeful will discover at once. Nay, even the snoring will arouse to notice the stream of its eloquence.

But further, he who is acquainted with the subject, will acknowledge, that in the preceding extract, the entire form of the diction, the aspect, as it were, of the expression, by which even the ignorant are delighted and moved, has been produced by an appropriate diversification of those clauses called *κόμματα* by the Greeks, those members and periods, concerning which I have just spoken above. From the commencement of it onwards, we meet with periods. Of these, the first is of the smallest kind or composed of two members, it being impossible for periods to contain less, though they may contain more. It stands thus: 'I say again,—let no man think me a fool.' Then comes another of three members: 'If otherwise,—yet as a fool receive me,—that I may boast myself a little.' The third has four members: 'That which I speak,—I speak not after the Lord,—but as it were foolishly,—in this confidence of boasting.' The fourth has two: 'Seeing that many glory after the flesh,—I will glory also.' The fifth also has two: 'For ye suffer fools gladly,—seeing ye yourselves are wise.' The sixth also has two: 'For ye suffer,—if a man bring you into bondage.' Then follow three *caesa* or clauses: 'If a man devour you,—if a man take of you,—if a man exalt himself.' Then three members: 'If a man snite you on the face,—I speak as concerning reproach,—as though we had been weak.' A period of three members is then added: 'Howbeit whereinsoever any is bold,—(I speak foolishly,)—I am bold also.' We then have three clauses in the interrogative form, and three opposed to them by way of answer; three being opposed to three: 'Are they Hebrews?—so am I.—Are they Israelites?—so am I.—Are they the seed of Abraham?—so am I.' In the fourth place, however, though we meet with a clause likewise in the interrogative form, we find the answer given by a member instead of another clause: 'Are they the ministers of Christ?—(I speak as a fool,) I more.' Four clauses now follow, by means of which, while the interrogation is left at an appropriate distance, the answer to it is drawn out with diffuseness: 'In labours more abundant,—in stripes above measure,—in prisons more frequent,—in deaths oft.' A short period now intervenes, for it must be marked in utterance, with a suspended tone of voice; here the words, 'Of the Jews five times,' constitute the first member, and the words, 'Received I forty stripes save one,'—the second. Resort

is now again had to clauses, of which three are introduced : ' thrice was I beaten with rods,—once was I stoned,—thrice I suffered shipwreck ;' and a member is then added : ' A night and a day have I been in the deep.' Fourteen clauses now follow, flowing on with a most appropriate impetuosity : ' In journeyings often,—in perils of waters,—in perils of robbers,—in perils by mine own countrymen,—in perils by the heathen,—in perils in the city,—in perils in the wilderness,—in perils in the sea,—in perils among false brethren,—in weariness and painfulness,—in watchings often,—in hunger and thirst,—in fastings often,—in cold and nakedness.' A period of three members now intervenes : ' Besides those things which are without,—that which cometh upon me daily,—the care of all the churches.' To this he adds two members by way of interrogation : ' Who is weak, and I am not weak?—who is offended, and I burn not?' Then, as a kind of breathing place, the whole is closed with a period of two members : ' If I must needs glory,—I will glory of the things which concern mine infirmities.' What follows after this impetuous current of thought, when, by the introduction of a short narration, he rests as it were and causes his hearer to rest, is inexpressibly delightful and beautiful ; for he goes on to say : "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed forevermore, knoweth that I lie not;" and then he tells us in a few words, the dangers he had incurred, and how he had escaped from them.

It would be tedious to pursue this subject, or point out the same things in other parts of the sacred Scriptures. Had I resolved indeed, to point out the figures of rhetoric contained even in the words of the apostle which have been examined, would not the grave be more ready to think I had done too much, than the student to think I had done enough? These things, whenever taught by masters, are esteemed of great value, purchased at a high price, and sold with high commendation,—with a boasting indeed, of which I fear even I may be thought to savour, while thus discussing these points. Still an answer, however imperfect, was required to those learned men who suppose the sacred writers are to be condemned, not for not having, but for not displaying that eloquence, of which they themselves are so enamoured.

But some will perhaps think, I have selected the apostle Paul, on the supposition that he was an eloquent man. For when he

says : "Though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge,"¹ he merely seems to yield to the affirmation of his calumniators, and would not accede to it as true ; whereas, if he had said : "I am indeed rude in speech, but not in knowledge," nothing else could possibly have been understood. It is certain, that he did not hesitate to lay claim to knowledge, without which he could not have been a competent teacher of the Gentiles. It is also certain, that whatever of his we bring forward as a specimen of eloquence, we adduce it from those epistles which his very calumniators, even while professing to hold his speech contemptible when present, acknowledged to be weighty and powerful.² I see therefore, I must also say something respecting the eloquence of the prophets ; in whose writings there are many things enveloped in tropical language, which, the more they are thus involved in the obscurity of metaphor, acquire a proportional increase of sweetness, on being rendered intelligible. In this case, however, I feel it incumbent upon me to select something for my remarks which demands no exposition, but permits me to confine myself to the mode of expression. For this purpose, I prefer, above all others, the prophet who tells us, that he was originally a shepherd or herdsman ; and that, while engaged in this employment, he received a divine call to go and prophesy to the people of God.³ I shall not follow the interpretation of the Seventy, however ; who, being under the guidance of the Holy Spirit himself,⁴ seem, on this account, to have given a new rendering to some passages, in order to attract the attention of the reader to an examination of the spiritual sense ; for which reason, some things in their version are more obscure because more tropical ; but I shall follow the translation made from the Hebrew into Latin, by Jerome the Presbyter, an adept in both languages.⁵

¹ 2 Cor. 11 : 6.

² 2 Cor. 10 : 10.

³ Amos 7 : 14, 15.

⁴ The opinion here expressed by Augustine with respect to the inspired authority of the Septuagint version, was that of Philo, Justin, and others. See Philo, *De Vita Mosia*, L. II ; Rollin's *Ancient Hist.* B. XVII. chap. I. Sect. 6 ; also various works referred to in Jahn's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 52. Compare *Joseph. Ant.* XII. 2.—Tr.

⁵ In this translation, the language of our English version is used except in some particular cases.—Tr.

Now when this rustic, or this prophet who had been a rustic, would reprove the impious, the proud, the luxurious, and those neglectful of every thing like fraternal charity, he exclaims :* “Wo to them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria, which are named chief of the nations, entering the house of Israel with pomp. Pass ye unto Calneh, and see ; and from thence go ye to Hamath the Great : then go down to Gath of the Philistines, and the best of these kingdoms, if their border is greater than your border. Ye that are set apart for the evil day, and draw near to the seat of iniquity ; that lie upon beds of ivory, and play the wanton upon your couches ; that eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall ; that chant to the sound of the viol. They thought themselves possessed of instruments of music like David, drinking wine in bowls, and anointed with the chief ointments ; but they were not grieved for the affliction of Joseph.” Had those, who, as learned and skilful men, contemn our prophets as inerudite, and ignorant of elocution, been obliged to say any thing either to or in reference to such characters, they would hardly have wished to express themselves in any other manner ; however unwilling they might have felt to partake of their inspiration. What is there, indeed, to which the sober-minded can listen with greater delight than to this passage ? In the first place, with what a blast is the invective poured forth against the stupid to awake their drowsy senses ? “Wo to them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria, which are named chief of the nations, entering the house of Israel with pomp.” Then, to show them how ungrateful they were for the favours of God in giving them a kingdom of ample space, since they trusted in the mountain of Samaria and even worshipped idols there, he says : “Pass ye unto Calneh, and see ; and from thence go ye to Hamath the Great : then go down to Gath of the Philistines, and the best of these kingdoms, if their border is greater than your border.” In what he here says, he also introduces the names of the places, Zion, Samaria, Calneh, Hamath the Great and Gath of the Philistines, as lights, to ornament his discourse. The epithets connected with these places are also varied in a pleasing and appropriate manner, as *who are at ease, who trust, pass ye, go ye, go down.*

He then goes on to foretell the approach of a captivity which

* Amos 6: 1—6.

was to take place under a wicked king, and adds: "Ye that are set apart for the evil day, and draw near to the seat of iniquity." The rewards of luxury are then subjoined: "That lie upon beds of ivory, and play the wanton upon your couches; that eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall." From these six members, we have obtained three periods of two members each; for he does not say: "Ye that are set apart for the evil day; ye that draw near to the seat of iniquity; ye that lie upon beds of ivory; ye that play the wanton upon your couches; ye that eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall." Had he thus said, there would indeed have been this beauty in the sentence, that each of its six members would have flowed from one pronoun repeated, and been closed with a single enunciation or impulse of the voice; but it is rendered more beautiful, by connecting the members two and two with one pronoun in each case, so as to obtain three sentences; the first of which relates to the captivity foretold: "Ye that are set apart for the evil day, and draw near to the seat of iniquity;" the second to lust: "That lie upon beds of ivory, and play the wanton upon your couches;" the third to gluttony: "That eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall;" by which means the speaker is enabled, either to close each part by itself, and thus make six members; or to utter the first, third, and fifth, with a suspended tone of voice, and, by connecting the second with the first, the fourth with the third, and the sixth with the fifth, to make three elegant periods of two members each; in the first of which, the great calamity is made prominent; in the second, the impure couch; and in the third, the prodigal table.

He then reprobates a luxurious indulgence in the pleasures of the ear. In this case, after having addressed such voluptuaries in the words: "That chant to the sound of the viol," so proper for them to hear; instead of proceeding to say: "That think yourselves possessed of instruments of music like David," he, with admirable grace, relaxes the impetuosity of his invective, and, since music can be wisely practised by the wise, by speaking of them, he admonishes us to distinguish the music of the wise from that of the voluptuary;* while, in a manner also to point out

* Compare Augustine's remarks respecting the pleasures of music, *Opp.* Vol. I. Conf. L. X. c. XXXIII. p. 142. The substance of the remarks may be found in Milner, Vol. II. p. 253, Bost. 1822.—Tr.

their unskilfulness to others, he adds: "They thought themselves possessed of instruments of music like David, drinking wine in bowls, and anointed with the chief ointments.* Here we shall find it best to suspend the two first members of the period in utterance, and close it with the third.

The addition made to all this in the words: "But they were not grieved for the affliction of Joseph," is not, it must be confessed, very elegant, whether uttered in a series so as to constitute one member; or, which is more graceful, with the tone of voice suspended through the clause, "But they were not grieved," and then concluded with: "For the affliction of Joseph," so as to constitute a period of two members. The word *Joseph*, however, is placed for *brother*, so that any brother might be designated by the name of him who was eminent above the rest, not only in respect to the evils he endured, but the rewards he received. The trope by which the word is thus used, certainly belongs to the art of rhetoric; but whether to that which we have studied and taught, I know not. That it is a beautiful one, however, and produces a fine effect upon the intelligent reader, it would be useless for me to say to any one who does not perceive it himself.

There are indeed many things to be found in the very passage here adduced as an example, which pertain to the precepts of eloquence; but the learner will derive less instruction from a discussion of it however thorough, than he will be kindled up on hearing it repeated with earnestness and vehemence. These expressions were not composed by human skill, but poured forth in wisdom and eloquence from the divine mind; not in a wisdom intent upon eloquence, but in an eloquence which did not recede from wisdom. And if, as some of the most fluent and pene-

* The original may here be presented to the reader, as a specimen of some of Augustine's long and involved periods.

"Deinde luxuriosam remordet aurium voluptatem. Ubi cum dixisset, *Qui canitis ad vocem psalterii*, quoniam potest exerceri sapienter a sapientibus musica, mirabili decore dicendi, invectionis impetu relaxato, et non ad illos, sed de illis jam loquens, ut nos musicam sapientis a musica luxuriantis distinguere commoneret, non ait, *Qui canitis ad vocem psalterii*, et sicut David putatis vos habere vasa cantici: sed cum illud ad illos dixisset, quod luxuriosi audire deberent, *Qui canitis ad vocem psalterii*, imperitiam quoque eorum aliis quodammodo indicavit, adjungens, *Sicut David putaverunt se habere vasa cantici, bibentes in phialis vinum, et optimo unguento delibuti.*"—Tr.

trating men have perceived and declared, those very things which are to be learned by means of the rhetorical art, would never have been observed, nor noted down, nor reduced to system, had they not first been produced in the genius of orators; what wonder is it, if they are produced in persons sent by him who formed genius itself? We therefore declare our opinion, that the authors of the sacred canon, our teachers, were not only possessed of wisdom, but also of eloquence, and just such an eloquence as became persons of their character.¹

The few examples of eloquence which we have now adduced from the sacred writers, are to be understood without difficulty; but it is not so with every thing they have said. In order in a manner to exercise and perfect the minds of their readers, suppress a fastidious and haughty spirit, quicken the desires of those who wish to learn, and also to cover with a veil the minds of the ungodly,² either that they may be converted to piety, or be secluded from mysteries, they have left many things enveloped in a useful and salutary obscurity. We ought not however by any means to think it incumbent upon us, to imitate them in this respect. They so expressed themselves, that those coming after them, who would rightly understand and explain their works, might obtain other grace, unlike theirs indeed, but yet subsidiary to it, in the church of God. Their expositors therefore ought not to speak as if they would set themselves up for exposition with similar authority; but in all their discourses, they should labour first and principally to be understood, and, as far as possible, speak with such perspicuity, that either he must be very dull who does not understand them, or that the cause of their not being understood with facility, shall lie, not in the language they employ, but in the intricateness and subtilty of the things which they wish to explain and hold up to view.

¹ Augustine was evidently induced to enter more at large into this subject, from the feelings which he himself had experienced in respect to it. See Opp. Vol. I. Confes. L. III. c. V. p. 66. Also Milner, Vol. II. p. 220.—Tr.

² "Ad celandos—animos impiorum." There is another reading which has been set aside by the Benedictine editors, namely, *ad zelandos etc.* The passage is somewhat obscure. If the above rendering is correct, it probably contains an allusion to something like the *disciplina arcani* of the primitive Christians. See Murdock's *Mosh.* words, *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I. Schröckh K. G. Th. IV. p. 372. Something of the same kind is to be found in the 40th Homily of Gregory the Great, Opp. T. I. p. 1658 sq.—Tr.

There are, indeed, some things unintelligible, or hardly intelligible, in their very nature, notwithstanding all the pains that may be taken by the speaker, to exhibit them in the plainest manner possible; and such things should rarely be addressed to the ears of the people, even if called for; and perhaps they should be withheld from them altogether. But in books, which, when understood, in a manner hold the attention of the reader; and which, when not understood, cannot prove hurtful to those who refuse to read them;¹ and in more private colloquies, it is our indispensable duty, to bring even the most difficult truths with which, in the case, we have made ourselves acquainted, down to the apprehension of others, how much soever labour it may require in discussion; provided the hearer or colloquist have an ardent desire to learn these truths, and mental capacity to receive them, in whatever form they are presented; in which case, the teacher is not to make the amount of eloquence the object of his attention, but the degree of evidence and perspicuity.

He who is fond of this perspicuity, will sometimes neglect the more elegant words,—looking not at what sounds well, but at what faithfully designates and brings out to view, the ideas he purposes to convey. Hence, a writer has said, in treating of this species of discourse, that there is in it, a kind of *careful negligence*.² This negligence, however, detracts from the beauty of the language in such a way, as not to contract any thing offensive. Indeed, the anxiety of good teachers to impart instruction, is, or ought to be so great, as to lead them to employ vulgar words, where pure Latin ones would be ambiguous or obscure; and to express themselves in the ordinary language of the ignorant, in preference to that of the learned, if by so doing, they can become intelligible and clear. If our translators did not hesitate to say: “Non congregabo conventicula eorum de sanguinibus,”³ using the noun *sanguis* in the plural number, because they felt that the thing required them to do so, although in correct Latin it is used only in the singular; why should the

¹ Former editions of Augustine's works, contained an additional explanatory clause, which has been set aside by the Benedictines, as a gloss, namely: “Cum intelliguntur, molesti non sint volentibus legere, cum autem non intelliguntur, molesti non sint nolentibus legere.”—Tr.

² Cicero, Orat. ad M. Brutum, c. 23. T. III. p. 156 sq.

³ Ps. 15 : 4.

pious teacher hesitate, in addressing the unlearned, to say *ossum* rather than *os*, lest the latter should be understood of that which is expressed in the plural, not by *ossa*, but by *ora*; since the African ear is here unable to decide by the length and shortness of the vowels? Of what use indeed is it to employ purity of language, if the hearer's intellect does not comprehend it; since we wholly cease to have any motive for speaking, so soon as we fail to render ourselves intelligible to those whose instruction we have in view? He, therefore, who teaches, will shun all words which do not teach; and if other words in good usage can be found, which are intelligible, he will select them in preference; but if not, either because they do not exist, or because they do not at present occur to his mind, he will employ those which are less pure; the thing itself, however, being meanwhile taught and learned in its purity.*

This perspicuity, this making ourselves intelligible, is moreover to be insisted upon, not merely in colloquies, whether carried on with one person or many; but much more also, in such discourses as are delivered before the people. In colloquies, every one has the liberty of asking questions; but when all are silent, listening to a single speaker, with their countenances fixed intently upon him, it is neither customary nor decorous for any one to ask for an explanation of what he has not understood; and hence, the speaker ought to take great pains to relieve the attention of his silent auditor. It is usual, however, for an assembly desirous of knowing the truth, to signify by their movements, whether they understand what is spoken; and until they shall have done this, the point or matter in question, should be turned over and exhibited in a variety of language. But this cannot be done by those, who merely pronounce what they have prepared and verbally committed to memory. As soon, however, as it is manifest, that the audience understand what is said, the speaker should either close his discourse, or pass on to other things; for as that orator proves acceptable, who removes obscurity from what is to be made known; so he proves burdensome, who dwells on and inculcates things that are known,—at least, he is so to those whose whole expectation has been

* Augustine himself practised what he here inculcates, and was very careful, when preaching, never to soar above the minds of his audience, either in matter or manner. Hence, his sermons are far less eloquent, learned, and profound than his other writings.—It should be added that in the preceding paragraph, there is a play upon the words *integre*, *integer* and *integritas*.—TR.

suspended upon the solution of the difficulty in the things to be unfolded. There are cases, indeed, in which even known things are exhibited in order to delight an audience; but then, it is not the things themselves which command attention, but the manner in which they are uttered. Now in such a case, it matters not, whether he who officiates is a reader or speaker, provided the manner itself be apprehended and please the audience. Whatever is well written, is usually not only read with pleasure by those to whom it is for the first time presented; but it is also read a second time, and that not without pleasure, by those to whom it is already known, and from whose minds it has never been erased. So likewise, it is willingly listened to, by both these classes of persons. But when one is reminded of something he has forgotten, he is taught. I am not, however, now treating of the manner of imparting delight. I am speaking of the manner in which those are to be taught, who desire to learn; and here that mode will be the best, by means of which the hearer is made to hear the truth, and to understand what he hears. When this end has been attained, nothing farther will remain to be accomplished in respect to the exhibition of any subject, than perhaps the commendation of it in such a manner as to fix it in the heart. If this shall be proper, it must be done with moderation and gentleness, so as not to occasion weariness.

Certainly eloquence in teaching is that which enables a man by speaking, not indeed to render the horrid pleasing, or effect the accomplishment of what is painful, but to bring to light what was before concealed. But if this be done in a disagreeable manner, it will prove of benefit to a few only of the most studious, who are anxious to know whatever there is to be learned, without regard to the low and inelegant style in which it may be expressed. Such persons feed upon the truth when they have once obtained it, with great delight; indeed, it is a noble characteristic of gifted minds to love the truth contained in the words, rather than the words themselves. Of what use indeed is a golden key, if it will not open what we wish? and what is the harm of a wooden one, if it will accomplish this purpose? since all we seek is, to obtain access to what is concealed. Let me say however, since there is some resemblance between eaters and learners, that, on account of the fastidiousness of the multitude, even those kinds of food, without which life itself cannot be sustained, must be furnished with condiments.

Hence, a writer upon eloquence has said, and with truth,

that an orator should so speak as to teach, delight, and persuade.¹ He then adds: "Necessity requires him to teach; suavity to delight; and victory to persuade."² Of these three, the first, or the necessity there is of teaching, lies wholly in the things spoken; the other two, in the manner. He, therefore, who speaks in order to teach, should not think he has said any thing to the purpose, so long as he remains unintelligible. For although he has spoken what he himself understands, he must not be regarded as having said it to him by whom he has not been understood; whereas, if he has been understood, he has said it, whatever the way in which he expressed himself. But if he wishes also to delight the person addressed, or to persuade him; then his *manner* of speaking becomes a point to which he must attend in order to succeed. Now as the hearer must be delighted in order to be induced to listen, so he must be persuaded in order to be induced to act; and as he is delighted if you speak with suavity, so he is persuaded, if he love what you promise, fear what you threaten, hate what you blame, embrace what you commend, grieve for what you set forth as grievous, rejoice over what you declare to be joyful, pity those whom in speaking you hold up to view as objects of pity, fly from those whom by way of terror you represent as carefully to be avoided; or feel any other of the effects of a lofty eloquence, by which the minds of an audience may be moved, not merely to ascertain what there is to do, but to do what they now know ought to be done.

If however they are still ignorant, they must first be instructed, before they can be moved. And perhaps the things themselves, on being made known, will so work upon their feelings, that there will be no need of resorting to the higher powers of eloquence for accomplishing this object. But we must not hesitate to take this step, whenever there is need of it; and there will be need of it, whenever they neglect to do, what they know ought to be done. And hence the necessity of teaching; for while men can either do or neglect to do, what they know; who has ever asserted, that they ought to do what they do not know? But there is no absolute necessity of persuading; inasmuch as

¹ The word *flectere*, used by Cicero, means so to persuade as to prevail. It has been rendered by various words, but by none perhaps better than *persuade*, though somewhat inferior in the strength of its signification.—Tr.

² See Cicero, *Orator ad M. Brutum*, c. 21. T. III. p. 153.

the hearer may assent at once to the teacher, or at farthest, to him who seeks to delight. Victory, however, requires persuasion; since it is possible for a man to be taught and delighted, without being brought to yield his active assent; and of what use will the two first be, without the last? Nor is it a matter of necessity to seek to delight; because a teacher, in making true things manifest, as it is his province to do, aims not at giving delight; but it is the things themselves thus manifested, which cause the delight, because they are true. Hence, in general, even false things, on being laid open and shown to be such, cause delight,—and this, from the very fact, that they are evidently false; and the discourse itself causes delight, as the means by which their falsity is rendered evident.

On account of those, however, who are so fastidious as not to be pleased with the truth, except they receive it in the most fascinating language, eloquence has been furnished with ample room for seeking to delight. Yet even the addition of this part will prove insufficient for those obstinate persons, who might as well have neither understood nor been delighted with the discourse of the teacher; for what advantage can these two points confer upon the man, who, while he acknowledges the truth and praises the manner in which it is expressed, withholds from it his assent? to obtain which is the object of all the speaker's efforts, and the careful attention he pays to what he utters. If the things taught are such, that to know or believe them be sufficient, then to assent to them requires nothing more than an acknowledgement of them, as true; but when that which is taught, is something to be done, and is taught in order that it may be done, then it is in vain to urge the truth of what is uttered, or to present it in such a manner as to please, unless it be so received as to be performed. When, therefore, the eloquent preacher inculcates any thing to be done, he must not only teach in order to inform, and delight in order to hold fast the attention; but he must also persuade in order to overcome. He who has not yet been brought to yield his assent to a faithful exhibition of truth united with suavity of speech, must be wrought upon for this purpose, by means of the grand in eloquence.

Much pains has been bestowed upon this suavity by many writers; and by its means many wicked and detestable things have been most elegantly inculcated by the wicked and base; not for the purpose of obtaining the assent of people to them as true, but for the sole purpose of delighting; in consequence of

which they will continue frequently to be read. God avert from his church, what Jeremiah relates respecting the synagogue of the Jews, when he says: "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?"¹ O eloquence, terrible and vehement, in proportion to thy solidity and purity! thou art indeed like *the hammer that breaketh in pieces the rock*; as God himself says of his word, uttered by the sacred prophets, —by the very prophet we have quoted!² Away, therefore, far away from us, be what was said of God's ancient people: "That the priests commend those who speak wickedly, while the people of God love to have it so;" far away from us, I say, be such madness! for what shall we do in the end thereof? Admit, that the things we speak are less intelligible, less pleasing, less effective; still let them be spoken; and let good and honest things be heard with willingness, and not such as are dishonest. But this depends solely on the suavity with which they are uttered.

In the great congregation, however, respecting which in an address to God it is said: "I will give thee thanks in the great congregation,"³ this suavity ceases to be agreeable when employed, not indeed for setting off what is absolutely bad, but for ornamenting only what is trivial and fragile in what is good, by exhibiting it with those frothy embellishments of language, which could not with propriety be bestowed upon any thing great and lasting. There is something of this kind to be found in an epistle of the blessed Cyprian; which, whether it came there by accident or design, was left there, as I think, that posterity might know how soundness in christian doctrine at length stripped his language of its redundancies, and reduced it to an eloquence more manly and grave, such as it is in his subsequent letters; an eloquence which we safely admire, and religiously aspire after, but find it extremely difficult to attain. "Let us," says he, in a certain place, "visit this seat. In the neighbourhood we shall find secret places for retirement beneath a leaf-formed bower, where the wild vines clustering, creep; winding their way with clasping tendrils, among the sustaining reeds."⁴ What Cyprian here says, certainly exhibits the richest and most

¹ Jer. 5: 30, 31.

³ Ps. 35: 18.

² Jer. 23: 29.

⁴ Epist. I, ad Donatum.

admirable flow of eloquence ; but it is rendered less pleasing by a profusion which cannot be reconciled with gravity. They who love this kind of writing, imagine indeed, that those who do not employ it, but express themselves with more chasteness, are unable to write in this way, and do not of their own accord avoid it. This holy man, therefore, not only showed, that he was able to express himself in this way, by doing so in a certain place ; but also, that he did not choose to do it, by neglecting it forever afterwards.¹

The christian orator, therefore, in uttering what is sacred, good, and just,—and he should utter nothing else,—endeavours to the utmost of his power, to be understood, and be listened to with willingness and obedience. And let him not hesitate to believe, that when and so far as he accomplishes this, he is indebted for his success, more to pious prayers, than to oratorical powers ; that he may learn to pray for himself and those whom he is about to address, before he begins to speak. On the approach, therefore, of the hour, in which he is to hold forth, let him, before moving his tongue, raise his thirsty soul to God ; that, having drunk himself, he may have a supply for others, and be able to pour out to them of the fulness which he himself has received. Since many things can be said upon every subject appertaining to faith and charity, that comes up for consideration, and said in various ways by those to whom they are known ; who but HE that sees all hearts, is thoroughly informed of what it is expedient for us to speak or listen to, at any particular time ? And who can enable us to utter what we ought, and say it as we ought, *but He in whose hand are both we and our words ?*² Let him, therefore, who is anxious to obtain knowledge and impart it to others, learn, indeed, whatever there is to be taught, and acquire such skill in speaking, as it becomes a minister of the gospel to possess ; but when the hour of holding forth arrives, let him rather with a good mind, avail himself of the words of our Lord : “Take no thought how or what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father

¹ Du Pin expresses the same opinion of this letter that Augustine does, whose remarks respecting Cyprian he quotes with approbation. ‘It is written,’ says he, ‘in a very gay and flowery style, by no means suitable to the matter in hand ; but he did not follow the same manner of writing in his other works.’ Vol. I. p. 120.—TR.

² Wisdom, 7 : 16.

which speaketh in you.”¹ If then the Holy Spirit speak in those who for Christ’s sake are called to face persecutors, why not in those whose business it is, to impart instruction respecting Christ?²

He, however, who should say, that if teachers are formed by the Holy Spirit, it is not for men to lay down precepts respecting the matter to be taught and the manner of giving instruction; might also say, that we ought not to pray, because the Lord says: “Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him;” or that the apostle Paul ought not to have laid down directions for the guidance of Timothy and Titus, in imparting precepts to others; as he has done in his three epistles to them, which every one who has received the office of a teacher in the church, ought to keep before his eyes. In the first epistle to Timothy, do we not read:³ “These things command and teach?” that is, the things of which he had just been speaking. A little after is it not added:⁴ “Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father?” In the second epistle does he not say to Timothy:⁵ “Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me?” And a little after:⁶ “Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the words of truth?” and also: “Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine?”⁷ And in his epistle to Titus also, does he not say, that a bishop ought to “hold fast the faithful word according to what he has been taught, in order that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers?”⁸ And also:⁹ “But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine, that aged men be sober, etc.” and further:¹⁰ “These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee. Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, etc.” What then? Shall we suppose

¹ Matt. 10: 19, 20.

² Si ergo loquitur in eis Spiritus Sanctus, qui *persequentibus traduntur pro Christo*, cur non in eis, qui *tradunt discentibus Christum*?

³ 1 Tim. 4: 11.

⁷ 2 Tim. 4: 2.

⁴ Ib. 5: 1.

⁸ Tit. 1: 9.

⁵ 2 Tim. 1: 13.

⁹ Ib. 2: 1, 2.

⁶ Ib. 2: 15.

¹⁰ Ib. 2: 15. 3: 1.

that the apostle contradicts himself; when, notwithstanding his affirmation, that men are made teachers by the operation of the Holy Spirit, he goes on immediately to lay down precepts for directing them how and what to teach? Or is it not rather to be understood, that the duties of men in imparting instruction, even to teachers themselves, are not to cease with the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit; and yet, that, “neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase?”¹ Hence, then, whoever the ministers or servants are that labour, whether holy men or holy angels, no one correctly learns the things that pertain to the divine life, until he has been rendered docile by God; to whom the Psalmist addresses himself, saying: “Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God.”² Hence the same apostle, speaking to Timothy as a teacher to his pupil, says:³ “But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them.” The medicine administered by one man to another, for healing the body, proves of no avail towards the restoration of health, in those who receive not the concurring assistance of God; who indeed is able to heal them without it, but without whom they cannot be healed, although it be administered; yet if this be done in an obliging manner, it is regarded as an act of kindness and benevolence. Just so the instruction imparted by man to a soul, proves of no avail to that soul, until it is rendered efficacious by the assistance of God; who nevertheless was able to have given man the gospel, without permitting him to receive it from or through his fellow man.

Whoever therefore strives, by speaking, to persuade men of what is good, while he regards neither teaching, delighting, nor persuading, with contempt,—must pray, and, as we have already said, endeavour to be understood, and listened to with willingness and obedience. When he does this in an apt and becoming manner, he may well be called eloquent, even though he do not obtain the assent of his hearers. For with these three things, that is, teaching, delighting, and persuading, the author of Roman eloquence already quoted, seems, in his own mind, also to have connected those other three, which he goes on to name:⁴ “He therefore will be eloquent, who can

¹ 1 Cor. 3: 7.² Ps. 143: 10.³ 2 Tim. 3: 14.⁴ Cicero, Orator ad Brutum, c. 29. T. III. p. 164. Comp. c. 21 sq. p. 153.

discourse of humble matters in a plain style ; of matters of a middle character, in an intermediate style ;¹ and of great affairs in a style imposing and grand,"²—as if, after having added these three things, he would so explain himself as to bring out the same sentiment he had previously expressed : " He, therefore, will be eloquent, who, to teach, can discourse of humble matters in a plain style ; to delight, of matters of a middle character in an intermediate style ; and, to persuade, of great affairs in a style imposing and grand."

He might indeed point out these three things, agreeably to his description of them, in forensic matters ; but not in the case before us, that is, in ecclesiastical and spiritual concerns, in which discourse of the kind which we wish to form, is employed. In the former, those things are termed humble, which relate to decisions in pecuniary affairs ; and those great, which relate to decisions respecting the life and welfare of men ; while those which relate to neither of these two, and in which the object is not to teach any thing or to procure any thing to be done, but only to delight, are considered as intermediate, and are hence said to be of a middle character ; the word *modica*, from *modus*, by which we designate them, being never properly used for *parva*. In the latter, or ecclesiastical and spiritual concerns, however, since every thing, especially what is addressed to the people from an elevated place, ought to bear upon, not the temporal but eternal welfare of mankind, where eternal death is to be avoided,—every thing we utter is great ; so far so, indeed, that nothing the sacred teacher has to say, even concerning gain or loss in pecuniary affairs, whether great or small, should be deemed of trifling importance. Certainly, there is nothing trifling in justice ; it being our duty to show ourselves just in the most trifling concerns, agreeably to the words of our Lord : " He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in that which is much." That which is least, then, is least ; but to be faithful in that which is least, is something great ; for as the law of the circle, namely, that all the lines drawn from the centre to

¹ The word *temperatè* or *temperatum*, for which we sometimes find *medium*, has been variously rendered ; and particularly by *temperate* in the translation of Cicero's Orator and Orators, Lond. 1808. Perhaps, however, the word *intermediate* comes as near to the true import of the original, as any we have.—Tr.

² *Parva submisse, modica temperate, magna granditer.*

the periphery, are equal, remains the same, whether applied to a large discus or to the smallest coin ; so also justice remains undiminished in magnitude, even when exhibited in the management of the smallest affairs.

In fine, where the apostle speaks concerning secular strifes—and what but money is the cause of such strifes?—when, I say, he speaks concerning secular strifes, as in 1 Cor. 6: 1—9, why does he exhibit such displeasure? Why does he thus reprove, censure, inveigh, threaten? What causes him to express the emotion of his mind by so frequent and so severe a change of tone? And finally, what is it that causes him to speak in such a lofty style respecting the smallest affairs? Did secular concerns merit such attention from him? Far from it. He does so for the sake of justice, charity, and piety; all of which are matters of importance, in the estimation of every serious mind, even in the most trifling concerns.

To be sure, if called upon to advise a man how he should manage secular affairs in the presence of ecclesiastical judges, either on his own account or that of his friends, we should do right in advising him to treat *parva submisse*, i. e. humble matters in a plain style; but when we speak of the eloquence of the man, whom we wish to become a teacher of those things by which souls are rescued from eternal evil and put in possession of eternal good; then—no matter how or under what circumstances he is to do it, whether in public or in private, to one or to many, to friends or to enemies, in a continued discourse, or in colloquies, treatises, books, or epistles, and these either longer or shorter—then, I say, every thing he utters is great. Unless perchance, since a cup of cold water in itself considered, is a most trifling and insignificant concern, our Lord himself has therefore uttered something trifling, and insignificant, in saying: “Whosoever shall give one of his disciples a cup of cold water to drink, shall in nowise lose his reward;”¹ or unless it be incumbent on the teacher, whenever he delivers a discourse from this subject in the church, to consider himself as uttering something trifling; and hence, to be under obligation to use the plain style, and not the intermediate or the grand. When we have happened to address the people from this subject, and God was present to direct us to appropriate matter; did not a kind of flame arise from that cup of cold water, which set even cold hearts on fire,

¹ Matt. 10: 42.

leading them on to works of mercy, and inspiring them with hopes of future reward?¹

And yet notwithstanding the sacred teacher has to speak of great things, he should not always employ the lofty style for this purpose. In teaching, he should employ the plain style, and in bestowing praise and blame, the intermediate; but when any thing is to be done, and those whom he addresses, though under obligation to do it, are unwilling, he must resort to the lofty style, and speak in a manner adapted to produce a change in their minds. Sometimes the very same great subject must be discoursed of in all three of these styles; in the plain style for instruction; in the intermediate, for commendation; and in the grand, when urged for the purpose of obtaining the assent of the unwilling mind. What indeed is greater than God? But are we therefore, not to learn what we know of him? Must not he who teaches the unity of the Trinity, discuss this difficult subject in the plain style, in order to render it intelligible as far as possible? Should we seek for ornament in this case, and not rather for proof? Is not the hearer to be instructed, that he may learn; rather than persuaded, that he may perform some act? Moreover, when God is celebrated either on his own account or that of his works, what an array of beautiful and splendid language presents itself to the man capable of praising God, so far as it is possible for him to be celebrated,—HIM whom no one can praise appropriately; no one in any wise cease to praise.² But if God is not the object of worship to the hearer, or if idols or demons or any created thing whatsoever be worshipped with Him or in His stead; then the grand style must be employed, in order to show the greatness of this wickedness and induce men to forsake it.

To render my meaning somewhat plainer, I will adduce an instance of the plain style (*genus dictionis vel dicendi submissum*), from the epistle of Paul to the Galatians:³ "Tell me,

¹ Augustine often trusted to fortuitous circumstances for the subject, and of course for the matter of his sermons. Sometimes he took the first passage of Scripture which struck his eye; at others he left the reader, who was often a lad, to choose his own place.—Tr.

² "Quem nemo convenienter laudat, nemo quomocumque non laudat;" antithetical, in allusion to the declarations of Scripture, that even the wickedness of the wicked shall be made to redound to the glory of God.—Tr.

³ Gal. 4: 21—26.

ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond woman, was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all," etc. So also in a course of reasoning, where he says:¹ "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men. Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, *that* the covenant which was before confirmed of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." And because it might have occurred to the hearer's thoughts to ask, for what purpose the law had been given, if the inheritance were not of the law; he himself, taking the attitude of an objector, asks the question: "Wherefore then the law?" and then answers it: "It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Here he comes to the point at which he was aiming: "Is the law then against the promises of God?" and he answers: "Far from it;" and then goes on to give the reason: "For if there had a law been given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe," and so further in a similar strain. The business of the teacher, therefore, requires him not only to lay open what was concealed, but also to solve the difficulties of the question he is considering, and, while he is doing so, to meet other questions which may arise, lest what he says, be disproved or refuted by these;—provided, the solution of them presents itself with facility; for

¹ Gal. 3: 15—18.

we must not agitate difficulties which we cannot solve. Care must be taken, however, that in solving one question after another that arises, we do not suffer our attention to be drawn out into such a length of ratiocination, as to render it difficult, except by a strong and vigorous effort of memory, to bring the mind back to the original point of discussion. Yet it is well to have every thing refuted, that is capable of refutation; lest what is left uncontradicted should come up again when there is no one present able to answer it; or some silent auditor go away less sound than he came.

As an example of the intermediate style, (*genus dicendi temperatum*,) we may again quote from the same apostle:¹ "Rebuke not an elder but entreat him as a father; and the younger men as brethren;" also,² "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God;" and also nearly the whole of the exhortation commencing with the sixth verse in the same chapter,³ in which the apostle presents the same things in greater beauty, and, while each expands itself in pleasing order, assigns it to its proper place and connexion: "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another; not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another." And then how beautifully, after being thus drawn out, is the whole passage concluded with a period of two members: "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." A little after he says: "Attending continually upon this very thing, render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom

¹ 1 Tim. 5: 1.² Rom. 12: 1.³ Rom. 12: 6 sq.

fear; honour to whom honour;” which after being thus drawn out in members, is also concluded with a period of two members: “Owe no man any thing, but to love one another.” And a little after he says: “The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof,—‘et carnis providentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis.’ The latter part of this passage would doubtless sound more melodious to the ear, if read: ‘Et carnis providentiam ne in concupiscentiis feceritis;’ but the sober interpreter preferred to retain the order of the words in the original. How this sounds in the Greek, the language of the apostle, let those better acquainted with such matters, judge. As for myself, I must say, that even in the original, this order does not seem to flow very melodiously.

It must be confessed, indeed, that the species of ornament which depends upon melodious clauses, is not to be found in our sacred writings; but whether the reason of this is to be sought in those who translated them from the original, or (as I am rather inclined to think) in the intention of the sacred writers to shun those things which gain applause, I dare not affirm; for I confess I do not know. I am certain, however, that if any one skilled in the melody of language, should adjust their clauses according to the laws of such melody, (which he can easily do, by merely changing some words, or the order in which they stand,) and yet preserve the full meaning, he will find them destitute of none of those things so highly esteemed by grammarians and rhetoricians, and which are taught in the schools. He will also meet with many modes of speech of great elegance even in our version, but especially in the original language of the sacred writers, of which nothing is to be found in the productions that these men are so proud of. But care must be taken in regard to the grave sentences of sacred writ, lest, in adding to their melody, we detract from their weight. The prophets indeed were not destitute of that musical skill, in which this melody when acquired to a high degree of perfection, originates; as is testified by the learned Jerome, who speaks of these measures in the Hebrew original;* though

* In Prologo super Jobum.

in his translation, in order to preserve the true force of the words, he has neglected this melody. To speak from my own feelings, however, with which I am best acquainted, I must say, that while I pay as much attention to rhythm in my own style, as I think modesty will permit, I am far better pleased with finding it of very rare occurrence in the sacred writers.

The grand or lofty style, (*genus dicendi grande*,) differs chiefly from the intermediate, in that it is not distinguished so much by the beauty of ornament as by the vehement emotions of the soul. Ornaments, indeed, of almost every kind it takes, but it does not demand them. It is carried on by its own impetuosity, and seizes the beauties of language, if they present themselves from the nature of the subject, without assuming them for the sake of elegance. It is enough for this style, so far as the grand object of its being employed is concerned, if congruous words, without being industriously selected, present themselves to the ardent emotions of the soul. The warrior, clad in armour decked with gold and set with gems, if he be intently engaged in battle, employs these accoutrements, not because they are valuable, but because they constitute his arms. He himself is ever the same, and is ever powerful in his strength, even when rage leads him to employ as a weapon, whatever comes first to hand.¹ The apostle pleads that, for the sake of the gospel ministry, all the evils of his time should, under the consolation of the gifts of God, be endured with patience. The subject is a great one, and grand is the style in which he treats it; nor are the ornaments of style wanting.² "Behold," says he, "now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation. Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed; but in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings. By pureness, by knowledge, by long suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and

¹ There is here an allusion to Virgil, *Æneid* VII. 506—508.

—*Hic torrens armatus obusto,
Stipitis hic gravidi nodis, quod cuique repertum
Rimanti, telum ira facit.*

² 2 Cor. 6: 2 sq.

good report ; as deceivers and yet true ; as unknown and yet well known ; as dying, and behold we live ; as chastened and not killed ; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing ; as poor, yet making many rich ; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." And behold him with ardour exclaiming : " O ye Corinthians, our mouth is open unto you, our heart is enlarged, etc." It would be too long to follow out the sacred writer.

In his epistle to the Romans, also, the apostle shows that the persecutions of this world may be overcome by love and a confident hope in the assistance of God. Equally grand and ornate is the manner in which he treats this subject. [The reader is referred to the passage, in Rom. 8: 28—39, which is too long for insertion here.]

In the epistle to the Galatians, also, although the whole of it is written in the plain style, except the very last parts, which are in the intermediate, there is a passage, which exhibits such mental emotion, that, notwithstanding it is destitute of all those ornaments to be found in the passages just brought forward, it must be pronounced grand.¹ "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years," says he ; "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed labour upon you in vain. Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am ; for I am as ye are. Ye have not injured me at all. Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at first ; and my temptation which was in my flesh, ye despised not, nor rejected ; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of ? For I bear record, that if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me. Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth ? They zealously affect you, but not well ; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them. But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you. My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice ; for I stand in doubt of you." Here we meet with nothing like antitheses, climaxes, or sounding clauses, members, or periods ; and yet nothing lukewarm is discoverable in the deep emotion, from which we perceive at once the vehemence of the eloquence.

¹ Gal. 4: 10 sq.

[Several specimens of each of the three kinds of style, taken from Cyprian and Ambrose, and accompanied with a few unimportant passing remarks, are here omitted.]

Let no one think it contrary to professional skill to mingle these different styles together. A discourse should be varied in language, as far as it can be done with congruity, by the introduction of all these three styles; for if it be long confined to any one of them, it loses of its power to hold the attention of the hearer. Whereas, when made to pass over from one style to another, even though it have considerable length, it advances with far more propriety and grace; because each of these three styles has varieties of its own, of which the eloquent avail themselves, and by means of which the discourse is prevented from becoming frigid and dull in its effects upon the hearers. The plain style nevertheless will be more readily endured for a length of time, than the grand; for the greater the emotion excited in the mind of an auditor, to bring him to yield us his assent, the less the interval during which it can be maintained, beyond the moment of its being excited to a sufficient height. Caution must be exercised, therefore, lest, while we aim at farther exciting what has already been excited, we diminish the effects which have already been produced. But, having introduced the plain style for a time, it is well to return again to the grand, that the current of the discourse may alternate like the waves of the sea. Hence it follows, that if it be necessary to employ the grand style for any length of time, it must be varied by means of the other styles; in which case, however, the whole discourse will be referred to that kind of style which is the most prevalent.

Here it becomes an important question, what particular style shall succeed another, or be introduced, in certain places, and on given topics. In the grand style, it is always, or almost always, proper to commence with the intermediate. The orator can also sometimes employ the plain style for expressing those things which might have been expressed in the grand, and thus render what he utters in the grand style, still more lofty by this comparison, more luminous by the shading with which it is contrasted. Wherever any questions arise, however, which are to be solved, whatever be the style in which we are speaking, there is need of an acumen which properly demands for itself the plain style; and hence this style must be employed even in the other two styles, whenever such questions arise; just as the intermediate must be employed, whenever, in either of the other

two styles, any thing comes up which calls for censure or praise, without requiring the liberation or the condemnation of any one, or his assent in the performance of some action. In the grand style, therefore, both the other kinds of style find their places; and the same is likewise true of the plain style. With regard to the intermediate, however, this is not always the case. Sometimes, as I have said, it requires the plain style, especially when a question comes up for solution, or when things capable of ornament are uttered in the plain style without ornament, in order that a more conspicuous place may first be prepared for some wreaths of ornaments, if I may be allowed the expression. The grand style, however, is never required along with the intermediate; because the aim of the latter is not to move, but to delight.

We must not however attribute to a speaker the grand style, because he receives frequent and vehement acclamations; for these are called forth both by the acuteness of the plain style, and the embellishments of the intermediate. The grand, on the other hand, by its weight, for the most part not only suppresses all exclamations, but even extorts weeping. Thus when I formerly undertook to dissuade the people of Caesarea in Mauritania from engaging in a civil, or, rather, worse than civil conflict, which they called *Caterva*,—for not only citizens, but also neighbours, brothers, and even parents and children, having divided themselves into two parties, were accustomed to fight together in earnest combat, for some days in succession, at a particular season of the year, each one killing whom he could,—I availed myself, as far as I was able, of the grand in eloquence, in order that I might tear away and banish from their customs and their hearts, this cruel, this inveterate evil; but yet I did not think I had accomplished any thing, so long as I heard their acclamations, nor until I saw them in tears. Their acclamations showed that they were taught and delighted, but their tears showed that they were persuaded. When, therefore, I saw their tears, I felt confident, that the savage custom which had long been handed down from one father, grandfather, and ancestor to another, and which, like an enemy, besieged, or rather held possession of their breasts, would be subdued; and that too, before I was authorized to feel so, by the occurrence of the thing itself. Soon after, having closed my discourse, I turned my heart and lips to give thanks to God; and lo! Christ being propitious, eight years or more have now elapsed, since any thing of the kind has been attempted. Many other things have occurred in my experience, from which I have learned, that those who

have been in any measure affected by the grand in a wise display of eloquence, show it by sighs rather than clamour, sometimes by weeping, and finally by a change of life.

Many have also been led to a change, by the plain style; but only so far, as to come to know what they knew not, or to believe what seemed to them incredible; not so far as to be brought to do, what they had known ought to be done and yet refused to perform. To overcome hardness of this kind, the grand in eloquence is necessary. Both vituperation and praise, which belong to the intermediate style, so far affect some persons, when eloquently expressed, as not only to fill them with delight at the eloquence thus exhibited, but also to induce them so to live as to avoid censure and deserve praise. But are all those who are thus delighted, changed; as in the grand style, all who are persuaded, act; and in the plain, all who are taught, know, or believe that to be true, of which they before were ignorant?

Hence we infer, that it is necessary for those who would speak with wisdom and eloquence, to keep in view the objects intended to be accomplished by these two kinds of style, the plain and the grand. The intermediate style, the specific object of which is to render eloquence delightful, should not be employed for its own sake; but in order, by means of the delight it creates, to induce the hearers more readily to assent to, or more tenaciously retain, things which, being already known and approved by them, and thus requiring neither instruction nor persuasion, are delivered for good and useful purposes. The great and universal object of eloquence in all these three styles, is to speak in a manner adapted to persuade; but its particular object or the end to be accomplished, is persuasion. The orator, therefore, whichever of these three styles he employs, will speak in a manner adapted to persuade; but if he does not persuade, he fails of arriving at the particular object or end of eloquence. While, however, in the plain style, he persuades his hearers that what he utters is true; and in the grand, persuades them to do those things which they are aware ought to be done, and yet treat with neglect; in the intermediate style, he persuades them to look upon his speaking as ornate and beautiful. But what need have we of such an object? Let those seek such an end, who glory in the tongue, and pride themselves in panegyrics and those kinds of discourse, in which the hearer is neither to be instructed nor induced to act, but only to be delighted. Let us refer this object of the intermediate style to another, viz. the ac-

complishment of the end we aim at when we speak in the grand style,—to bring men to love good and avoid evil. Provided, however, they are not so averse to this duty as to render it necessary for us to employ the grand style itself, to urge the duty upon them ; or, if it is a duty which they already perform, to bring them to perform it with more diligence and persevere in it with firmness. In this way we can make a discreet use of the embellishments of the intermediate style, and avoid all appearance of ostentation ; not contenting ourselves with the specific object of this style, which is merely to delight the hearer, but rather endeavouring by its aid to facilitate the accomplishment of that good, which is the object of our persuasion.

The three points, therefore, which we laid down above,—that he who speaks with wisdom, if he would also speak with eloquence, must so express himself, that he may be heard with intelligence, willingness, and obedience,—are not to be so strictly taken as to require every subject to be so distributed to these three kinds of style, that the hearing of any thing with intelligence shall be confined to the plain style ; with willingness, to the intermediate ; and with obedience, to the grand ; but, on the contrary, he must rather always keep these three points in view, and aim, so far as possible, at their accomplishment, in whichever of these styles he may be engaged. We are unwilling, indeed, to have even what we utter in the plain style, treated with disdain ; and therefore we wish, not only to be heard with intelligence, but also with willingness. What, moreover is the object of our efforts in imparting instruction respecting the divine testimonies, except to be heard with obedience ; that is, with the assistance of Him of whom it is said, “ Thy testimonies are very sure,”* to obtain belief in these testimonies ? What indeed does he desire, who narrates any thing to a company of learners, although in the plain style, except to be believed ? And who will listen to him if not allured to do so by something like suavity ? And who does not know, that if he is not understood, he cannot be heard with willingness or obedience ? Now the plain style, while it solves the most difficult questions and presents us with unanticipated demonstrations ; while from some dark and unthought of caverns, as it were, it brings forth and exhibits to view the most acute opinions ; while it confutes the error of an adversary and proves that to be false which he

* Ps. 93: 5.

deemed incontrovertibly true; especially when it is possessed of a kind of natural elegance and a certain melody of language, the result not of ostentation but of necessity, and extorted (so to speak) from the subject itself;—the plain style, I say, under these circumstances, often excites such acclamations as almost to lose its distinctive character, and cease to be recognized as plain. The fact, then, that this style appears neither adorned nor armed, but always as it were naked, does not prevent it from crushing an adversary by its muscular strength, nor hinder it from overturning and destroying opposing falsehood with its powerful members. But whence come the frequent and multiplied acclamations, except from the delight experienced by the audience, on seeing the truth thus demonstrated, defended, and rendered victorious? Even in the plain style, therefore, the sacred teacher and orator should aim so to express himself, that he may be heard not only with intelligence, but also with willingness and obedience.

The eloquence of the intermediate style, also, as employed by the sacred orator, is neither left unornamented, nor is it ornamented in an unbecoming manner. He does not in his use of it like others, aim solely at creating delight. In whatever he praises or blames; in desiring and firmly retaining some things, and in shunning and utterly rejecting others;—in all this, it is his aim to be heard with obedience. But then, if he is not heard with intelligence, he cannot be heard with willingness. Hence, the object to be aimed at even in this style, in which pleasing holds the prominent place, is, that those who hear, may understand, receive delight, and yield obedience.

When now there is need of the grand style, for the purpose of moving and persuading the hearer, (and there will be need of it, when the truth is acknowledged to be uttered with suavity, but no desire evinced to practise it,) then without doubt, this style must be employed. But who will be moved, if he understand not what is said? Or who will be held to listen, if not delighted? Hence, in this style also, the professed object of which is to bring the hard heart to obedience, by means of the grand in eloquence, it will be impossible to induce an audience to listen with obedience, to him who cannot be heard with intelligence and willingness.

In leading any one to hear with obedience, however, the life of the speaker exerts far more influence than the grand in style. He who speaks with wisdom and eloquence, but at

the same time leads a wicked life, does indeed teach many who are desirous of learning, though as it is written, "He is unprofitable to himself."¹ Hence the apostle says, that "whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached."² But Christ is the truth; and it is possible for the truth to be announced in untruth; that is, for those things which are good and true, to be preached by one who has a false and depraved heart. Thus, for example, Jesus Christ is announced by those who seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ. Since, however, it is not a man to whom the faithful listen with obedience, but the Lord himself, who says:³ "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say and do not,"—those may be heard with profit, who do not themselves practise. They studiously indeed seek their own; but, from the high place they occupy in the church, established as it was for imparting sound doctrine, they dare not teach their own. Hence, our Lord before he gave the above injunction respecting them, premised that *they sat in Moses' seat*. The seat therefore which they occupied, not being theirs, but Moses', constrained them to teach what was good, though they did not practise it. In their lives, therefore, they practised their own; but the seat they occupied, belonging to another, would not permit them to teach their own.

By teaching, therefore, what they do not practise, they profit many; but by practising what they teach, they would profit many more. There are an abundance of persons who endeavour to draw the justification of their own wicked lives, from those placed over them as instructors; replying in their hearts, and if these overflow, with their mouths, saying: "Why do you enjoin upon me, what you yourselves do not practise?" The consequence of this, is, that they do not listen with obedience, to him, who has not been an obedient hearer himself; but contemn both the word of God preached to them, and the preacher of it. Hence, the apostle, writing to Timothy, after having said: "Let no man despise thy youth," in order that Timothy's youth might not be thus despised, subjoins:⁴ "But be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in spirit, in faith, in purity."

Such a teacher, in endeavouring to be heard with obedience, speaks without reproach, not only in the plain style and the in-

¹ Eccclus. 37: 19. ² Phil. 1: 18. ³ Matt. 23: 3. ⁴ 1 Tim. 4: 12.

termediate, but also in the grand ; and that, because he leads a life which commands respect. Indeed, in making choice of a good life, he does not show himself neglectful of a good name ; but as far as possible, he “ provides things honest in the sight of God and man,” fearing the one, consulting for the other. In his discourses too, he seeks to please by things rather than words ; and let him not suppose he has spoken any thing well, except as he has spoken it in truth ; and let not the teacher dance attendance upon words, but let words always be at the service of the teacher. This, indeed, is what the apostle says : “ Not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.”¹ To the same purpose also, he says to Timothy : “ Charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers.”² The meaning of the apostle is not that we should say nothing for the truth in opposition to its opposers ; for he expressly inculcates the contrary, when, in showing what a bishop ought to be, among other things, he says that he must be “ able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers.”³ To contend about words, is not to seek how error may be vanquished by the truth, but in what respects our own diction may be preferable to another’s. Moreover, he who avoids contention about words, employs them, whatever be the style in which he speaks, for the purpose of rendering the truth apparent, pleasing, and effective ; since even love, which is the object of the precept and the fulfilling of the law, ceases altogether to retain its proper character, if the things loved are not true but false. As, however, he who has a beautiful body and a deformed mind, is more to be pitied than if he also had a deformed body ; so he who utters falsehood in an eloquent manner, is more to be pitied than if he uttered it in a disagreeable manner. To speak with wisdom, therefore, as well as with eloquence, what is it, but to exhibit such truths as should be exhibited, in appropriate words, in the plain style ; in elegant words, in the intermediate ; and in vehement words, in the grand ? Let him, however, who is unable to do both, speak with wisdom what he cannot speak with eloquence, rather than speak with eloquence what is destitute of wisdom. If he is unable to do even this, then let him so order his walk and conversation, as not only to obtain a reward for himself, but also to prove an example to

¹ 1 Cor. 1: 17.² 2 Tim. 2: 14.³ Tit. 1: 9.

others ; and let his eloquence, so to speak, consist in his manner of life.

There are individuals who can pronounce a discourse well, but are unable of themselves to compose one. Such persons will do well to take the discourses of others, when written with wisdom and eloquence, and, committing them to memory, rehearse them to the people ; provided they have received a commission to this effect. In this way, indeed, we may obtain many preachers of the truth, which is certainly useful, without having many masters ; provided they all speak the productions of one true Master, and there are no schisms among them. Nor should such persons be deterred from this labour by the voice of Jeremiah the prophet, through whom God rebuked those " who stole his words, each one from his neighbour ;"¹ for to steal, is to take what belongs to another ; but the word of God certainly belongs to those who obey it. He rather is to be accused of speaking what is not his own, who, while he speaks well, leads a wicked life ; for though the good things he utters seem to be the productions of his own genius, they are foreign from his manners and habits. God therefore pronounces those to be stealers of his word, who desire to appear good in speaking what is God's, while they are wicked in practising what is their own. Nor do they, if you carefully look at the case, in reality themselves speak the good things which they utter ; for how can they in reality speak in words, what they deny in deeds ? It is not without reason, therefore, that the apostle has said of such ; " They profess that they know God, but in works they deny him."² In one sense, therefore, it is they themselves who speak ; and again in another sense it is not they themselves who speak ; since in either case that is and remains true, which the truth declares. Speaking of such, the Lord says :³ " Whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do ; but do not ye after their works," that is, practise what you hear from their mouths, but not what you see in their works ; " for they say but do not." They teach, therefore, though they do not practise. And inveighing against them in another place, he says : " O ye hypocrites, how can ye, being evil, speak good things." Hence, when they speak what is good, it is not they themselves that speak it ; since both in will and works, they deny what they utter. We see, therefore, that a learned but wicked man

¹ Jer. 23: 30.

² Tit. 1: 16.

³ Matt. 23: 3.

may compose a discourse, in which the truth is exhibited, to be delivered by another who is a good man, but not eloquent. In this case, the former gives to another, what is not his own; and the latter receives from another, what is his own. When, however, pious believers assist pious believers in this way, both of them speak what is their own; since even God is theirs, whose are the things they speak; and those who live in conformity to the things they thus speak, practise what is their own, even though unable to exhibit it in a discourse of their own composition.

But whether we are about to address the people, or others; or whether we are about to dictate what is either to be delivered to the people, or to be read by those who are able and willing; let us pray God to furnish our mouths with good discourse. If Esther, when about to speak to the king respecting the temporal welfare of her people, prayed God to put suitable words into her mouth; how much more should he pray for such a favour, who labours in word and doctrine for the eternal salvation of men? And let those who are to deliver what they receive from others, first pray for those from whom they thus borrow, that through them they may obtain the desired supply; and then for themselves, that they may be able properly to exhibit what they thus receive; and also for those whom they address, that they may have hearing ears; and, having ended their discourse with success, let them return thanks to Him, to whom, beyond all question, they are indebted for success; that he who glories, may glory in that Being "in whose hands are both we and our words."*

This treatise has run on to a greater length than I wished or anticipated. To the reader or hearer, however, who likes it, it will not seem long; or if so, and he still have a desire to become acquainted with it, let him read a part of it at a time. He who does not wish to become acquainted with it, will not complain of its length. And for myself, I here give thanks to God, who has permitted me, in these four books, to discuss so far as I have been able, not what I myself am, for in many things I am deficient,—but what he ought to be, who, being sound in the faith, i. e. in the true christian doctrine, desires to live and labour not for himself only, but also for others.

* Wisd. 7: 16.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. XII.

OCTOBER, 1833.

**ART. I. SKETCHES OF IDUMEA AND ITS PRESENT
INHABITANTS.**

From the Travels of Burckhardt and Legh.

With an Historical Introduction.

By the Editor.

THIRD ARTICLE.

IN our two preceding Numbers, we have given a sketch of the history, etc. of Idumea, and copious extracts from the Travels of Burckhardt in the same region. We now proceed to place before the reader similar extracts from the account given by Mr Legh of his excursion to Wady Mousa in the year 1818, six years after the journey of Burckhardt.

Mr Legh had been the companion of Dr Macmichael, in a journey from Moscow to Constantinople in December 1817 and January 1818. Here they separated, Dr M. returning to England, while Mr L. proceeded, in the spring, to Palestine. An account of the journey from Moscow was afterwards published by the former; to which the following description of Mr Legh's subsequent travels is subjoined as the last chapter. The work bears the following title: "Journey from Moscow to Constantinople in the years 1817, 1818. By W. Macmichael, M. D. F. R. S. etc." Lond. 1819. 4to. Mr Legh made the excursion in question, in company with Captains Irby and Mangles,

VOL. III. No. 12.

79

and of Mr Banks. The two former of these gentlemen wrote and printed an account of the journey, for private distribution; but it was never published. Many extracts from it have appeared in the *Modern Traveller*, and other works. Mr Banks is a gentleman of taste and science, and a scholar of distinguished attainments; and the public have anxiously waited for his long promised work upon the extraordinary monuments of Wady Mousa, and the historical illustrations connected with them. Fourteen years have now passed away since his visit to that place; but the work has not yet appeared.

In the mean time the following *Sketch* by Mr Legh cannot but be acceptable to the reader. It is lively, graphic, and spirited, dealing more with the character and manner of the present inhabitants, than with the antiquities of the country. The writer everywhere corroborates the previous statements of Burckhardt; which, however, he had not seen, because they were not then published. In the names of persons and places, it will be seen that he follows a different orthography from that of Burckhardt; but it must be borne in mind that Burckhardt was master of the language, and travelled as a native Arab; while Mr L. appears to have known little or nothing of the Arabic, and had with him an interpreter. Burckhardt's orthography is therefore, in every instance, to be regarded as the only correct one. The notes of the original work are everywhere subjoined; and a few have been occasionally added.—EDITOR.

III. SKETCHES ETC. FROM MR LEGH.

The Greek vessel, on board of which I had engaged my passage, had been detained for more than a fortnight, in the canal of the Bosphorus, by contrary winds; when the weather, at length, becoming more favourable, I sailed from Constantinople on the 15th of March, 1818.

I was provided with a *ferman* from the Porte, and accompanied by a Janissary, Mustafa, belonging to the English embassy, and a Greek servant, Nicolo, a native of the island of Corfou, whom I had hired at St. Petersburg. The Hydriote captain, to whom the vessel belonged, was bound to Tarsus, for corn; but, in consideration of a certain sum of money, he engaged to land me at Jaffa. After a tempestuous voyage of seventeen days,

during which we touched at the island of Rhodes, and at the port of Larnica, in Cyprus, where, at the earnest request of a Greek priest, who came to pay me a visit, fifty pilgrims bound to Jerusalem were taken on board, we reached Jaffa on the 2d of April. On my landing I assumed the Turkish dress, which I had purchased at Constantinople; and, after a stay of two days, took the road to Jerusalem, distant about fourteen hours. The first night I slept at the convent of Rama, and, on the following day, entered Jerusalem. On my reaching the convent of Terra Santa, where I was to take up my lodgings, I had the pleasure of finding Mr Banks; and, in a few days, our party was increased by the arrival of the Honble Captain Irby and Captain Mangles, both of the royal navy, who had been absent for a short time to visit Bethlehem. These three travellers had just returned from an unsuccessful attempt to penetrate by the north and eastern coast of the Dead sea to Wadi Moosa*, the supposed site of Petra. They had crossed the Jordan, and entered into a negotiation with the powerful tribe of the Benesark† Arabs, who, for a reward of fifteen hundred piastres, had engaged to conduct them to Wadi Moosa; but, on the receipt of the money, were found unable to perform their promise, and the travellers, after suffering great privations from the want of food, effected a most masterly retreat from Salt, escaped the tents of their treacherous guides, re-crossed the Jordan, and returned to Jerusalem. Though their first attempt had failed, they were not to be disheartened by this disappointment; and having proposed to myself to join their party on a second endeavour, I eagerly embraced an offer that promised so much interesting discovery.

Mr Banks had long meditated this journey, and an idea may be formed of the almost insurmountable difficulties that seemed to prevent its accomplishment, from the enumeration of the objections that were started at Constantinople, when he applied for a ferman, in which these distant places were to be inserted. Karrac and Wadi Moosa were said not to be in the dominions of the Grand Seignior; and when the point was strongly urged by the British minister, Mr Banks was referred by the Porte to the Pasha of Damascus, and by him to the Moosilim, or Governor, of Jerusalem. The latter desired him to apply to Abou-Nabout,‡ the governor of Jaffa, of whom the Be-

* The Valley of Moses.

† Sons of a Tree.

‡ The father of the Stick.

doueen Arabs, on the eastern side of the Dead sea, were said to be in great fear, as he has, in some measure, the command of the annual provisions of corn, which they draw from Egypt. But the governor of Jaffa, to whom we all now had recourse, declined interfering in the business, as he could not be answerable for our safety; we were thus left entirely to our own resources. We remained at Jerusalem about a month, using all our endeavours to discover the means of prosecuting our journey, and to persuade the Moosillim to facilitate our views, as far as lay in his power; and from him we obtained, at last, a promise, that he would write to the Sheikh of Hebron, and send also for the Sheikh of Karrac. We staid at Jerusalem in the expectation of the performance of these promises, and employed our time in examining the curiosities of the city and neighbourhood. During this period of delay, Lord and Lady Belmore, and Captain Corry, arrived; and it is not a little singular, that accident should have brought together so many English travellers, all of whom had been in Nubia, and every one, except myself, as far as the second cataract.

Lord Belmore and his party,* consisting of more than twenty persons, had crossed the desert from Cairo to Jaffa; an enterprise, which, considering the number of females and children in the caravan, was one of no ordinary difficulty. We might esteem ourselves lucky in being at Jerusalem during Easter, and in having an opportunity of witnessing the ridiculous farce of the sacred fire, and the other superstitious ceremonies of the holy week, of which Maundrell has given so faithful and lively a description.† We also accompanied the pilgrims to the Jordan; they amounted to about six thousand, and went under the protection of the Moosillim, with a strong escort of Albanians, Dalhis‡, and the motley troops of the Arab chief Abou-Gosha,§ who receives the *gaphar*, or tribute, paid by the Christians on their way from Jaffa to Jerusalem. The group of pilgrims consisted of Russians, Servians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Circassians, and Christians from Asia Minor and

* Dr. Richardson, who has published an interesting account of his travels, was also a member of lord Belmore's party.—Ed.

† Vide *A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, p. 93.

‡ Turkish cavalry, chiefly natives of Latichea, Hamah, and Homs, and distinguished from Spahis, by wearing a sort of Persian cap instead of a turban.

§ The father of the Passage.

the northern parts of Syria ; men, women, and children, on foot, horses, camels, mules, and asses ; the green banner of Mahomet waved at the head of the procession. The first evening we encamped near the village that occupies the situation of ancient Jericho, forming one of the most extraordinary sights I had ever witnessed ; in the centre of the camp was pitched the tent of the Moosillim, but the greater part of the pilgrims passed the night on the earth, in the open air, singing, and performing other exercises of devotion.

At two o'clock after midnight the drum of the Dalhis announced the hour of departure, and we continued our march, by torch-light, towards the Jordan, which we reached at sunrise.

The banks of the river are so beset by tamarisks, willows, oleanders, and other shrubs, that the sacred stream is not visible, except on the nearest approach. Making their way through the thick bushes, men, women, and children, plunged into the water with the greatest eagerness and show of religious fervour. Many of the pilgrims jumped in with their clothes on, and others had their garments handed to them, which, being dipped and wrung out, were carefully folded up, to be preserved as holy reliques. Most of our party swam across the rapid stream of the Jordan, which is here not much wider than the Thames a little below Oxford, and, from the opposite bank had a full view of this singular spectacle. The water was of a white muddy colour, and had a brackish taste.

On our return to the western side of the river, we left the pilgrims ; and thinking this a good opportunity, (notwithstanding the advice of the Moosillim to the contrary,) went by the ruined convent of St. John, along the plain incrustated with salt, a distance of about six miles, to the north-western side of the Dead sea. Our Arab guides had endeavoured to alarm us as to the consequences of bathing in these pestiferous waters ; but we made the experiment, and found that, though two of our party were unable to swim, they were buoyed up in a most extraordinary manner. The sensation perceived immediately upon dipping was, that we had lost our sight ; and any part of the body that happened to be excoriated, smarted excessively. The taste of the water was bitter, and intolerably saline.

From this experiment some of us suffered a good deal of inconvenience, an oily incrustation being left upon the body, which no attempt at washing could remove for some time ; and seve-

ral of the party continued to lose portions of skin for many succeeding days.* Upon the shore of the Dead sea, we found many pieces of bitumen, and in the water saw several small shellfish, not unlike periwinkles. The mountains on each side of the northern extremity are exceedingly high, rising abruptly from the margin of the water, and extending towards the south, as far as the eye can reach. On our return to the camp of the pilgrims, the procession was beginning to move; they halted at the distance of two hours from Jerusalem, but we entered the city that night.

The scheme of our journey to Petra now occupied all our thoughts, and we waited impatiently for the performance of the promises of the governor of Jerusalem, and the arrival of the Sheikh from Karrac; but we soon began to discover that the letter to Hebron had never been despatched, and that the Moosillim had no serious intentions of giving us the least assistance. If the expedition was to be undertaken, we were to depend upon ourselves for its performance. We accordingly bought horses, and equipped ourselves and our attendants in the most ordinary dress of Bedoucens, consisting of a shirt of cotton, over which we had a coarse thick frock of the same materials, an *abba*, or cloak of woollen stuff, with broad brown and white stripes; the covering for the head was a square handkerchief, with alternate red, green, and yellow stripes, folded up in a triangular form, (fastened to the crown of the head by a worsted

* According to an analysis of the water of the Dead sea, made with the most scrupulous exactness by Dr Marcet, the contents of one hundred grains of the water were found to be as follows:—

	Grains.
Muriat of lime	3,920
Muriat of magnesia	10,246
Muriat of soda	10,360
Sulphat of lime	0,054
	24,580

Its specific gravity is 1,211, and if the salts be only desiccated at the temperature of 180°, they will amount to 41 per cent. of the water; but if reduced to a state of perfect dryness, their weight is one fourth of the fluid.—Vide *Philosophical Transactions* for the year 1807. [Compare with the above the account of Messrs. Fisk and King, *Miss. Herald*, Ap. 1824. p. 92.—Ed.]

rope,) with two of its corners depending from the ears, while the other hung down the neck. Our costume was completed by a pair of red boots, the most expensive article of our dress, which cost thirteen piastres, and by a belt, or girdle, in which we carried our pistols. The party consisted of Captains Irby and Mangles, and their servant Ibrahim, a Christian Arab, a native of Tiberias; Mr Bankes, with his domestic, the renegado Hadgi Mahomet, a soldier belonging to the Pasha of Egypt, who was by birth an Italian, and acted as his dragoman; and myself, with James Curtin my interpreter,* the Tartar Mustafa, who had come with me from Constantinople, and Georgiolo, an Armenian, who was to take charge of my horses. The Greek servant Nicolo, was sent with all our baggage and valuables, to await our return at Acre. We carried our money, consisting of the smallest Turkish gold coin, called *rubees*, each equal to two piastres and thirty paras, rather less than two shillings, concealed in leathern belts about our waists.

We respectively assumed the Arab appellations of Abdallah, Hassan, Halleel, to which the title of El Beg† was usually added, and Osman, which was the name I had adopted.

We mounted our horses, and, two hours before dusk, on the 6th of May, rode out of the gate of Bethlehem, under the guidance of a single Arab, to whom Mr Bankes had formerly shewn great kindness, in being the means of procuring the liberation of his son from prison. We took the road to Haleel-rochman, or Hebron, famous as the burial-place of Abraham, and slept the first night in the convent at Bethlehem.

May 7. At an early hour in the morning we took leave of our hosts, the priests; and, passing by the pools of Solomon, ascended the Frank Mountain, a high conical hill, reported to have been defended for forty years, after the expulsion of the crusaders from the rest of the Holy Land. From its summit it is easy to catch different glimpses of the Dead sea, and a white point was indicated to us as the situation of Karrac, on its eastern side. From the Mountain of the Franks we visited the Labyrinth, consisting of natural grottos, on one side of a deep and gloomy ravine. The ruins of Tekoa, which we next

* By birth an Irishman, who had been for eight years in the service of M. Belzoni; his zeal, fidelity, and knowledge of the Arabic language, were of the greatest use to me.

† The prince.

reached, presenting only the foundations of some considerable buildings, stand on a slight eminence, from which the Dead sea is also to be seen. The country hence to Hebron is more cultivated, and of a more inviting aspect, than the vicinity of Jerusalem; and the sides of the hills are partially covered with the prickly oak, arbutus, and fir-trees. Continuing our route, we rode by several camps of *Fellahs*, or cultivating Arabs, who treated us with civility, offering us *lebbin*, or sour milk, and inviting us to stop the night in their tents; but we moved on, and passing an Arab village, entered Hebron at dusk. The Sheikh received us kindly, and allotted us a small room, attached to the khan; and when we stated to him the object of our journey, seemed to make no objection to our proceeding to Wadi Moosa.

May 8. The next morning we walked about the town, apparently populous, but of no very great dimensions, and surveyed, from the outside, the mosque which is built over the sepulchre of Abraham; an edifice of such sanctity, that, even in our present correct costume of Arabs, we dared not attempt to enter it.

The ancient and lower part of the mosque is formed of enormous stones, some that appeared to be about twenty-six feet in length; and, from the general aspect of the building, resembling neither Grecian, Roman, nor early Christian architecture, it seemed to me to be possibly of Jewish origin. Though we were not allowed to enter the sacred precincts of the mosque, Hadgi Mahomet, the attendant of Mr Bankes, and my Tartar, were admitted; and reported that they had seen in the interior four or five tombs, covered with red velvet. The sepulchre of Abraham was more richly decorated than any of the others. At the mouth of a well, sunk in the interior of the building, stood a dervish, who, for a slight gratification, wrote down the names of the devotees who consulted him, and then dropped the paper, carefully watching its manner of descent: if it fell perpendicularly, without any vibration, the omen was good; otherwise it betokened ill. The fate of the name of my Tartar was of the latter complexion, and the effect of this evil augury was visible during the rest of the journey; for, naturally rather a coward, he ever afterwards betrayed signs of the most ridiculous terror.

When we visited the Sheikh, and repeated our request, he desired us to wait; saying, that a caravan was expected from Wadi Moosa, and that we should accompany it on its return. We now called upon the Seraff, or Jew banker, who was re-

ported to have great influence with the Sheikh, and endeavoured to win him over to our interests. Mr Banks also presented a watch to the Sheikh, which, however, he received reluctantly, and seemed, on the whole, discontented and unwilling to assist us. We soon learned that the watch had been given by the Sheikh to the Jew, apparently with a design of shewing that he did not think the present of sufficient value for himself. On our again calling on the Jew, we found the Sheikh in close consultation with him; and we now offered the sum of three hundred and fifty piastres for guides to conduct us to Wadi Moosa, the great object of our expedition. At first it was hinted, that for that sum we should be forwarded to Karrac; but on our persisting in the substitution of Wadi Moosa for that place, it was finally agreed that for four hundred piastres, which should be instantly paid into the hands of the Jew, our guides should be ready to attend us early in the morning.

The Jew afterwards shewed us the synagogue, and as the bargain seemed perfectly arranged we retired with satisfaction to our khan. But on the following day the business was as little advanced as ever; during the course of the night the Sheikh had become alarmed at his own determination, and called upon us at the khan, accompanied by the elders of the town, and the guides who had been selected for the journey. In the presence of these people, the Sheikh stated who we were, whence we had come, and the place to which we were desirous of proceeding; and then offering the four hundred piastres to the guides, asked them if they were willing to undertake the affair; as, for his part, he was quite unable to promise us the least aid or protection. The reply of the guides, notwithstanding the tempting offer of the money, was decidedly in the negative. On this, the Sheikh most honourably returned the money, and the present of the watch, declining to have any thing more to do in the business.

We rose, and mounting our horses, immediately quitted the town. Under the shade of some olive trees, at a short distance from Hebron, we halted, and consulted together what course to adopt. The Bedouen Arab, who had accompanied Mr Banks from Jerusalem, and another who had joined us on our road to Hebron, used every argument to induce us to return; but we decided to send a messenger to the Sheikh, offering to adopt his proposal of going first to Karrac, and requesting that he would furnish us with guides for that purpose; but our offer met with

a decided refusal. An Arab horseman now rode up to us, and being told of our dilemma, volunteered himself to be our conductor to Wadi Moosa; we immediately embraced his offer, and, having proceeded about two miles, perceived two horsemen riding in full speed after us, and shouting to us to stop. We halted in a corn-field, and sent the Arnaout of Mr Bankes to the Sheikh, to hear the proposition which he now had to make. While waiting for the return of the messenger, we fell asleep, and, on our awaking, found ourselves entirely alone; the two Arabs who had hitherto attended us had availed themselves of this opportunity quietly to make their escape, and the horseman who had lately so courageously proposed to be our guide to Wadi Moosa, had equally withdrawn.

Soon after, our messenger returned accompanied by a Jew, the brother of the Sheikh, and two Arabs, with a letter addressed to Sheikh Yousouf Amgelie, the governor of Karrac, and a demand of three hundred piastres, or two hundred piastres and the watch, for permission to proceed thither. We agreed to pay one hundred and fifty piastres, together with the watch, and giving the Jew two rubees for his share in the negotiation, and one (about two shillings) to the brother of the sheikh, for which he appeared very thankful, we rode off with our two guides to the tents of the Yellaheen Arabs, to which tribe they belonged.

We proceeded onwards in a south-easterly direction, and watered our horses at a well near some patches of standing barley, of which our Arabs cut a sufficient quantity for our horses; and, filling one of their *abbas* with it, pointed out to us, in the distance, the black spots on the desert, the tents of their brethren, where we were to sleep. It was dusk when we reached the camp, the watch dogs were on the outside, and the few camels, sheep, and goats they possessed, were already placed for security within the interior circuit of the encampment. The number of tents was about thirty-five; the tribe seemed very poor, but they received us with hospitality, and killed a sheep for our entertainment. The women, of whom the Arabs appeared very jealous, remained concealed during the whole time of our stay. In the Sheikh's tent, where we slept, we contracted, for the first time, an unceasing source of torment, from the tribes of vermin with which these people swarm; and never were entirely free from this annoyance until we had washed in the baths of Dgezar,* the famous Pasha at Acre.

* The Butcher.

May 10. When we arose on the following morning a negotiation was to be commenced with our host, an affair of no small difficulty with a cunning and prevaricating Arab. After much altercation, it was agreed that we should pay seventy-five piastres to the Sheikh, and ten to each of five guides who were to attend us, armed with muskets, to Karrac. Though the terms of the contract were received by the Arabs with apparent indifference, and even reluctance, no sooner was the bargain concluded, than they all fought, throwing stones at each other, drawing their swords, and contending who should be selected for the journey.

We quitted the tents in the company of the Sheikh, and soon were joined by our five guides, carrying their muskets. At a short distance, we endeavoured to persuade the Arabs to change their rout, and lead us directly to Wadi Moosa, offering them the considerable bribe of five hundred piastres; but this proposal they rejected, saying, that not even five thousand piastres should induce them to undertake so perilous an expedition; that the Arabs of that country were of a most savage character, and occupied a mountainous district, concealing themselves in the clefts of the rocks, and hurling down stones and other missiles, on any strangers who might venture to approach their strong holds. In an hour and a half we reached a tank, where we watered our horses, which occupied us nearly half an hour, as we possessed only one small skin, with which to draw the water. Now, our guides finding that we were so rich, from the imprudent offer we had made them of five hundred piastres to take us to Wadi Moosa, resolutely demanded the same sum, or they would not even conduct us to Karrac.* This imposition we as firmly resisted, telling them they might return to their camp if they pleased, but that we should continue on our way, as we well knew the direction of the route we had to follow. We mounted our horses, and leaving them behind, pursued our journey through a very mountainous tract of desert; the prospect was a dreary one, but, having got so far, we were determined, at all hazards, to proceed. At the expiration of three hours one of

* It is but fair to observe here, that this was the only attempt we ever met with among the Arabs, to depart from the terms of an agreement they had once made; for, though eager to stipulate the most advantageous conditions for themselves, they, on all other occasions, shewed the most honourable inclination to adhere to their bargain.

our guides made his appearance behind us, on the summit of a hill, waving his turban, and vociferating with all his might. Though not a little pleased at this circumstance, we still affected great indifference, and, seemingly regardless of his shouts, continued slowly on our way. In a short time he came up, together with two other of the Arabs, who overtook us breathless with haste, and now appeared willing to continue with the party, as if no difference had ever taken place.

Travelling onwards for about a league, the country assumed the most fantastic shapes; conical hills of a white chalky appearance, whose summits were covered with flinty substances, seemed to have been produced by some powerful convulsion of nature, as if the bowels of the earth had been turned up and exposed to view. From these eminences we enjoyed one of the most commanding prospects of the Dead Sea, and of the great plain that extends from its southern extremity. The sight, though cheerless, convinced us, at least, that the project of reaching the eastern side of the sea was not entirely impracticable. We began to descend, leading our horses down a most difficult and dangerous path for two hours, till we reached a small pool of rain-water, not far from which stood the remains of a ruined Arab fort, with loop-holes, commanding the pass. Near the water a few trees were growing, producing a fruit, called by the Arabs the doom-apple; it is very different from the doom-palm of Egypt; the fruit is of the size of a small plum, of a reddish-yellow colour, and of a pleasant acid sweet taste, which we found very refreshing. About sun-set we reached the plain, and proceeding southward about one hour, entered a ravine, where we determined to stop for the night, though much against the inclination of our guides, who urged us to pass the valley of the Dead Sea, and cross the river Naher el Hossan, or Horse River,* where we should be in security; but the darkness of the night, the fatigue of the day's journey, and the want of confidence in our Arab conductors, determined us to adhere to our original resolution.

We endeavoured to make a fire with the wood † lying about,

* Properly the *El Ahsa* of Burckhardt, and here called *Horse river* only by mistake; see the note on p. 407 above. For a fuller account of the dreary nature of this region, see the work of Irby and Mangles; also Calmet's *Dict. Art. SALT, VALLEY OF*, p. 804.—ED.

† During our examination of the coast of the Dead sea, we found great

but owing to the great quantity of salt with which it was impregnated, our attempt was unsuccessful, and we were obliged to pass the night, without even the luxury of a cup of coffee. Our only refreshment consisted of some flour mixed with the water we had brought from the pool in our goat-skins, and our repose was disturbed by the distant barking of dogs, which our guides told us proceeded from a station of Bedouens, who might have seen us from the opposite side, and were probably watching our movements.

May 11. Before day-light we left the ravine, and continued our route along the foot of the high mountain-ridge, whose sides were sometimes formed of pure rock-salt, fragments of which had rolled down, or were seen hanging in other places as stâlactites from the perpendicular sections of the rocks. We now struck across the sandy plain, leaving the more marshy country to the left, and reached a tract grown over with reeds, acacia, tamarisk, the mustard tree, and a great variety of other shrubs, that would have afforded the most interesting objects of research to a botanist. The more open country, near the banks of the Horse River, was cultivated with barley and wheat, and the natives, of a wild and savage appearance, were of a dark bronze colour. Though early in the morning, the heat was intense, and we approached the Arabs, who were employed in getting in their harvest, (contrary to the advice of our guides, who represented them as being of a very vicious character,) in the hopes of obtaining some provisions, for which our meagre fare of the preceding night had made us very keen. They conducted us to some rude wigwams, formed of reeds, where we saw several of their tribe employed in beating out their corn; they behaved to us with great respect, as we had thought it prudent here to assume the character of soldiers, belonging to Mahomed Aga of Jaffa, sent by him on some business of his, to Karrac. We were treated with the doom-apple, pounded into a paste, and mixed up with butter, which we found very palatable; but we were so tormented by flies, and our horses so bitten by them, as to stream with blood, so that we were compelled soon to take

quantities of the trunks of the palm-tree thrown up on the shores, and seemingly preserved by their perfect impregnation with salt. Jericho was formerly celebrated for its dates, but now there are, probably, not more than a dozen palms growing near that spot, and few are observable in the neighbourhood of the Dead sea.

our leave. When we offered them a remuneration for their hospitality in money, they at first refused it; but, at length, when we told them that our master, Abou-Nabout of Jaffa, would be displeased with us for not rewarding their kindness, they reluctantly consented.

These Arabs call themselves Goharnees.*

The distance across the valley we had passed was computed to be about fourteen miles; and the rugged tract we entered upon at the foot of the mountains, to the east of the Dead sea, was strewn with large fragments of porphyry, granite, breccia, serpentine, and basalt, fallen down from the rocks to the right. Our route was E. N. E. for three hours, and afterwards, until six o'clock in the evening, was north; when we halted on the banks of a small and rapid rivulet, flowing through a ravine, beautifully wooded with oleanders, acacia, and a few palm-trees.

May 12. At three o'clock we turned to the east, and began a steep ascent, through the gorge of the mountains, that brought us, after three hours, within sight of the fortress of Karrac. On our way thither we were hailed by some Arabs, who had seen our fire during the night; and, on their approach, we exchanged the reciprocal Mussulman salutation, "Peace be on you, on you be peace."† Their intentions had, at first, been hostile, but seeing we were well armed, they allowed us to proceed without molestation; and, after passing a stream, that, rising at the foot of the mountain of Karrac, turns a mill, and waters some gardens, planted with olives, figs, and Indian corn, we descended into the deep ravine that surrounds the perpendicular rock of the fortress. The ascent was so steep as to oblige us to dismount, and with much fatigue we reached the western entrance, formed by a long winding passage, apparently cut with great labour through the natural rock. At the other extremity of the excavation, the ruins of extensive buildings appeared before us; on the left stood the remains of a square edifice, which had, probably, been formerly the keep of the fortification, and on the right were dilapidated walls of another building of some magnitude. The whole seemed of Saracenic architecture. The place had the air of having formerly been much more populous; but the houses of the present inhabitants were mean, built of mud, flat-roofed, and very low. Some ingenuity was, however,

* The *Ghowárene* of Burckhardt; see p. 273 above.—ED.

† *Salem alicum, alicum salem.*

displayed in the manner of supporting the roofs, effected by two arches of stone, on which were placed reeds and sticks, and over all a coating of mud. The only mosque in Karrac was in ruins, and there were also to be seen the remains of a Greek church; in the exterior walls of the fortifications were several Arabic inscriptions. Our guides took us to the house of the Sheikh, situated in the centre of the town; but he was not at home, being absent at the village of Khanzeer,* distant about three hours from Karrac, whither he had gone to celebrate his marriage with a young bride, of the age of twelve. But the son of the Sheikh, Abdelkader,† gave us a friendly reception, invited us into his house, and immediately presented us with coffee. When he had read our letter from the Sheikh of Hebron, and been informed of the object of our journey, he despatched a messenger to the village to announce our arrival to his father, the Sheikh Yousouf Angelie.—We soon attracted the curiosity of the inhabitants, who came in crowds to see us; and among them was a Greek priest, who recollected M. Seetzen‡ and our lamented friend Sheikh Ibrahim. The inquiries of the priest after the fate of the latter, excited feelings of regret in us all, for we had all known him in Egypt. The priest in whose house he had lodged when at Karrac, spoke of him in terms of the highest commendation; and it was, probably, because he supposed we were countrymen of M. Burckhardt, that he offered us his good offices with the governor of the town. Sheikh Yousouf did not return the following day, which we employed in exploring the ruins of the town and castle of Karrac, from whence the city of Jerusalem and the mountain of the Franks are clearly discernible across the Dead sea in a north-westerly direction. The population of Karrac is half Christian and half Mahometan, who appeared to live on a very amicable footing. The women here were not under the usual restraint, but went with their faces uncovered, upon which were generally to be seen dark bluish spots, made, I believe, with antimony; from one of their nostrils a ring was frequently suspended. They wore robes of blue cotton, and a black silk veil drawn across the

* The *Khanzyre* of Burckhardt; see p. 403 above.—ED.

† The Slave of Power.

‡ The author of *A Brief Account of the Countries adjoining the Lake Tiberias, the Jordan, and the Dead Sea*, published in London, 1810. [See p. 444 above.]

point of the chin only. Their conversation with us was perfectly unembarrassed; and one of them being ill, asked us for medicine, the beneficial effect of which increased the good opinion they began to entertain of us. The Sheikh arrived on the following day; during which we had been regaled by his brother, who had invited us and several of his friends to a feast, at which he treated us with a sheep. Our interview with Sheikh Yousouf was very different, and much more satisfactory, than any we had yet had; he was a fine, venerable old man, with a white beard, apparently about sixty years of age, with manners blunt and sincere. His first question was, Are you come to see the country of your forefathers? And when we explained to him the nature of our journey, and asked him to assist us, he replied instantly, that he would consent to accompany us to Wadi Moosa on the payment of four hundred piastres. The bargain was struck, and we left Karrac on the following morning, 17th May, in company with the Sheikh.*

On riding out of the town, we passed some sepulchres cut in the living rock, and continued our route in an easterly direction over a fine undulating country, covered with good pasturage, for two hours, when we reached the tents of his son Ismael: for the tribe of which our Sheikh was at the head, have their magazines of corn and places of retreat in the fortress of Karrac, but pass the greatest part of the year in the open and cultivated country around. During this day's journey we had been joined by an Arab, who had just returned from the Wahabees, by whom he had been carried off at the time they were in the neighbourhood of Karrac. He had been detained by them for three years, a part of which time he had spent at Derajeh, their capital, which he stated to be very strong; and told us that while he was among them, they were governed by a female of great courage and enterprise. Every evening, he said, the Wahabees gave their horses camels' milk to drink, to render them strong and capable of bearing fatigue.

* This Sheikh, it will be recollected, is the same person whom Burckhardt, travelling as a poor Arab, found so faithless. To the rich Englishmen, travelling with authority, he would naturally present a different exterior. Still, experience taught them also, in respect to him, "on many occasions, that honesty has no place whatever among the virtues of an Arab." See under June 18; and compare the language of Burckhardt on pp. 404, 405, above.—Ed.

Ismael, who appeared to be the favourite son of the old Sheikh Yousouf, had a fine intelligent countenance, was about twenty-four years of age, and gave us a cordial welcome. On entering his tent, he and every one present rose to receive the Skeikh, under whose protection we were travelling; a respect the Arabs always pay to their chief, and which they usually shewed to ourselves. We all interchanged the kiss of friendship; a ceremony that consists in first touching the hands of each other, and then applying your own hand to the mouth and forehead. On being seated, a fire was made in one corner of the tent, of bushes or camels' dung, before which an old Arab placed himself and roasted some coffee in an iron ladle, constantly stirring it with a small rod of the same metal attached to the ladle by a chain. It was then pounded in a wooden mortar, and afterwards boiled. The *caffee gee* drank the first cup, to prove that it was not poisonous, and the beverage was then distributed among the guests, and to any casual visitors who might happen to enter. We were afterwards served with curds and whey, to be drunk out of the hollow of our hands, for we saw no spoons, and our supper consisted of an entire sheep cut in pieces and boiled in *lebbin** or sour milk; for the Bedoueens never boil their meat in water, and seldom, if ever, eat bread with their flesh. Their manner of eating, which we were obliged to conform to, was as follows:—The pieces of mutton were thrown into a large wooden bowl, and the fat of the tail being cut in lumps, was placed on the top, for this was reckoned the chief delicacy, and was bolted with the greatest avidity. A smaller bowl containing hot butter† was brought in and poured over the meat. It was necessary to be on the alert, for as many as could get near were squatted round the mess, and every hand was eagerly employed in snatching and tearing the pieces of meat. Those who were not able to approach the bowl, stood at the backs of the other more fortunate guests, and thankfully receiv-

* "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk."—Exod. chap. xxiii. v. 19. This was a custom probably practised by some neighbouring people: or perhaps the prohibition applied only to the particular milk specified, that of the mother.

† Their butter, made from the milk of goats, or sheep, is churned by the women, who suspend from the apex of three sticks placed pyramidically, a skin partly filled with milk and partly inflated. This they move rapidly to and fro till the process is completed.

ed the half-gnawed bones, which they finally threw to the dogs who formed the outer circle. The repast was concluded by a dish of *burgul*, made of green wheat, peeled and boiled in the same sour milk that had served for the cooking of the mutton. It was eaten by being formed into balls by the hand, and then, by the help of the thumb, dexterously thrust into the mouth. The above description of an entertainment in the tent of a Bedouen Arab, is not in the least exaggerated; and applies, pretty uniformly, to every feast given to us during our residence amongst these people.

In the vicinity of this camp were various ruined towns.

On the morning of the 18th, at six o'clock, we left the tents, taking a south-easterly direction over some rich country abounding in corn and good pasturage; and, passing by the tomb of the Sheikh Abou-Taleb, halted, at ten o'clock, at the encampment of Sheikh Salim, under whose protection, our friend Yousouf told us, it was absolutely necessary to place ourselves, before we could proceed to Wadi Moosa. The manner of entering an Arab camp is this:—If the Skeikh happens to be in company with the strangers, you ride directly through the circle towards the tent of the chief; but, if not, the custom is, to form in line at some distance from the encampment, and, on nearer approach, suddenly to wheel round, at the back of the other tents, and thus reach from behind the residence of the chief. A spear of bamboo, under the iron head of which usually hangs a bunch of ostrich feathers, is reared up against his tent, and distinguishes the abode of the Sheikh, in front of which, at a short distance, is piqueted his mare. Our first reception from Sheikh Salim was very hospitable, and he gave us the common repast of a boiled sheep; but when we came to touch upon the subject of our further expedition, he demanded the sum of two hundred and fifty piastres for his attendance on that occasion. This we obstinately refused, as we had been led to think that fifty piastres would have been sufficient; and we rode back from his tents, as if intending to give up the journey altogether, rather than submit to such an imposition. Our conduct enraged Sheikh Salim, who exclaimed in a fury, as we retreated from his camp, that he wished “a flash of lightning would come and sweep us all from the face of the earth;” and he added, that if it had not been for his friend Yousouf, he would have had five hundred piastres. After a good deal of dispute, it was arranged that he should receive one hundred and fifty piastres, for which he agreed to join our party; and we left his camp, our route

being due south, until we reached, in the evening, the tents of some Bedouens of his tribe. Our friend and protector, Sheikh Yousouf, had here some difficulty in satisfying the curiosity of the Arabs, who were all eager to know who we were, whither we were going, and why we had come into their country. He conciliated them by saying that we were Englishmen, and, though not strictly Mohammedans, yet we had saved Acre from being burnt by the French; and, to convince them of our consequence, displayed and read to them our different fermans. "Here," said he, "is the ferman of Abou Nabout of Jaffa; and here is the ferman of Solyman, Pasha of Acre; this is the ferman of Sali, Pasha of Damascus; and this the ferman of Mahmoud Ali, the Pasha of Cairo; and here," cried he, kissing that from Constantinople, and then respectfully applying it to his forehead, "is the ferman of the Sultan; and this," pointing to my janissary, "is the Tartar of the Sultan." But, notwithstanding these powerful recommendations, they persisted in thinking we had some sinister views in our visit, that we were come to discover the wells of water, for the purpose of informing our king of them, who would then attack and conquer their country. These fears Yousouf attempted to dissipate, by telling them, that from all he had heard, our country was one of the best in the world, and that we were come only to see the old buildings, to which none similar existed in England. During our stay in this camp, we observed many of the old women, and a few of the young ones also, with their cheeks scratched and their faces covered with blood, and were informed that they had mourned the day before for the death of a female belonging to the family of the Sheikh.

May 19. This day we passed some ruins, apparently Roman, as we descended into the valley of Ellasar,* which was covered with large masses of volcanic rocks; and having mounted the opposite slope, we arrived at a camp of thirty-five tents. One of our party had accidentally dropped a telescope, which the Arabs would not at first restore, without a large bribe, but ultimately gave it up, on receiving a few piastres. Near this spot we saw a ruin of some importance, with a few columns standing, probably Roman; and from hence a white streak in the distant desert was pointed out to us, as the *Darab-el-hadg*, or the road to Mecca. After seeing the ruins, we returned, and slept that night in the camp.

* The *El Ahsa* of Burckhardt; see the note on p. 407 above.—ED.

May 20. Our route to-day was due south till twelve o'clock, over a country covered partially with low bushes, when we reached an encampment of fifteen tents in a small valley, where we dined. They were of the tribe of Hadgea. During our stay, a great confusion was occasioned in the camp, by an alarm of thieves who were stealing their sheep, and the women set up a loud shout; the men ran to the top of the hills with their matchlocks slung over their shoulders, and we also went with them to their assistance, but the marauders were gone.

From this place we saw the fortress of Shubac, and passing by two volcanic craters on our left, and one on our right, observed a Roman road formed of lava, upon which we continued for some distance, when we lost sight of it, and arrived at Shubac at six o'clock in the evening.

We approached the town on the north-east side by a circuitous path, and entered by an iron gate. On our ascending the hill towards the town, the natives had assembled in front of the castle with their arms, taking us for Bedoueens; but when they saw we were accompanied by the Sheikhs Yousouf and Salim, they conducted us to a khan, brought corn for our horses, and treated us with coffee, mutton, and some excellent figs, preserved in such a manner as to retain their flavour and green colour, as if they were freshly gathered. Shubac is a very strong position, but chiefly in ruins, among which we observed the remains of a church, probably of the architecture of the time of the crusades.* The ravine that surrounds the town is about three hundred feet deep, cultivated with gardens full of fig-trees, and the calcareous rock is excavated into several sepulchres. Soon after our arrival, an alarm was spread here also, of thieves who had carried off the goats of the inhabitants, but their pursuit was fruitless. The Sheikh of Shubac, Ebn-Raschid, was not in the town, but encamped at some distance.

May 21. At four o'clock in the afternoon, as the Sheikh was not yet returned, we received an order to go to him in his tents, but we deferred our departure till the following morning. As we rode through the crowd of inhabitants, accompanied by the governor of the fortress of Shubac, Solyman, we overheard them exclaim, What white Arabs! In three hours we reached the camp of Mahomet Ebn-Raschid, but he

* Shubac is the *Shobak* of Burckhardt, and the *Mons Regalis* of the crusaders; see the historical notices on p. 269 above; and Burckhardt's account, p. 419 above.—Ed.

was not there : we met, however, a merchant, whom we had seen at Hebron, there, who complained grievously of having been robbed by his people of some linen, which they would not return.

On the 23d, Sheikh Mahomet Ebn-Raschid arrived, and with him also came the Sheikh Abou-Zeitun*, the Governor of Wadi Moosa. The latter proved afterwards our most formidable enemy, and we were indebted to the courage and unyielding spirit of the former for the accomplishment of our journey, and the sight of the wonders of Petra. When we related to the two Sheikhs, who had just entered the camp, our eager desire to be permitted to proceed, Abou-Zeitun swore, "by the beard of the Prophet," and by "the Creator," that the *Caffres*, or infidels, should not come into his country.

But Ebn-Raschid, who began to shew a great inclination to oblige us, from the moment he knew that we had a ferman from the Pasha of Egypt, (by whom he had been much employed in carrying wood from Cairo to Suez, for the purpose of building boats,) appeared firmly resolved to further our plan. Now, there arose a great dispute between the two Sheikhs, in the tent, which assumed a serious aspect; the Sheikh of Wadi Moosa, at length, starting up, vowed that if we should dare to pass through his lands, we should be shot like so many dogs. Our friend Mahomet mounted, and desired us to follow his example, which when he saw we had done, he grasped his spear and fiercely exclaimed, "I have set them on their horses, let me see who dare stop Ebn-Raschid." We rode along a valley, the people of Wadi Moosa, with their Sheikh at their head, continuing on the high ground to the left, in a parallel direction, watching our movements. In half an hour we halted at a spring, and were joined by about twenty horsemen, provided with lances, and thirty men on foot with match-lock guns, and a few double-mounted dromedaries, whose riders were well armed. On the arrival of this reinforcement, the chief, Ebn-Raschid, took an oath in the presence of his Arabs, swearing, "by the honour of their women, and by the beard of the Prophet, that we," pointing to our party, "should drink of the waters of Wadi Moosa, and go wherever we pleased in their accursed country." The Sheikhs, Yousouf and Salim, had remained behind; our good old friend, the former, thinking that

* The father of the Olive-tree.

we were doomed to destruction by our own rashness, as he had employed every argument, in vain, to induce us to desist from the undertaking. But both parties were equally pledged not to retreat, and nothing could exceed the obstinate resolution of our protector, the Sheikh Ebn-Raschid, which hitherto had been exerted in our behalf in the most disinterested manner, as he had as yet neither received nor been promised any remuneration. Having quitted the ravine, a most magnificent view opened upon us; the rugged peak of Mount Hor was seen towering over the dark mountains to our right; to the left, and before us, was a boundless expanse of desert; on the sloping sides of the hills close to us, were growing many carob trees, in a hollow of the trunk of one of which we found some good water. Soon afterwards we arrived at the tents of Ebn-Raschid, amounting to about seventy, pitched in three distinct circles.

As the tents of an Arab encampment are always of the same construction, a general description may serve for them all. They are made by the women, of goats' hair, mixed with that of the camel or coarse wool, and are usually twenty-five feet long and about fourteen feet wide. One half of each tent is allotted to the women, where all cooking takes place, and the other half is occupied by the males, a screen separating the females from view. In the division appropriated to the men during the day, the kids and lambs are driven for shelter during the cold nights of severe weather. The height of the tent is, in the centre, about six feet, sloping gradually to the sides, which are stretched out by cords. The middle is supported by three poles, attached to the ground by ropes, made also of goats' hair; the tents are pitched in an instant, and with so little regard to convenience of local situation, that large stones lying in the way are frequently enclosed within them. The sides of the tents are fastened to the upper part by wooden skewers, and can be taken off or put on at pleasure, according to the state of the weather. The furniture of these dwellings consists of different sized wooden bowls of the rudest workmanship, the common hand-mill of the East, two or three kettles of copper or iron, a few goat-skins to hold milk or water, cushions and carpets made by the women of coarse materials, but otherwise not inelegant. In the tent, the chief seat is generally indicated by the saddle of a dromedary, on which the Sheikh reclines. At sun-set, the flocks of sheep and goats are driven into the interior circle of the encampment, and are stationed near the tents of their respective

owners, the kids and lambs being fastened by a rope, pegged down, with nooses to prevent them from sucking their dams. Lastly, the camels enter majestically, and the old ones, of their own accord, kneel down close to the tents of their masters. In the morning, the she-camels are the first to be milked, affording a beverage which is immediately drunk; they are then driven out to feed upon the more scanty and distant herbage: afterwards, the sheep and goats being milked, are turned out to graze near the camp; and liberty is now given to the young ones to play about in the immediate vicinity.

Next morning we observed that our camp was situated near the edge of a high and precipitous cliff, from which the tents of some Arabs were visible in the hollow, and at its foot, a small village, where we were accustomed, during our stay here, to water our horses. In front of us was seen *Gebel-Nebe-Haroun** (Mount Hor), under which the black and frowning cliffs of Petra assumed the most fantastic shapes; in them we were able, by the help of a glass, to distinguish several ruins, amongst others what appeared to be an amphitheatre, and innumerable excavated tombs or temples.

From this eminence, *Gebel-Tour*, or Mount Sinai, was also pointed out to us in the farthest horizon, having the appearance of a small conical hill, and reported to be at the distance of three days' journey. The nearest extremity of the Red Sea was said to be at the distance of one day and a half.

These various objects, of such uncommon interest, excited our eager wish to proceed, and we awaited impatiently the return of the messenger who had been despatched by *Ebn-Raschid* early in the morning, to learn if the people of *Abou-Zeitun* were encamped at *Wadi Moosa*. At twelve o'clock the spy came back, and reported that our enemy had posted his men to guard the stream on both sides of the valley, in such a manner that he would not allow the shepherds of our Sheikh to water their flocks. We now sent a messenger to *Abou-Zeitun*, with a proposal that if they would allow us to pass, we would not touch their water; but he returned for answer, that we should neither pass through their lands nor drink of their water.†

* The Mountain of the Prophet Aaron.

† The manners and customs of the natives of these countries remain unchanged since the days of the passage of the children of Israel from Egypt into the Land of Promise; and it is from the striking

This message enraged still more our Sheikh, who, when we had advanced, in the morning, two miles further, to a point from whence we saw the village of Wadi Moosa, and the tents of our enemies above it, again sent to Abou-Zeitun, to demand if he would not obey the orders of the Sultan, and of the Pashas, and particularly of Mahmoud Ali, the Pasha of Cairo. At the same time, he despatched also a messenger to his own tents in the rear, and to the fortress of Shubac, with an order to bring up four hundred men, and a request that our friends, the Sheikhs Yousouf and Salim, would accompany them. At one o'clock the messenger to Abou-Zeitun returned with an unfavourable answer, saying that he was always ready to obey the ferman of the Sultan, and of the Pashas, but that he knew that our fermans were fabricated by Jews;* besides which he heard that we poisoned the waters, made the springs dry up, and that all Franks were necromancers. And he again swore, that while he lived we should never come there.

At this time, an old Sheikh, who was nearly blind, and of a poor and miserable appearance, but said to be of great authority among the Arabs of this part, visited our tents; and when he found the Sheikh Ebn-Raschid so much interested in our favour, he also declared himself in our behalf. At four o'clock the messenger who had been sent for the reinforcement, returned with the Arab troops, and the Sheikhs Yousouf and Salim at their head. They advanced in a line singing, the women in our tents

aptness, and peculiar felicity of expressions which constantly occur in the books of the Old Testament, that, even without adverting to the feelings of devotion inspired by the sacred authority of the Scriptures, the Bible is, beyond all comparison, the most interesting and the most instructive guide that can be consulted by the traveller in the East.

We were now in the land of Edom, to the king of which country Moses sent messengers from Kadesh. See *Numbers*, chap. xx. 17, 18.

V. 17. "Let us pass," said he, "I pray thee, through thy country; we will not pass through the fields, or through the vineyards, neither will we drink of the water of the wells: we will go by the king's high-way; we will not turn to the right hand nor to the left, until we have passed thy borders.

18. "And Edom said unto him, Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword."

* Alluding, we supposed, to Maleem Heim and his brothers, who hold high situations under the Pashas of Acre and Damascus, and are supposed to be their chief advisers.

greeting their arrival with the loud and prolonged scream with which they always animate their husbands to the fight. When the two Skeikhs had taken possession of the tents allotted them, Yousouf drew me aside, and earnestly entreated me to use my influence with my companions to induce them to give up the design and quietly return. A violent storm of rain, with thunder and lightning, came on, and we were completely drenched in our tents. My interpreter was now sent with the present of a blunderbuss to Ebn-Raschid, saying, that as it seemed impossible to execute our project without the loss of blood, a circumstance that would probably be fatal to all our party, we requested that he would consent to conduct us back. The spirited Sheikh, however, declined the present till he had performed his promise, and vowed "by God and the Prophet, that we should not return till we had seen the *hasna*, or treasury of the temple of Pharaoh, in Wadi Moosa." Thus matters remained that night.

On the following morning, 26th, our affairs wore a better aspect: three people from Haman,* a town on the *Darab-el-Hadg*† in the desert, arrived at our tents, for the purpose of inspecting our fermans, and they were satisfied that they were genuine. Abou-Zeitun, having heard of this, consented to allow us to pass to Wadi Moosa, though not to drink of the water; and, in token of peace, he and all his attendants were seen advancing towards our camp with a piece of white cotton attached to a spear. Sheikh Yousouf, finding now that there was no immediate danger of bloodshed, became very eloquent in our behalf, saying, that the sole object of our journey was to visit the tomb of Aaron; and when questioned by the Arabs, if we were Mahometans, cunningly replied, "They are English, and did they not drive the French from Acre, and out of Egypt?" and again had recourse to the ostentatious display of our fermans, a ceremony so often repeated, that it was with difficulty we preserved the necessary gravity on the occasion.

Accompanied by Ebn-Raschid and about twenty horsemen, we descended into a valley, and came to the stream that had been the subject of so much contention, above which stood the

* Probably the *Maan* of Burckhardt; see p. 437 above, and also p. 277.—ED.

† The road of the pilgrims to Mecca.

mud village of Wadi Moosa.* The natives appeared to have evacuated the village, and were seen on a height in tents, observing the movements of our party. The stream of water was clear and rapid, but after a short course disappeared under the accumulated fragments of rock that had been detached for ages from the surrounding precipices. Our conductor, Ebn-Raschid, with an air of triumph, insisted on our watering our horses at the rivulet; and while we halted for that purpose, we examined a sepulchre excavated in the rock to the right of the road. It was of considerable dimensions: at the entrance of the open court that led to the inner chamber were represented two animals, resembling lions or sphinxes, but much disfigured, of colossal size. In the sides of the interior apartment were cut deep niches. As this was the first object of curiosity that presented itself, we began to measure its dimensions; but our guides grew impatient, and said, that if we intended to be so accurate in our survey of all the extraordinary places we should see, we should not finish in ten thousand years. We remounted our horses, and rode into a most sombre and terrific pass, varying from eight to fifteen feet in width; the sides of which were formed by completely perpendicular precipices, rising to the height of from two hundred to five hundred feet—occasionally the lofty summits alternately inclined towards each other, so as often to exclude almost entirely the light from above. In some places niches were sculptured in the sides of the rocks, in which statues had probably formerly been placed; and we saw frequent representations of rude stones, mysterious symbols of an indefinite figure, detached in relief from the body of the rock. Water-courses, or earthen pipes, situated at various heights, were observable on either hand of the pass: the tamarisk, oleander, wild fig, and other shrubs, obstructed the passage below, or hung from crevices in the cliffs above. When we had proceeded rather more than half a mile, on looking up, an arch, perhaps belonging to an aqueduct, was seen connecting the opposite precipices. We continued to explore the gloomy winding passage for the distance of about two miles, gradually descending, when the beautiful façade of a temple burst on our view. A statue of Victory, with wings, filled the centre of an aperture like an attic window; and groups of colossal figures, representing a centaur and a young man, were placed on each side of a

* This seems to be the village called *Eldjy* by Burckhardt; see p. 423 above.—Ed.

portico of lofty proportion, comprising two stories, and deficient in nothing but a single column. The temple was entirely excavated from the solid rock, and preserved from the ravages of time and the weather by the massive projections of the natural cliffs above, in a state of exquisite and inconceivable perfection. But the interior chambers were comparatively small, and appeared unworthy of so magnificent a portico. On the summit of the front was placed a vase, hewn also out of the solid rock, conceived by the Arabs to be filled with the most valuable treasure, and shewing, in the numerous shot-marks on its exterior, so many proofs of their avidity; for it is so situated as to be inaccessible to other attacks. This was the *hasna*, or treasure of Pharaoh, as it is called by the natives, which Ebn-Raschid, our conductor, swore "we should behold." While Mr Bankes was employed in sketching the temple, my two friends, Captains Irby and Mangles, climbed with great difficulty up some broken steps on the left of the edifice, to the top of the rocks; and reported, on their descent, that they had seen, at some distance to the westward, a vase of colossal dimensions, probably belonging to another temple.

In front, but rather to the right of the temple, were many excavated chambers. Leaving this splendid monument on the left hand, we continued for about three hundred yards in the same narrow and awful pass, when we reached more excavated apartments, and at the termination of the rock to the left, arrived at the amphitheatre we had seen from the Arab camp during our negotiation with Abou-Zeitun. Thirty-three steps (*gradini*) were to be counted, but unfortunately the proscenium not having been excavated like the other parts, but built, was in ruins; so that we had here also to regret, as in most other similar monuments, the absence of that portion of an ancient theatre. A large open space now presented itself, strewn over with fragments of tiles, bricks, and the rubbish of former buildings. The only edifice of consequence was on the left of the area, which had the appearance of a palace; the rocks which enclosed the space on all sides, with the exception of the north-east, were hollowed out into innumerable chambers of different dimensions, whose entrances were variously, richly, and often fantastically decorated with every imaginable order of architecture.*

* The city of Petra, in the time of Augustus, was the residence of a king, who governed the Nabathæi, or inhabitants of Arabia Pe-

I abstain from attempting to enter into a more minute account of the wonders of this extraordinary spot, conscious as I am of my own inability to do them justice, and because the public will probably soon be favoured with a much more detailed and accurate description of them from the pen of Mr Bankes, whose zeal, intelligence, and unwearied assiduity in copying inscriptions, delineating remains of antiquity, and ascertaining points of curious classical research, cannot be surpassed. The chief aim of my narrative will be to endeavour to give the reader some insight into the mode of life followed by the wandering tribes of Arabs we fell in with, and to relate the adventures of a journey not in the usual route of ordinary travelling.

Taking a south-westerly direction from the ruined palace, we arrived at the foot of Mount Hor, at three in the afternoon; where, finding an Arab boy tending some goats, he offered to conduct us to the summit for a small remuneration. The ascent was rugged and difficult in the extreme, and it occupied us one hour and a half to climb up the almost perpendicular sides. A crippled Arab hermit, about eighty years of age, the one half of which time he had spent on the top of the mountain, living on the donations of the few Mohammedan pilgrims who resort thither, and the charity of the native shepherds who supply him with water and milk, conducted us into the small white building, crowned by a cupola, that contains the tomb of Aaron. The monument is of stone, about three feet high, and the venerable Arab, having lighted a lamp, led us down some steps to a chamber below, hewn out of the rock, but containing nothing extraordinary. Against the walls of the upper apartment, where stood the tomb, were suspended beads, bits of cloth and leather, votive offerings left by the devotees; on one side, let into the wall, we were shewn a dark looking stone that was reputed to possess considerable virtues in the cure of diseases, and to have formerly served as a seat to the prophet.

From the summit of Mount Hor, amongst a chain of mountains extending from east to west, Mount Sinai was clearly dis-

træa. This country was conquered by Trajan, and annexed by him to Palestine; but it afterwards formed a particular province, called the Third Palestine, or Salutaris. In more modern times, Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem, becoming master of Petra, gave it the name of Mons Regalis. [The writer here confounds Wady Mousa with Shobak, which was the *Mons Regalis* of the crusaders; see the Histor. Introd. p. 269 above.—Ed.]

tinguishable ; to the westward was an expanse of boundless desert ; to the east were the high cliffs from whence we had caught the first glimpse of the situation of Petra, and behind which were pitched the tents we had left ; below us were the dark and rugged rocks that we had just explored. From this point also we perceived the temple to the north, to which belonged the great vase that had been observed by Captains Irby and Mangles. We descended, and, late in the evening, and greatly fatigued, reached some tents, about four miles to the north-east of the mountain, where we were to sleep that night. Here a curious scene occurred ; the bridles of our horses were seized by three or four different hands, each Arab striving to claim us as his guests ; when it was decided who should have the honour of entertaining ourselves and giving barley to our horses, we, with some difficulty, made our way after Ebn-Raschid, who was borne away to a tent by the torrent of our hosts. The following morning, the 27th, having purchased a sheep, we returned to the ruins of Petra, which we examined more at our leisure ; when the discovery of other ravines and of more numerous excavations rewarded our search, and filled us with astonishment. But notwithstanding we made many attempts to approach the temple we had plainly seen from Mount Hor, and on the summit of which was fixed the vase observed by us at a distance, we were unable to succeed, from the constant succession of intervening chasms and the inextricable confusion of the various ravines in which we got entangled. We had left orders that our sheep should be cooked by a certain hour, and on reaching the appointed spot where we were to dine, were not a little astonished to find that, after its throat had been cut, it had been thrust into a large pot, without even having its wool or entrails removed. That night we returned to the tents where we had slept the preceding evening, but met with a very different reception. The eager hospitality of the day before was exchanged for the most undisguised rapacity ; we had bought the sheep, and the Arabs, finding that we possessed money, set no bounds to their demands. Every article was to be paid for at an exorbitant rate, and no sum seemed sufficient to gratify their avarice. But this was the only occasion, during our stay among the Arabs, on which a pecuniary remuneration was expected from us, in exchange for the rites of hospitality : the bargains we were in the habit of making with the different Sheikhs, covered all other expenses, and while we travelled under their protection, they considered us as their guests.

May 28. At an early hour, with the weather exceedingly cold, we returned to the tents, where we had lodged the first night after we left Shubac, and where the Sheikhs Yousouf and Salim were waiting our arrival with some degree of anxiety.

Here we were to take leave of Ebn-Raschid, who, by his intrepid and disinterested conduct, had completely won our esteem, and our regret at parting appeared to be mutual. We rewarded him with four hundred piastres, and made a present to his brother of fifty piastres. To the courage of Ebn-Raschid we were indebted for a sight of the wonders of Petra; though, perhaps, a spirit of animosity, on his part, against the Arabs of Wadi Moosa, had its share in exciting him to assist us in our undertaking. It appeared that a free access to the water in the neighbourhood of that village, had long been a subject of contention between the two Arab tribes, and this was probably thought a good opportunity to decide the dispute. On taking leave of the Sheikh, he regretted that he could not accompany us to Shubac, but gave us his iron truncheon, to be shewn on our arrival there, to ensure us a proper reception. That evening Sheikhs Yousouf and Salim accompanied us to Shubac, and early on the next day, the 29th, we set out on our return to Karrac, which we now began to look upon as our home: we returned by a route different from that by which we had come. On ascending from a valley, in which we had travelled during two hours, we fell in with a swarm of locusts on the ground, benumbed by the extreme coldness of the wind, and strewed so thickly that our horses could not pass over without trampling upon them. In the evening we reached the tents we had formerly occupied on our road to Petra, where we slept, and met with the same hospitable reception as before.

May 30. This day we travelled in a north-westerly direction, and reached a village where we stopped for the night, and were well treated. The Arabs inquired if we had brought back the treasure from Petra, and offered us a *bournous* and a watch for sale, which we supposed to have belonged to some unfortunate Moors who had been murdered in the ravine of Petra, by the inhabitants of Wadi Moosa, on their return from Mecca to Gaza. Here we were feasted with camels' milk, and a pilau of rice; the latter dish had become rather a treat. Our direction to-day was north, and in the evening we entered the camp of Sheikh Salim, from whom we parted the next morning. He had never been a great favourite with us, and Sheikh Yousouf

told us, when we were alone, that he was of a bad character. About mid-day, *June* the 1st, our party was the cause of alarm to two Arabs, who saw us approach, and, fixing their handkerchiefs on the tops of their spears, shouted to some of their brethren in tents at a distance, but Sheikh Yousouf quieted their fears. To-day we crossed the valley of Elassar, and bathed in the hot baths of Solomon, situated on the southern side nearly at the bottom, near some corn-fields, where one of our Arabs having plucked some green ears of corn, parched them for us, by putting them in the fire, and then, when roasted, rubbed out the grain in his hands.*

That night we halted in a camp belonging to the village of Khanzeer, where was the young bride of the old Sheikh Yousouf. Here I lost my Bible, which was probably stolen by my friend Yousouf, or his father-in-law; for the latter sent to me to say, that if I would give him an oka of coffee, (equal to two pounds and a quarter,) worth eighteen piastres, he would return it. We remained in these tents the next day, and on the following evening arrived at Karrac. The country we had passed over from Shubac, consisted of downs well adapted to pasturage, and in some places tolerably cultivated with wheat and barley.

The people of Karrac were employed in bringing their harvest into the fortress, and the house of the Sheikh was full of Anasee Arabs,† who had come with their camels from the east to procure corn. To compliment Yousouf, with whom their tribe had lately had some disputes, they had brought him, as a present, an iron truncheon, by which they acknowledged his dignity as a chief; and, in return for this mark of respect, he bestowed upon them six camel loads of wheat and six of barley, together with a sword of value and a *benish* for their own Sheikh.

A further examination of the southern extremity of the Dead Sea occupied the attention of the rest of the party during a few days after our return to Karrac; but I accompanied Yousouf to the tents of his son Ismael, distant some hours from the town, with the intention of hunting the antelope, and to have further opportunities of witnessing the manners of the Arabs. It appears

* This practice we frequently witnessed; it is mentioned also in the Old Testament:—"And she sat beside the reapers, and he reached her parched corn, and she did eat and was sufficed, and left."—*Ruth* ch. 2, v. 14.

† The *Aeneze* of Burckhardt—Ed.

that the office of Sheikh is generally hereditary, though it does not necessarily descend to the eldest son; and quarrels among the rival children, who dispute the succession of the father, are not uncommon. The tribute paid to the chief by the Arabs of his tribe, consists of every tenth sheep or goat born, every twentieth camel, and a certain portion of all plunder taken. The neighbourhood of Karrac is extremely fertile, producing great crops of wheat and barley; the first is usually cut with a sickle, the latter pulled up by the roots; the harvest is then carried on asses and camels into the fortress, where it is trod out by oxen and horses; for the inhabitants dare not perform this process in the fields, lest they should be attacked by some of the wandering hordes.

Amongst the presents sent by Nasar, the chief of the Anasees, to our Sheikh Yousouf, was a very powerful mare, about fifteen hands three inches high; but we had seen a fine grey horse of sixteen hands high, in the possession of Sheikh Salim, which he valued at one thousand piastres.* Their horses are usually shod. As a remedy for sand-cracks, they employ sour milk, in which is dissolved a great quantity of salt; this mixture, in a boiling state, is poured into the crack, and, as it appeared, with a very good effect. In their own persons, they have recourse to the use of the actual cautery: in the case of a sprain, for instance, they mix up a ball of camels' dung and sand, and, when red-hot, apply it to the part affected. I never saw an example of leprosy among them.

Their sheep are large, with short fine wool and fat tails; the colour of their goats generally black. To fetch water from the wells, the women are employed in driving the asses, which are always kept in the immediate neighbourhood of their tents, and these animals are also used in carrying the light furniture of their camps. On these occasions of moving their stations, the children are placed in panniers suspended on each side of the camels, which the mothers ride upon and guide. The wives of the Sheikh, amounting to three or four, according to his riches, are mounted in a sort of wicker bower, which screens them from the sun and observation. An Arab, in general, has, however, but one wife; though a Sheikh, in addition to his plurality of wives, possesses male and female black slaves, procured from Egypt. A few oxen are kept for ploughing; but, except in the villages, it is rare to meet with cows.

* Compare Burckhardt's account, p. 401 above.—ED.

With respect to the dress of the Arabs, the better sort among them have sheep-skin pelisses hanging half way down their thighs, the wool worn inside, and the exterior skin tanned of a reddish-brown colour. The *abba*, or outer garment, is sometimes black, at others with broad or narrow stripes of black, brown, or yellow colours; attached to a leathern belt, worn round their waist, is a pocket containing their flint and steel, and the matches used for their muskets. The substance employed for this latter purpose is procured from the oscar plant*, which grows near the eastern shores of the Dead Sea, to the size of a small tree, producing a fruit juicy and delicious to the eye, but hollow within, or filled with a grating matter disagreeable to the palate. The filaments contained within the fruit are employed by the natives to stuff their cushions, or as tinder for their match-lock guns, and are said to be combustible even without being impregnated with sulphur. Most of the Arabs go barefooted, but the richer wear sandals of leather, or untanned hide. Their manner of eating, as described before, is extremely uncleanly; and as they are frequently without water sufficient to wash themselves after a repast, they rub their hands with sand and then wipe them on the sides of their tents. The vermin with which their persons are infested, and the manner in which they endeavour to get rid of them, are in the highest degree disgusting. One of their chief articles of diet is *lebbin*, or sour milk; they form besides balls of curds, mixed with a great deal of salt and dried in the sun, on the tops of their tents; of this kind of cheese they occasionally make also a beverage by dissolving it in water.

The common Bedouens seldom pray, but superstitiously carry about their necks bits of paper, upon which characters are written by travelling dervishes, supposed to possess various virtues, among others, that of warding off the evil eye. Old Yousof was, however, more regular in his devotions, and during the whole of our journey with him, observed the stated periods of prayer, with his face religiously turned towards Mecca. We were on such good terms with the Sheikh, that though it is a custom with a Mahometan when he prays, to take care that an infidel is not interposed between him and the sacred temple of the Prophet at Mecca; and if that cannot be avoided, to put a

* Called by Seetzen *aoeschaer*, and supposed by him to be the *poma Sodomæ*.

sword, or some other weapon of that sort, between him and the stranger; yet Yousouf shewed us the respect to omit that precaution; and once, when one of his attendants, happening to come into the tent during his devotions, placed a ramrod in that situation, the Sheikh himself took it up and laid it on one side. On parting I gave him a pocket compass, and as the situation of Karrac is nearly due north from Mecca, his satisfaction at such a present was not to be expressed, as he now said he should always know precisely how to place himself at the hour of prayer.

When my companions returned from their excursion to the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, we were all amused by being present in the tents of Ismael at a sort of court of inquiry and judgment held by his father the Sheikh Yousouf. The dispute was this:—Some of the people belonging to his son had, on a predatory excursion to the Hauran, a district to the north of Karrac, distant more than one hundred miles, carried off about sixty cows;* and two natives of that country, together with a man from Salt, were come to reclaim them at the hands of the chief of the tribe. But notions of equity were not very firmly rooted in the mind of Yousouf; and, after great shuffling and prevarication on his part, the utmost that could be obtained from the partial judge, was a restitution of the half of the cattle, with which decision the sufferers were very ill content. We were feasted by the Greek priest, who had received us so well on our first arrival at Karrac; and, on the 5th of June, left that town, still under the protection of Yousouf, accompanied by his son Ismael, Daoud his nephew, the two men from the Hauran, and the man from Salt. A fine flat country, with corn growing luxuriantly around us, which reapers were employed in cutting, and offering various prospects of ruined towns, indicating that the population had formerly been much more considerable than at present, brought us in two hours to Rabbah, anciently Rabbath-

* This distant excursion of this plundering horde, in which they must have passed through the territories of other tribes, serves finely to illustrate the manner in which, in ancient times, the nomadic nations adjacent to Palestine were wont to make inroads into that country. Compare particularly the account of the surprise of Ziklag, 1 Sam. c. 30. Similar to this also, though on a larger scale, was probably the manner in which the Idumeans became masters of Bozrah, see p.258, 266, above; and the Arabians of Damascus under Aretas, see p. 266.—ED.

Moab,* and afterwards called Areopolis, the capital of the Moabites, a celebrated country that extended to the east of the Asphaltite Lake. There are no traces of walls observable; but on an eminence are two ruined Roman temples, and some tanks. A small Christian camp, pitched near the hill, offered us accommodation for the night; and, on the following day, at the distance of one mile and a half from Rabbah, we saw, among the ruins of Bart-el-Carn, a large structure, that reminded us of the palace of Petra, and was apparently of Roman architecture. The forty cattle that had been restored to the people of the Hauran, formed part of our caravan; but their drivers, who were by no means satisfied with the interested decision of Yousouf, told us he was a robber, and threatened that "they would drag him by the beard to Mezerub."

From the heights on which we now were, we enjoyed many fine views of the Dead Sea, whose clear unruffled surface, of a dark aspect from the reflection of the impending rocks on its coast, was seen below us—beyond, Jericho, the valley of the Jordan, Jerusalem, and the Mountain of the Franks; and to the south, the marshy country that terminates the lake in that direction. The prospect from this eminence, embracing as it did, the whole extent of the sea, convinced us that its length has been greatly overrated, and that instead of seventy-five or eighty miles, the usual estimate, it cannot exceed forty miles.

On the 8th, proceeding northward, we reached the Wadi Mosit,† the valley of the ancient torrent Arnon. The remains of an ancient Roman bridge, of which one single arch alone is standing, were observable at the foot of the difficult path that brought us to the bottom of the precipice that overhangs the Naher-Arnon, and on ascending the opposite steep bank, we had left the country of the Moabites and were in that of the Amorites. This day we saw many Roman mile-stones, and frequent traces of a road of the same period.

The country was a plain district covered with smooth even turf, and we continued along the Roman road till we reached Dibân, the Dibon of the Old Testament. Our progress to-day was much impeded by the extreme heat and suffocating sensa-

* Burckhardt and Seetzen both state the distance between Rabbah and Kerek at six hours; see p. 286 above. The difference arises in part, probably, from the different rate and mode of travelling.—Ed.

† The *Modjeb* of Burckhardt

tion occasioned by the *kamsin*, or wind of the desert, which literally raised a fog of sand, and exceeded in its intolerable nuisance, as old Yousouf said, any thing he had ever felt before. We reached a camp in the Wadi-Wale, the valley of a river that seemed to be liable to sudden and destructive torrents, to judge from the great number of oleanders which were torn up by the roots. Near the banks of the Wale were two rude stones placed upright, probably the boundary stones of the ancient inhabitants of the country. Higher up the stream than the place where we crossed, a knoll was observable, on which was placed a quadrangular platform, made of rough stones, without cement; and about a mile lower down the valley, were the remains of a Roman bridge, formerly of five arches, but the foundations of the piers are all that are now to be distinguished.

Passing by the foot of Mount-Nebo, from the summit of which Moses had a prospect of the Promised Land, we entered a fertile plain cultivated with corn, and stopped at a camp near the ruins of Maëin,* near some springs of hot water. From an eminence in the neighbourhood we had a commanding view of the Dead Sea, and saw below us a ruin of a square form, which from its position might be Herodium. We took a guide from the tents near Maëin to conduct us to the hot springs, anciently called Callirhoë. Our route was south-west, and we saw on our road, near a rocky knoll, about fifty sepulchral monuments, of the rudest construction and of the highest antiquity. Four unhewn stones, covered by one large block, probably covered the ornaments or weapons of the ancient Amorites. At the distance of a mile beyond, we came to the bed of the torrent Zerka Maëin, where we saw ten animals, a species of antelope, but of the size of our red deer. In four hours from Maëin we reached the brink of a precipice, down the sides of which a narrow zigzag path was cut, which brought us, after some difficulty, to the thicket of canes, aspines, and palms, that grow out of the crevices of the rocks, whence issue the numerous springs of hot water we were in search of. In one part, a copious stream precipitates itself from a high and perpendicular rock, the sides of which are coloured of a brilliant yellow, from the deposit of sulphur with which the water is impregnated. A hot rapid tor-

* The *Mayn*, and so the *Zerka Mayn*, of Burckhardt. In connexion with the hot springs of Callirhoë, compare the Art. *ΑΝΑΗ* in Calmet's Dict.—Ed.

rent, receiving from all sides in its course fresh supplies of scalding water, flows at the bottom. From the confined situation of the spot, the steam from the water, and the rays of the burning sun, a most insufferable heat was produced; but unfortunately the day before, my thermometer, the only one possessed by the party, was found broken, and we were consequently unable to ascertain precisely the temperature of the stream. It was not possible to hold the hand in the water, even for half a minute: the deposition of sulphur was very considerable. There does not appear to have been space enough in the valley for any buildings; though Herod, who is supposed to have visited this spot for the purpose of bathing, must have had some accommodation. The distance from the springs to the Dead Sea, was estimated at about two hours.

While here, our Arab guide took a vapour-bath, after the following manner:—Over a crevice, whence issued one of the springs, a bed of twigs and broom was laid, at the distance of about a foot from the water, upon which he placed himself, enveloped only in his *abba*, and remained in that state for several minutes. In the immediate vicinity of these hot sources, we saw some of the most curious plants.

From Callirhoé we returned by the same road to Medaba, near which was a great encampment of the Benesakars Arabs, consisting of more than two hundred tents, under the command of the chief Ebn-Fayes. In the tent of the Sheikh, which was about one hundred feet long, we found Ebn-Fayes and his brother, who were not a little astonished at the boldness of my companions in thus venturing again among them, after the example they had had of their former faithless conduct. These were the Arabs with whom Mr Bankes and Captains Irby and Mangles had made a contract on their first attempt to reach Petra, and from whose hands they had so fortunately escaped previous to my arrival at Jerusalem. In the camp we saw a messenger who had been despatched from the Pasha of Damascus, to invite the chief, Ebn-Fayes, to come to that city for the purpose of entering into a contract with him for camels, and making arrangements to carry the *Hadg*, or convey the pilgrims from Damascus to Mecca. This was a service that had formerly been done by the Anasee Arabs, but they were now at war with the Pasha, and, as the next powerful tribe to them, the Benesakars were applied to, to undertake that sacred employment.

From Madaba, where is a large tank of hewn stone, we proceeded to the extensive Christian ruins of Umerassas, situated in a district now in the possession of the Anasees, by whom one of our party was attacked, and robbed of his *abba*, in a most violent and outrageous manner. We had proceeded alone into this part of the country, and did not rejoin our friend Yousouf, and the man of Salt, till the next day, when we found them in the tent of the Prince of the Benesakars, at Hesbon.

The prince of this tribe made various attempts to extort from us a considerable sum of money, for permission to visit the celebrated pools in this neighbourhood; but, by timely resistance, we succeeded, at length, in obtaining free leave to go thither, though there was little to be seen. The ruins are of small extent, and the only pool we observed was extremely insignificant.—In two of the cisterns amongst the ruins, we saw many bones and human skulls.

On the 13th, we left Hesbon; and, taking the road to Salt, arrived, in four hours, at Arrag-el-Emir, where are the ruins of an edifice built of very large stones, some of them twenty feet in length. Around it were traces of hanging gardens, and large caves cut in a long range of perpendicular cliffs, some apparently intended as stalls for horses, and others for the accommodation of a numerous retinue of servants; representations of various beasts were sculptured in relief about the building. We spent the morning here, and slept at an adjoining camp.

On the 14th, continuing our route through a richly-wooded and picturesque country, we arrived, early in the afternoon, at Salt*, where we lodged in the castle. At the distance of ten hours from Salt, in a direction E. S. E. are the ruins of Rabbath-Ammon, afterwards called Philadelphia, probably from a Philadelphus, king of Egypt, but now known by an appellation derived from its original one, Amman. It was the principal city of the Ammonitæ. The ruins are those of a theatre, an odeum, a colonnade to the eastern side of the river Nahr-Ammon, and, to the west, a large building with columns, from twenty to twenty-two feet high. There are many other smaller remains, but we found no inscriptions. We passed the night of the 17th in an Arab camp, about three miles distant from Amman, on the road to Jerrasch.

* This is written by Burckhart Szalt. This traveller visited and has described the ruins of Rabbath-Ammon, or Philadelphia. See his *Travels in Syria*, etc. p. 357.—ED.

Here our conductor, Yousouf, who had been persuaded to accompany us from Salt, by an additional bribe of two hundred piastres, was accused of having stolen cattle from these people four years ago. There was much disputing among them, and the Sheikh had recourse to every subterfuge to evade the accusation; but, at length, unable to deny the fact, he concluded by saying, "he was one of those men who never returned any thing after it was once in his power."

June 18. After accompanying us two hours on our road, Yousouf took his leave to return to Karrac. We had travelled so long in his company, and witnessed such extraordinary scenes together, that it was not possible to see him depart without some little regret, though he had latterly behaved very indifferently, and convinced us, on many occasions, that honesty has no place whatever among the virtues of an Arab. As soon as he left us we crossed the Zerka (the Jabbok of Scripture), the northern boundary of the country of the Amorites; and, two hours after mid-day, arrived at the ruins of Jerrash.

These ruins lie E. S. E. from Bisan, (Bethsan,) at the distance of eighteen hours, and are of a beauty and magnificence that greatly exceed those of Palmyra: a grand colonnade runs from the eastern gate to the west, formed on both sides by marble pillars with Corinthian capitals, and terminating in a semicircle of sixty columns of the Ionic order. At the western extremity stands a theatre, of which the proscenium is preserved. The first colonnade is crossed by another, running from north to south. Two superb amphitheatres of marble, three other temples, and the ruins of some palaces, together with many Greek inscriptions, are also to be observed. All the edifices of the city are of the period of the most beautiful architecture, and conjectured to be of the date of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

From Jerrash we took the road to the valley of the Jordan, through a very picturesque country, most beautifully wooded with the Asiatic oak (*vallonia*), the arbutus, the cedar, etc. Some spots were cultivated with corn, but the long grass, through which we had to make our way, abounded in venomous serpents.

On the following day we arrived at the village of Rajeb, situated without and below the woodland scenery, and reached the valley of the Jordan at two o'clock in the afternoon. The dis-

tance hence to the ford of Bisan is four hours, and we entered the town of that name as it became dark.

On the 21st we reached Tiberias, a small walled city with only one gate of entrance, containing a great number of Christians, and distant about sixty miles from Acre. From Mount Tabor, where we were on the 23d, the distance to Nazareth is four hours, and the *padre superiore* of the convent at the latter place received us with great hospitality.

On the 25th, we entered Acre. Here our party was to separate, Captains Irby and Mangles intending to sail in a Venetian brig to Constantinople, and Mr Bankes proposing to return to Egypt.

[From this place Mr Legh made a very rapid journey to Damascus and Palmyra; of which he gives a hasty sketch in the few pages which remain of his narration. The account of the journey from Kerek to Acre, although not relating to Idumea, has been given here, both for the sake of its intrinsic interest, and also because it would hardly bear to be separated from the body of the narrative. We hope to refer to it again hereafter.—ED.]

ART. II. THE GODHEAD OF THE MESSIAH AS TAUGHT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Translated from Hengstenberg's "Christologie." By George Howe, Prof. of Bib. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. Columbia, S. C.

THAT the Messiah, according to the predictions of the prophets, would possess a perfect human nature, will be doubted by no one. He was not to make himself known by a transcendent appearance, like Jehovah and the angels under the Old Testament; but he would be born, Is. 7: 14. Mic. 5: 3, and grow up by degree, Is. 11 and 53. In consequence of his human nature and descent he is called a Branch of David, Jer. 23: 5. 33: 15; the *Root-sprout** of Jesse, Is. 11: 1; the Fruit of the Land, Is. 4: 2.

* *Wurzelschössling, a sprout from the root.*

There is less agreement in respect to the question, whether *the doctrine of the Godhead of the Messiah* is already contained in the Old Testament. The negative is pretty generally maintained by the more recent interpreters. So Hufnagel,¹ Bretschneider,² Ammon,³ Baumgarten Crusius,⁴ De Wette,⁵ Gesenius,⁶ and others; both of which last mentioned writers nevertheless recognize a divine nature of the Messiah in Dan. 7: 13, 14. On the other hand, the existence of the doctrine in the Old Testament has been maintained, not only by the ancient church, but by Michaelis,⁷ Jahn,⁸ Rosenmueller,⁹ Knapp,¹⁰ Pareaux,¹¹ Hahn,¹² and others.

First of all, there can be no doubt, that Christ himself found this doctrine in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. He proves in Matt. 22: 41 sq. the Godhead of the Messiah from Psalm 110, in opposition to the Pharisees, who were expecting a Messiah who should be merely human. It is perfectly obvious, that without this supposition, his whole argument is entirely without meaning. And assertions, such as that he merely purposed to incite those who heard him, to investigate what foundation there was in the Bible for the belief in the Messiah; or that he was only asserting the firm foundation of a higher view and hope respecting the Messiah, (which last words do not even express a clear and definite thought,) find a sufficient refutation in an unbiassed view of the passage.

Yet aside from this testimony of Christ, the views of the later interpreters are shown, by a free examination of passages from the Old Testament, to have proceeded from theological prepossessions. There are not wanting passages which show, that with the human nature of the Messiah, the divine nature was supposed to be united. For they ascribe to him either names, or attributes, or actions, which belong to God exclusively; and this too, sometimes, with a distinct contrasting of what in him is divine, with what is human. We unite these passages here in one gen-

¹ Bibl. Theol. I. p. 373 et seq.

² Dogmat. I. p. 429.

³ Bibl. Theol. und Einheit der evang. Kirche II. 2. p. 61.

⁴ Bibl. Theol. p. 379 et seq.

⁵ Dogm. I. § 188, 200.

⁶ On Is. 9: 5.

⁷ Dogm. Tüb. 1785.

⁸ Vaticc. Mess. II. p. 235.

⁹ On Is. 7: 14. 9: 5. Mic. 5: 1.

¹⁰ Dogm. I. p. 226 seq.

¹¹ Instit. Interp. V. T. p. 194.

¹² Dogm. p. 215 sq.

eral view; while we refer the reader to our comments upon them, to be found elsewhere in this work.

In Ps. 2: 7 the Messiah is called the Son of God in a *proper*, not in a figurative sense. In v. 12, the right of punishing his enemies is attributed to him, and the insurgents are admonished to seek his protection. In Ps. 45: 7, 8, the Messiah is called God. In Ps. 110: 1 David calls him his Lord. In v. 5 he receives the name אֱדֹנָי, which is appropriated to God alone, and the right of punishing his enemies is assigned to him.

In Is. 4: 2 the Messiah is called צֶמַח יְהוָה, *the Branch of Jehovah*, i. e. the Son of God. In contrast with this designation of his divine nature, he is called with respect to his human nature, פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ, *the Fruit of the land* [of Judah], i. e. he who is to be born into Judah, or to proceed from the house of Judah. In c. 7: 14, the human nature is denoted by the child to be born of a virgin, and the divine nature by the name Immanuel, *Deus in terra*, the God incarnate. Especially are the marks of the divine nature of the Messiah accumulated in Is. 9: 5 (6). He there first receives the name מֵאֲמָנָה *wonder*, to denote that his being and his actions are exalted above the common course of nature; then, the name אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר *the mighty God*; then, *Father of Eternity*, i. e. the Eternal. On the other hand, his human nature and origin are pointed out by the words, "To us a child is born." In v. 6 as in Ps. 72, eternity is attributed to the Messiah and to his reign. In Is. 11: 14, divine omnipotence in the exercise of punitive justice is ascribed to him. As God, he executes punishments by his almighty word. And according to v. 10, the heathen nations will seek the Messiah in religious worship.

In Micah 5: 1 (2), *his eternal pre-existence* is announced, in contrast with his origin in time from the town of Bethlehem, and with his birth from a woman. "But thou Bethlehem—out of thee shall He come forth unto me, whose going forth is from the beginning and from eternity." In v. 3 (4), the power and majesty of Jehovah are attributed to him. In Hos. 3: 5, it is said, "Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek after the Lord their God and David their King," meaning by David the Messiah. Here the language must be understood of a religious seeking; for it is said in the same words, that the Israelites will seek Jehovah and the Messiah. The verb בָּקַשׁ commonly signifies a striving to be united with God, and to attain to the possession of his favour. Probably too in the same

verse the phrase טוב יהוה, *the Goodness of Jehovah*, in other words, the Revealer of his Majesty, is to be understood as a name of the Messiah.—The passage in Mal. 3: 1 especially, is very clear. Jehovah says there, that he will send out his messenger, who will prepare the way before *Him*; and immediately it is intimated that after this has taken place, the *Messiah* will appear. The appearing of the Messiah and the appearing of Jehovah, are thus identified. The Messiah receives the name יהוה, which, as is pretty generally admitted, is applied only to the Supreme God. Now to this Supreme God, the Leader of the Theocracy, the King of Israel, the temple is ever ascribed as his peculiar property. But according to this passage of Malachi, the temple is the property of the Messiah. He then must be truly God, and must be united with Jehovah, by an intrinsic oneness of essence. In v. 2 et seq. there is attributed to him a divine work, which is elsewhere always ascribed to Jehovah, viz. the punishment of the ungodly.

Daniel also, in c. 7: 13, 14, recognizes the union of the human and superhuman nature in the Messiah. In respect to form, he is indeed like a man, but he appears in the clouds of heaven.

There are many allusions to the Messiah's participating in the divine nature, and to the mysterious oneness subsisting between him and Jehovah, to be found in Zechariah. In c. 12: 10, Jehovah speaks of himself as pierced because of the piercing of the Messiah. In c. 13: 7, Jehovah speaks of the Shepherd who is afterwards (c. 11: 13. 12: 10) identified with him—the man, his fellow; and thus he designates the Messiah, who was united with him in an incomprehensible manner by a oneness of nature, as being, in a way equally incomprehensible, distinguished from him.

Here we are met by the question, How is the doctrine of the Messiah's divinity compatible with the fundamental doctrine of the Old Testament, the unity of God? As no contradiction of this doctrine can on any account be admitted, every one of those passages in which divine names, attributes, and actions, are attributed to the Messiah, declares therefore at the same time his real oneness with Jehovah. To these are superadded the passages from Malachi and Zechariah, in which the same thing is expressly affirmed. But if we would investigate more deeply the relation subsisting between Jehovah and the Messiah, we must institute a more detailed inquiry into the theology of the Messenger or Angel of God, the מלאך יהוה — מלאך אלהים — מלאך אלהים.

The New Testament teaches us to know God, the Father of Jesus Christ, as a Spirit every where present, but who never appears under a form or covering which is subject to the senses. But besides this invisible God, the New Testament makes us acquainted with a visible or manifested God, united with him by a oneness of nature, the Son or *λόγος*, who has constantly filled up the endless distance between the Creator and the creation, who has been the medium of communication, the mediator, in all the relations of God with the world and with mankind; who, even before he became man in the person of Christ, was at all times the light of the world, and to whom the whole direction of the visible theocracy belonged. Although the revelation of these doctrines, in their perfect clearness, was first made in the New Testament, yet we find the main outlines of a distinction between the invisible and the manifested God, or rather the Revealer of God, even in the Scriptures of the Old.

We will now, in the first place, unite the principal passages which speak of the Messenger, or Angel of God, in one view; and then adduce the proof, that in them the doctrine of a distinction between the invisible and the manifested God is really contained.

In Gen. 16: 7 it is mentioned, that the Angel of Jehovah had found Hagar. In v. 10 this Angel attributes to himself a work appropriate only to God, the indefinite multiplication of the posterity of Hagar. In v. 11 he says *Jehovah* has heard the distress of Hagar, and asserts of *Jehovah* what he before had asserted of himself. For this reason it was, that Hagar expressed her astonishment, that she had seen God and yet was still alive.—In c. 18 three men are entertained by Abraham, who afterwards, c. 19: 1, are called מַלְאָכִים *angels*. Abraham, as is gathered from the whole narration, did not know his guests, (for in v. 3 instead of אֲדֹנָי we must read אֱלֹהֵי,) but addresses himself to the one whom, probably on account of his majestic exterior, he thought the most distinguished. This one makes himself known v. 14, 17 et seq. as *Jehovah*. After he has finished the conversation with Abraham, he vanishes; and the two angels proceed alone on their way to Sodom, c. 19: 1. In v. 24 this *Jehovah*, who without doubt is the same who had before appeared as מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה *angel of Jehovah*, is distinguished from *Jehovah*: “And *Jehovah* caused it to rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from *Jehovah* out of heaven.” It is true that recent interpreters, following the example of Calvin, have attempted

to remove the force of this passage by the remark, that in Hebrew a noun is frequently placed where a pronoun ought properly to stand. But we cannot see what purpose could be answered by substituting *a semet ipso, from himself*, for *from Jehovah*, when the source of the fiery storm is otherwise expressed by the phrase "from heaven." Others, as Bauer, Rosenmüller, Baumgarten Crusius, unite the words *from Jehovah* and *fire and brimstone* together, entirely in opposition to the accentuation, and consider the phrase "fire and brimstone from Jehovah" as another name for *the lightning*, which in other places, as in 2 K. 1: 12. Job 1: 16, is called *the fire of God*. But this explanation is also unsatisfactory; partly because the rendering of שַׁפְרִיתָּהּ נֶאֱמַר by *lightning* rests on unsafe arguments, and has the verb הִמְטִירָהּ against it; and partly because, if the correctness of the interpretation is admitted, the lightning has still been sufficiently characterized and distinguished from that fire which originates from natural causes, by the expressions "Jehovah caused it to rain," and by the additional circumstance that the words "from heaven" are added. At all events, these interpretations would be admissible only in case the distinction between Jehovah (i. e. the Messenger of Jehovah, who, from being united with him by a oneness of nature, bears his name) and Jehovah, did not occur elsewhere.—In c. 21: 17, the angel of the Lord, מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִים, addresses Hagar. In v. 18, he ascribes to himself a divine work, the multiplying the posterity of Hagar to a great people. In c. 22: 1 Abraham receives from God, הֵאֱלֹהִים, the command to offer up his son. In v. 11 he receives, when on the very point of doing it, a counter command from the Angel of Jehovah, מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה. In v. 13, this angel identifies himself with God in these words: "For now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only son from *me*." From the name which Abraham, v. 14, gave *the place*, it is evident that he believed Jehovah himself had appeared to him there. — Chap. 31: 11, the angel of God, מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים, appears to Jacob in a dream. In v. 13 he calls himself the *God of Bethel*, to whom he had there made a vow. In this, reference is had to the circumstance related in c. 28: 11—22, where a ladder appears to Jacob in a nocturnal vision, upon which the angels ascend and descend, and upon whose top *Jehovah* stands, who calls himself the God of Abraham and Isaac. Here too the Angel of God identifies himself with Jehovah.— Gen. 32: 25, Jacob wrestles with one unknown, who afterwards

reveals himself as *God*; partly by the name *Israel*, *Wrestler of God*, given to Jacob, and the explanation of the same, "for thou hast wrestled with *God*;" partly by refusing to communicate his name; and partly by the impartation of his blessing. Jacob calls the place *Peniel*, *Presence of God*, because he there had seen *God* face to face; and he was filled with astonishment that his life was preserved.—The answer which *God*, אֱלֹהִים, here gives to Jacob when he asks his name, agrees altogether with the answer which is given in Judges 13: 17 by the Angel of *Jehovah*, מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, to the same question. In Hos. c. 12, the one who contended with Jacob is called in v. 3, אֱלֹהִים; in v. 4, מַלְאָךְ; in v. 6, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת. Thus the angel is again identified with אֱלֹהִים and יְהוָה.—In Gen. 48: 15, 16, Jacob wishes for the sons of Joseph a blessing "from the *God* before whom his fathers had walked, and who had provided for his family; and from the angel who had been his protector," הַמַּלְאָךְ הַיָּגֵאֵל אִתִּי.

In Ex. 3: 2, the *Angel of Jehovah* appears to Moses in a flame of fire from the bush. In v. 4 it is said "*Jehovah* saw that he drew nigh to see, and *Elohim* called to him out of the bush." In v. 6 and 14—16, the Angel of *Jehovah* ascribes to himself all the attributes of the true *God*. He calls himself the *Eternal*, the *God* of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and promises that he will bring the Israelites out of *Egypt*, and will suspend heavy judgments over the Egyptians. In v. 5 Moses is directed to take the shoes from off his feet, because the place on which he stands is a *holy* place. In v. 6 Moses hides his face, "because he was afraid to look upon *God*."—From c. 14: 19 it appears, that the Angel of *God*, מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, accompanied the Israelites on their march out of *Egypt*, and that the cloudy pillar was the symbol of his presence.—In c. 23: 20 *God* says to the people that he will send an angel before them to conduct them to the promised land. He warns them, v. 21, to yield him the most punctual obedience, for he is not a common angel, but *His name is in him*, בְּרִי שְׁמִי בְּקִרְבּוֹ.¹—In c. 32: 34, after the Israelites had sinned against *God* in the worship of the calf, *Je-*

¹ Le Clerc remarks on this passage, "Qui volunt τὴν δευτέραν τῆς τριαδὸς ὑπόστασιν e jugo Sinais montis loquutam (comp. Ex. 3 with 20: 3) angelum saltem creatum promitti hic fatcantur oportet. Neque enim una eademque hypostasis sui nuntia esse potest." But this difficulty is only apparent, and is removed by the remark, that the One sent here speaks in the person of Him who sent him.

hovah, i. e. the Angel of Jehovah, who had thus far led the Israelites, said that he would no longer lead them himself, but would send his angel, מַלְאָכִי, before them; "for I will not go up in the midst of thee myself, for thou art a stiff-necked people; lest I consume thee in the way," c. 33: 3. In c. 33: 4, the people are inconsolable at this sad news. On account of their sincere repentance and the intercession of Moses, Jehovah takes back the threatening, and says, "My presence shall go with you," i. e. I myself will be your companion; comp. Rosenmüller on v. 14. If we are unwilling to admit here, that the messenger speaks in the name of him who commissioned him, then "my presence," etc. will mean the same as *my Revealer*, the Angel in whom my name is, c. 23: 20. For the last acceptance of the word the passage in Is. 63: 9 appears to decide, where the Messenger, as is obvious, with particular reference to this passage, is called the Angel of Jehovah's presence.¹

In Num. 20: 16, the Israelites say, God had heard their weeping and had brought them out of Egypt by an angel, מַלְאָכִי; an indefinite expression, because the passage did not require any more exact term. In c. 22: 22 sq. the Angel of Jehovah makes his appearance in the history of Balaam.

In Josh. 5: 13, as Joshua with his host stood before Jericho, there appeared to him an unknown person with a drawn sword. To Joshua's question, Whether he was for them or for their adversaries, he answered, "Neither. I am Captain of the host of Jehovah, שַׂר צְבָא יְהוָה, i. e. according to the invariable usus loquendi, not the leader of the host of Israel, their guardian angel; but the Prince and Commander of the angels, who are constantly represented as the host of Jehovah. This prince of the angels, precisely like the Angel of Jehovah, מַלְאָכִי יְהוָה, in Ex. 3, appropriates to himself divine honours; for he commands Joshua to take off his shoes, because the place where he stands is holy. By referring to c. 6: 2, it will be seen that he is called Jehovah. In relation to that passage we cannot suppose, as some interpreters have done, that a revelation was made to Joshua in some other way than appears on the face of the narrative. For what object would there then be in the appearance

¹ Comp. R. Bechai on this passage. "Deus respondit Mosi: facies meae ibunt. Intelligit autem hac voce angelum illum, de quo scriptum est Jes. 63: 9, Angelus facierum ipsius juvit ipsos, h. e. angelus, qui est ipsa facies dei."

of the Angel, who here communicates his orders to Joshua for the first time?

In Judges 2: 1-4, the Angel of Jehovah appears to the assembled Israelites, at a place which is afterwards called Bochim. He announces himself as the one who had brought the Israelites out of Egypt into the land promised unto their fathers; and says that on account of their disobedience, he will not drive out the heathen nations. — In c. 6: 11 the Angel of Jehovah comes to Gideon, and in v. 14 is called *Jehovah*. From the first he is recognized by Gideon, and makes himself known by the words: "Thou shalt deliver Israel; I send thee." From this moment Gideon treats with him as with a divine person; although for the sake of greater certainty, he prays still for a sign from him to prove that he was what Gideon wished, and indeed took him to be. He addresses him in v. 15 by the name *Adonai*, אֲדֹנָי; he asks permission, v. 18, to present to him an offering.¹ In v. 21 the Angel touches the offering with the end of his staff, upon which fire bursts out from the rock and consumes it. Meanwhile the Angel disappears suddenly. In v. 22 it is said, "And Gideon saw that it was the Angel of Jehovah," i. e. by the assurance received from the sign demanded, and by the sudden disappearance of the Angel, he was *confirmed* in the conviction that a superhuman person had conversed with him. He now expresses his fear that he should die, since he had seen the An-

¹ Le Clerc and the author of the Exeget. Hdb. on this passage, and Winer on the word מִנְחָה, through a misapprehension of what follows the words "And Gideon saw" etc. suppose that Gideon did not propose to present an offering to the Angel of Jehovah known to be such, but to prepare a repast for a person unknown to him. We will not urge against this the word אֲדֹנָי in v. 15; for it is possible, if we examine the rest of the passage, that here, as in Gen. 18, the original reading was אֲדֹנָי. The LXX in some manuscripts have *κύριέ μου*, in others *ἐν ἐμοὶ κύριε*. But how could Gideon suppose the one who addressed him to be a mere man, or at least, how could he suppose that *he* wished to be considered a mere man, when he has said in v. 14, "I send thee," and v. 16, "I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites?" On this assumption, v. 17 is entirely inexplicable, where Gideon desires the personage who appeared, to give him a sign that he talked with him. Le Clerc supplies the words בָּשָׂם יְהוָה without the least authority for so doing. The narrative in c. 13: 15, where Manoah offers to prepare a repast for the Angel of Jehovah, cannot be here compared. For there it is expressly remarked, v. 16, that Manoah knew not that he was the Angel of Jehovah.

gel of Jehovah face to face ; and because Jehovah reassures him on this point, he builds an altar to which he gives the name "Jehovah Peace."—Judges 13: 3, the angel of Jehovah appears to the wife of Manoah. She does not indeed fully recognise him in this character, but she supposes him divine from the majesty of his appearance. At his second appearance also, v. 6, he is not known by Manoah and his wife at first ; for this is expressly mentioned v. 16. Yet he afterwards makes himself known, partly by refusing to give his name, because the same was *wonderful* ;¹ partly by the miraculous consumption of the offering ;² partly by his vanishing in the sacrificial flame. "Then knew Manoah that it was the Angel of Jehovah," v. 21. Manoah now says to his wife, "We must die, for we have seen *God*," v. 22.

In 2 K. 19: 35, the Angel of Jehovah annihilates the Assyrian host, which threatened the destruction of the theocracy.

In Is. 63: 9 it is said, "Jehovah was their helper.—Out of every difficulty were they set free,³ and the Angel of his countenance delivered them. Because he loved and pitied them he redeemed them ; and he bare them and carried them continually." Here the Angel of Jehovah is called the Angel of his countenance, i. e. the Angel by which Jehovah makes himself known, as the human soul does by the expression of the countenance. Comp. the corresponding expressions concerning Christ in Heb. 1: 3, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. Col. 1: 15, εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου. "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of the person of God ;" "the image of the invisible God." 2 Cor. 4: 4. Ex. 23: 20. To this Angel is ascribed all that is elsewhere ascribed to Jehovah. He has redeemed Israel, and has nursed and cherished them as a loving mother does her child.

Very often do we meet with the Angel of Jehovah, מַלְאָכֵי יְהוָה, in Zechariah. From him the prophet received all his revelations. He distinguishes himself, 1: 12—15, from Jehovah Sabaoth ; and says that he was sent from Jehovah for the purpose of punishing the heathen nations for what they had done to the covenant people of God ; and yet the prophet attributes to

¹ Or, as the English has it, *was secret*.

² This is intimated only in brief by the words וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה "he did wondrously," v. 19, because the author supposed that the reader would gather the rest from the similar narrative in chap. 6.

³ "In omni angustia eorum non angustum fuit." Kocher.

him the name Jehovah Sabaoth; comp. 6: 15. In c. 3: 2 he is called Jehovah, יהוה, who in v. 1 was called Angel of Jehovah, מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה. In c. 12: 8 the מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה is placed by the side of אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, as equal with him in honour and majesty.

In Ps. 34: 8 and 35: 5, there are attributed to the Angel of Jehovah the same things as are elsewhere attributed to Jehovah himself, the protection of the pious and the punishment of the ungodly.

We have now given a simple exhibition of the facts in the case. Let us next consider the different explanations of the same.

I. The most common is this, viz. that where the Old Testament writers spoke of the Angel of Jehovah, they did not mean a person united with God by a oneness of essence, but an inferior angel, by whom God executes his commands, speaks, and acts. That to these inferior angels were attributed divine names, acts, and predicates, and that divine honour was shown them, some explain from this circumstance, that the angels themselves allowed their own personality to be entirely kept in the back ground; and because they held a commission from God, they spoke and acted also in his person; so that they to whom they were sent, and the sacred writers too, raised themselves from the mediate, to the Great First Cause. Origen, in all probability, was of this opinion. He says, on Ex. 3, ἦν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖ ἐν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ θεωρούμενος, "God was there seen in the angel."¹ It was defended with great zeal and dexterity by Augustine. The principal passage in which he speaks of it is in his treatise on the Trinity: "It is therefore manifest, that all those things which were seen by the fathers, when God was presented to them in accordance with a dispensation adapted to their times, were transacted by the agency of creatures. And if we are unable to say in what way he did these things by the agency of angels, still we say these things were done by the angels, though not in a way that we can understand. For we would not seem to any to be more than wise, but would have sobriety in our wisdom, according as God has dealt to us the measure of faith. We believe and therefore speak. For we have the authority of the divine Scriptures" etc. (He here appeals to Heb. 2: 2, where the law given by angels, is opposed to the gospel published by the Lord himself.) "But says some one, Why is it then written, The Lord spake to Moses? Why not rather, the an-

¹ Opp. T. III. f. 229. ed. Ruæi.

gel spake to Moses? For the same reason as when a herald pronounces the words of the judge, it is not written in the records of the court, *The herald said*, but, *The judge said*. So also when the holy prophet speaks, although we say, *The prophet said*, we mean nothing else than, *The Lord said*. And if we say, *The Lord said*, we do not exclude the agency of the prophet, but we intimate who it is that has spoken by him.—I suppose it now to be sufficiently demonstrated, that when God is said to appear to our ancient fathers before the incarnation of the Saviour, those words or corporeal forms were exhibited by angels; either by their speaking or doing something in the character of God, as we have shewn that the prophets also were wont to do; or by their assuming something in the character of the creature which did not belong to them as such, whenever God was revealed to men in visible shape; which kind of representations the prophets have not omitted, as the Scripture teaches by many examples.”¹ In a similar way Jerome expresses himself on Gal. 3: 19. “When he says that the law was ordained by angels, it is meant, that in all the Old Testament, where an angel is first represented as seen, and is then introduced speaking as God, the angel seems really to be one

¹ Augustinus de Trinitate III. 11.—“Proinde illa omnia, quæ patribus visa sunt, cum deus illis secundum suam dispensationem temporibus congruam præsentaretur, per creatura facta esse, manifestum est. Et si nos latet, quomodo ea ministris angelis fecerit, per angelos tamen esse facta non a nostro sensu dicimus, ne cuiquam videamus plus sapere, sed sapimus ad temperantiam, sicut deus nobis partitus est mensuram fidei, et credimus, propter quod et loquimur. Extat enim auctoritas divinarum scripturarum, etc.—Sed ait aliquis: cur ergo scriptum est: dixit dominus ad Moysen, et non potius: dixit angelus ad Moysen? Quia cum verba iudicis præco pronuntiat; non scribitur in gestis: ille præco dixit, sed ille iudex, sic etiam loquente propheta sancto, etsi dicamus propheta dixit, nihil aliud quam dominum dixisse intelligi volumus. Et si dicamus: Dominus dixit, prophetam non subtrahimus, sed quis per eum dixerit admonemus. — Sed jam satis quantum existimo demonstratum est, quod antiquis patribus nostris ante incarnationem Salvatoris, cum deus apparere dicebatur, voces illae ac species corporales per angelos factae sunt, sive ipsis loquentibus vel agentibus aliquid ex persona dei, sicut etiam prophetas solere ostendimus; sive assumentibus ex creatura, quod ipsi non essent, ubi deus figurate demonstraretur hominibus, quod genus significationum, nec prophetas omisisse, multis exemplis docet Scriptura.”—Comp. *Tract. 3 in Jo. 17: 18. De Civ. Dei 16, 29.*

of many ministers; but in this one the Mediator speaks, who says: I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob. Nor is it wonderful that God speaks in angels, since God speaks in the prophets by angels who are in men. Thus Haggai says, And the angel said who spake in me, and then introduces, These things said the Omnipotent Lord.¹ For the angel who had been said to be in the prophet, did not venture to aver in his own person, These things says the Omnipotent Lord.² This view is stated briefly and forcibly by Gregorius. "Now they are called *the angels*, now, *the Lord*; because by the word angels those are expressed who minister without; and under the appellation *Lord*, he is intended who presides over them within."³— In later times this view has been defended by many Jewish interpreters; e. g. by Aben Ezra, who on Ex. 3: 2 remarks: השלוח ידבר בלשון שליחו, "The one who is sent speaks in the name of him who sent him." It was then eagerly taken up by many Romish interpreters, by the Socinians and Arminians. Comp. Grotius on Ex. 20.⁴ Le Clerc on Gen. 16: 13. 18: 1. Ex. 20: 1. 23: 20. In still later times it has not wanted advo-

¹ English Version, *Lord of Hosts*. Jerome had in view the passages in Zech. 1: 9, 13, 14. 2: 7 (3), coll. v. 12 (8); where he has translated *הַמְלִאֲךָ הַדִּבֶּר בִּי*, *qui loquebatur in me*; according to the example of the LXX, *ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοί*. English Version, "talked with me."

² Hieron. Opp. ed. Frkf. T. IX. p. 138. "Quod autem ait lex ordinata per angelos, hoc vult intelligi, quod in omni V. T. ubi angelus primum visus refertur, et postea quasi deus loquens inducitur, angelus quidem vere ex ministris pluribus quicumque sit visus, sed in illo mediator loquatur, qui dicat: ego sum deus Abraham, deus Isaac, deus Jacob. Nec mirum si deus loquatur in angelis, cum etiam per angelos, qui in hominibus sunt, loquatur deus in prophetis, dicente Aggeo: et ait angelus, qui loquebatur in me, ac deinceps inferente: haec dicit dominus omnipotens. Neque enim angelus, qui esse dictus fuerat in propheta ex sua persona audebat loqui: haec dicit dominus omnipotens."

³ Gregor. M. Mor. lib. 28. c. 1. "Modo angeli, modo donoimus vocantur, quia angelorum vocabulo exprimentur, qui exterius ministrabant, et appellatione domini ostenditur, qui eis interius prae erat."

⁴ "Nomen Jehovahae si proprie loquamur, non tribuitur angelis, sed deo in iis apparenti, quemadmodum nulla ratione instrumenti habita,

cates. Among others Vater,¹ Gesenius,² Bretschneider³, who wavers between this hypothesis and the one to be adduced under No. III, Baumgarten Crusius,⁴ and Schmieder.⁵

It was an interest of a very diversified character, which prompted the defenders of this hypothesis to take it up. The fathers who have been quoted, believed that they were driven to this course by certain passages in the New Testament. The Romish interpreters were induced by the wish to find in the Bible a foundation for the worship of angels. The Socinians by an abhorrence of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity; the Arminians, partly by their slight estimation of the Old Testament, and partly by their conceptions of God, which they have derived more from reason than from the Scriptures; and the more recent interpreters, from an apprehension of stumbling here upon a mystery, and upon a preparation for the christian doctrine of the Trinity.

We will now pass on to an examination of this hypothesis. We cannot here have any thing to do with the argument brought against it by all its earlier opposers⁶ and by its latest antagonist, viz. that the assumption according to which angels spoke and acted in the name of God and were addressed and treated as God, is in its very nature inadmissible. But certainly the passages by which Le Clerc⁷ would show that it was not unusual for him who was sent, to speak in the character of him who sent him,⁸ are in this case no proof; because in them an intimation of the sender always precedes, and those who are sent expressly

ei, qui instrumento utitur actio tribui solet. — Nec periculum fuit, ne Israelitae pro deo angelum propterea colerent; observabatur enim eorum animis deus deorum, coeli et terrae creator, seu ipse loqueretur, seu per interpretem angelum, nihil intererat, recte ad eum ferebatur eorum cultus.”

¹ On Gen. 16: 7.

² On the word מַלְאָכִים and on Is. 63: 9.

³ Dogm. I. p. 429.

⁴ Bibl. Dogm. p. 307.

⁵ In the ingenious treatise, *Nova Interpretatio l. Gal. 3: 19. p. 28 seq.*

⁶ The most important among them are Deyling *Obs. in Gen. 48: 15, 16; Obs. Misc. II. 74 seq.* and on *Ex. 3. l. c. V. 1 seq.* Vitringa on *Is. 63: 9.* Vitringa fil. *de lucta Jacobi, Bibl. Bremen. Cl. 1. fasc. 6. p. 773 seq.* Jahn *Hermeneut. p. 112.* Stier *Christus der Engel Jehovah's, in den Andeutungen I. p. 222 sq.* Steinwender *Christus Deus in V. T.*

⁷ On Gen. 16: 13.

⁸ 1 Kings 5: 2, 3. Luke 7: 6. Quinctil. *Instit. Or. IV. 4.*

declare beforehand, that they do not speak in their own names, but in the person of him who sends them. The examples would be analogous, only on the supposition that the Angel of Jehovah had always prepared the way before he spoke or acted in the person of Jehovah, by saying, "God has sent me to speak or do this." But the defenders of this hypothesis have no occasion to go so far for arguments in refutation of the objection. They may find them far more full and strong in the Scripture itself. In Gen. 19: 18 Lot addresses the two angels by the name אֱלֹהֵיךָ, which belongs only to God. The following words too: "Thy servant has found favour in *thine* eyes, and *Thou* hast showed me great mercy, inasmuch as *Thou* hast preserved my life," etc. show that, in speaking to the messenger, he had in view and addressed only the one who sent him. Precisely so, in v. 21, the Angel answered not in his own, but in the person of Jehovah, "Lo, I will hear this thy prayer," etc.¹ Indeed, the latest opposer of this hypothesis,² has sought here to aid himself, as Justin Martyr had already done,³ by supposing that Jehovah suddenly returned after the two angels had treated alone with Lot. But for this assumption there is not the least foundation in the text; and more than all this, it there finds a full refutation, for in v. 18 it is expressly said, "And Lot spake to them," אֱלֹהֵיךָ, to the same individuals evidently, who, according to v. 17, had brought him from the city and had directed him to fly to the mountains. Another argument is furnished to the advocates of this hypothesis, by those passages in which it is said of the prophets that they do those things which they predict. Thus Jacob says of Simeon and Levi, "I will scatter them in Jacob and destroy them in Israel."⁴ In Jer. 1: 10 God says: "See I have set thee this day over nations and kingdoms, that thou shouldst root up, break down, overthrow, and destroy,

¹ The following are the words of Calvin on this passage: "Quum duos videat, sermonem ad unum direxit: unde colligitur Lot non substitisse in angelis, qui satis persuasus erat, neque proprium illis esse imperium, nec salutem suam in eorum manibus esse positam. Eorum vero conspectu non secus ac speculo ad contemplandam dei faciem utitur.

² Steinwender l. c. p. 22.

³ Dial. cont. Tryphon.

⁴ The objection of Steinwender l. c. p. 13, against the application of this analogy, is therefore incorrect, viz. that the prophets never ascribe to themselves as an act, that which they predict as something future.

and build, and plant." Comp. Gen. 27: 37. Ex. 13: 19. 32: 18. 43: 3. It is true, that most interpreters explain these passages so as to assign to active verbs, *verba agendi*, a declarative signification. But certainly another explanation is more natural; that inasmuch as the same power of God which gave the prophecy, also causes its fulfilment, the same things are attributed to the prophets as their acts, which the efficient power of God was to produce by them as instruments. These passages may be adduced, however, in support of the hypothesis, with far greater force than the former. For the personality of the Angel being generally less distinctly marked, can more easily be sunk in the back-ground, than that of the prophets.

But there are not wanting other arguments, which show that this hypothesis must be rejected.

1. There is a grammatical argument which of itself is decisive. It is supposed, according to the hypothesis in question, that sometimes one angel, and sometimes another, is intended by these expressions, without deciding which. But in opposition to this, the definite appellation, *the Angel of God*, always occurs. Certainly the name מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִים cannot be translated "an angel of God." It is true the noun אֱלֹהִים as originally an *appellative*, not unfrequently retains the article; but it is not the less treated as a noun proper.¹ This is evident from the circumstance, that the appellation מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים with the article, and מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, alternate with each other, which last cannot possibly be translated otherwise than by, "the Angel of Jehovah."² In an Augustine, the neglect of this grammatical rule is not remarkable; because he was bound down to the Latin version, where the equivocal rendering, *angelus Jehovae*, admits his interpretation. But it is remarkable that this rule should have been overlooked by so great a number of learned men among the moderns;³ and that even Gesenius himself, on Is.

¹ Comp. Ewald Gramm. p. 569. "But where these words (*appellativa* which have passed over into *nomina propria*) lose the article, they still have always, partly from their origin, partly from their meaning, the same force and value in the language, as the nouns with the article.

² Ewald Gramm. § 305, 308.

³ Thus, for example, Schuurrer, (*Spec. Comm. Arab. R. Tanchum* p. 49,) on Judges 2: 1—4, understands by מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, *a prophet*, which explanation, to mention no other reasons, is already refuted by this rule of grammar.

63: 9, speaks of *an* angel who had led the children of Israel through the desert.—But Is. 63: 9, refers to a particular angel. As Jehovah there says, “The angel of my countenance has delivered them,” we cannot render it with Gesenius by “*An* angel of Jehovah,” without a violation of the grammar. For the suffix here belongs not to the *terminus consequens*, the case which follows the *construct state*, but to the compound idea.¹

2. But it may farther be demonstrated, that this particular angel is not some inferior and common angel, but a being exalted above all created angels. We here lay every thing aside which can be explained, if necessary, on the hypothesis that the angel speaks in the name of Jehovah; although this hypothesis loses very much in probability, from the circumstance, that *wherever* the angel of Jehovah appears, the exchange [of names] is so universal; whereas when other angels appear, the exchange takes place only in a single instance. But exclusively of these passages, there still remains as many as we need for the purpose of proof. The angel who represents Jehovah in the narrative in Gen. 18, is definitely distinguished from all other angels. The two angels who accompany him, sink entirely into the back-ground in comparison with him, and appear to be ranked below him.—So also in c. 28: 11—22, Jehovah, or as he is called in c. 31: 11, the angel of God, stands on the *top* of the ladder, while the angels ascend and descend on the same.—This distinction appears very definitely in Ex. 23: 20, where Jehovah gives to the Israelites an angel as their leader, in whom his name is, i. e. who partakes of his nature,² compared with c. 33, where the people are thrown into the highest affliction by the declaration of this their divine leader, that he would no longer undertake to lead them, but would give them over to his angel, to one not possessing like himself the fulness of divine omnipotence. Into what embarrassment Le Clerc was put by this passage, is abundantly testified by his remark upon it.—The angel of Jehovah also makes himself known as exalted above all created angels, in Josh. 5, where he first calls himself the Prince of angels, and then claims divine honours. To the same point is the appellation “the Angel of the Lord’s countenance,”

¹ Comp. Ewald § 306.

² Comp. the corresponding language respecting Christ: *ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*, Col. 2: 9. Calvin, “In ipso residebit gloria ac majestas mea.”

Is. 63: 9, which can refer to nothing else than to a perfect revelation of the Divine Being. To these we may subjoin also all those passages where the persons to whom the Angel of God has appeared, express the conviction that they have seen God "face to face," and the fear that they must die. These passages demonstrate beyond controversy, that they recognised in the Angel of Jehovah more than a created angel. Indeed there nowhere appears any trace of evidence, that they believed the seeing of such an one to endanger life.

II. Still easier to confute is another hypothesis, which was brought forward by Herder,¹ and is mentioned with approbation by Rosenmueller, although he explains himself differently in different passages. According to them the Angel of Jehovah can be nothing more than a natural phenomenon, or a visible token by which Jehovah makes his presence known. Thus the fiery bush, Ex. 3, and the cloudy pillar, were this Angel. Of the numerous arguments which go to oppose this hypothesis, we here mention only a few.

1. If this hypothesis be correct, then at least there must always occur a natural cause, whenever an appearance of the Angel of Jehovah is related. But this is the case only *twice*, at the appearance in the fiery bush, and in the pillar of cloud. And in both these cases, the Angel of Jehovah is expressly distinguished from the natural cause. In Ex. 3: 2 it is said, "And the Angel of Jehovah appeared to him *in* a flame of fire from the bush;" and in v. 4, "the Angel of Jehovah called to him *from* the bush;" instead of which, according to the hypothesis of Herder, it must mean, "*Jehovah* appeared to him, and Jehovah called him." In c. 14: 19 it is first related that the Angel of God had betaken himself to the rear of the army of the Israelites, and then the same is repeated of the pillar of cloud. How much less can this hypothesis be applied in those passages, where, without any appearance meeting the eye, the voice merely of the angel of God sounds from heaven, as Gen. 21: 17. 22: 11.

2. That the Angel of Jehovah was not something of momentary appearance, but a continually existing being, is evident from Gen. 48: 15, where Jacob prays for his blessing upon the sons of Joseph.

But we abstain from the farther refutation of this hypothesis; which might indeed be gathered in full from every narrative which relates to the point in question.

¹ Geist der Heb. Poesie, II. 47.

III. Others suppose that the מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, *Angel of Jehovah*, is identical with Jehovah; that it does not denote a person different from him, but only his own form of appearance. So Sack, who would translate מַלְאָךְ by *message*, rather than by *messenger*.¹ Pustkuchen goes further, and asserts that מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה, wherever it occurs, is equivalent to the Greek *θεοπαύλα*. Rosenmueller too, who does not remain at all consistent with himself, appears, on Gen. 16: 7, to incline to this view. He there explains מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה by “symbolum illud visibile, quo deus sese hominibus conspicuendum praebuit,”—“that visible symbol by which God causes himself to be seen by men.”² De Wette acknowledges himself to be of the same opinion: ³ “The angels are original personifications of the powers of nature, or of the extraordinary agencies and providences of God; hence *the Angel of Jehovah, as being nothing personal in his own nature*, is interchanged with Jehovah or Elohim.” To the same opinion Ewald appears to incline,⁴ who attributes a particular importance to the circumstance, that the noun מַלְאָךְ, cannot imply any thing of a personal nature on account of its *form*, but must have a neuter or indefinite sense, and must mean *message*. So also Koester.⁵ This hypothesis has indeed much that is specious. It perfectly suffices for the interpretation of some passages. But on a closer trial of *all* the passages, it shews itself to be unfounded. The facts on which it rests, and which seem to demand it, are explained perfectly by the remark, that the divine wisdom concealed the distinction between the Messenger and Him who sent him, in a greater degree under the Old Testament; because under that the maintenance of Monotheism had more practical significancy, than the knowledge of the different persons in the Godhead; and hence every thing was carefully avoided, which, in the strong inclina-

¹ *Commentatt. Theol.* Bonn 1821. p. 19. “Ita ut מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה non tam personam a Jehovah distinctam, sed naturalem illam apparitionem, qua Jehovah loqui et se manifestare voluit, indicare videatur. Persona, quae agnoscitur in nuntio Jehovah, semper Jehova ipse est, ac nobis fortasse מַלְאָךְ potius *message*, quam *messenger* vertendum esset.”

² *Untersuchung der bibl. Urgeschichte*, Halle 1823. p. 61.

³ *Comp. on the contrary* his note on Zech. 3: 2, “Vocatur legatus de nomine principis sui.”

⁴ *Dogmatik I*, § 108, 83.

⁵ *Heb. Gram.* p. 245.

⁶ *Meletemata crit. et exeget. in Zachariae partem posteriorom*, p. 68.

tion of the people to polytheism, could bring the former into the least danger. From this consideration it is also explained, why the oneness of the *מְלֶאכֶת יְהוָה* with Jehovah, is more prominent than his distinction from him.—The principal reasons which oblige us to suppose, that by the *מְלֶאכֶת יְהוָה* is denoted a personal nature, distinct from Jehovah, yet united with him by an essential oneness, and that *מְלֶאכֶת* is not to be translated *message*, but *messenger*, are the following :

In Gen. 48: 15, the angel who was Jacob's protector is expressly distinguished from Jehovah. If this was no being, subsisting personally, how could Jacob pray for a blessing from God the Father *and* from him? There is manifestly a personal distinction contained in Ex. 23: 20, where Jehovah promises the Israelites that he would send an angel before them, in whom his name is. Jehovah constantly speaks of him in the third person, attributes to him personal properties, etc. Still more definite is this distinction in Josh. 5: 13. The *מְלֶאכֶת יְהוָה* calls himself there the Captain of Jehovah's host, and, in respect to relation, ranks himself below Jehovah, although he immediately afterwards claims divine honours. The translation "message of Jehovah" is entirely excluded by Is. 63: 9, where it would be nonsense to translate *פָּנֵי מְלֶאכֶת* by "message of his countenance." — This hypothesis too, if we overlook all those passages which entirely refute it, is certainly not the natural one which suggests itself to every person at first view; for, as Vitranga remarks on Is. 63: 9, "the whole narrative, by the unerring rule of logic, marks a [personal] distinction."¹

But there are weighty arguments which contradict all these hypotheses in common.

1. It must appear to us the less remarkable to find in the Old Testament the doctrine of a Revealer of God, like God, and yet distinguished from him; of a mediator between him and the world,—and we can the less easily undertake to obliterate the traces of this doctrine by untenable hypotheses,—inasmuch as we find the same doctrine amongst all nations. We content ourselves here with pointing out this belief among the Persians; because the religion of this people exhibits the greatest relationship with that of the Old Testament; and therefore we are justified in tracing down this doctrine from the original revelation, among them, in preference to any other people. The Zenda-

¹ "Omnis relatio ex certo logicae canone distinguit."

vesta distinguishes between *Zervane Akerene*, the concealed God and origin of all things, and *Ormuzd*, the first of the *Amschaspands*, ("the angelic chief of Jehovah,") who, as the first of created things, is the creator of all other created things; possesses majesty like God; acts as a mediator in all things relating to the world; and from whom Zoroaster derived all his revelations. "Ormuzd, this first of the *Amschaspands*, this being enveloped in majesty, appears in the *Zend writings* in two very different forms. At one time as a creature, who has his body and his *Ferver*, who was produced by *Zervane Akerene*, like the remaining *Amschaspands*; so that he belongs to the *Amschaspands* and is himself an *Amschaspand*, although the first and greatest. In the second form he is represented as the almighty creator of the heaven and the earth, as creator and god of the remaining six *Amschaspands*, above whom he is infinitely exalted."¹ How easily might here a resemblance be traced, between the *יהוה מלאך* and *Ormuzd*! Especially remarkable is one passage of the *Zendavesta*:² "I approach thee, powerfully operating fire (*Orvazeshte*), existing since the beginning of things, the foundation of union between *Ormuzd* and the being enwrapped in glory (*Zervane Akerene*), whom I am content not to explain." Here is asserted a mysterious union between the invisible God and his revealer, by means of the fire *Orvazeshte*; to which is attributed the same in the *Zend books*, which in the *Old Testament* is attributed to the *אֱלֹהִים רַבָּהּ*, the principle of all life in the moral and physical world.³

2. Against all these hypotheses speaks further the tradition of the Jews. The ancient Jews found in all the passages where the Angel of God is spoken of, neither an inferior angel, nor a natural cause, nor the invisible God himself, but the proper mediator between God and the world, the author of all revelations, to whom they gave the name *Metatron*. This is originally an appellative noun, *nomen appellativum*, which might therefore have been applied to different beings;⁴ and one must correctly

¹ Rhode *Die heilige Sage des Zendvolkes*, p. 317.

² Vol. I. p. 169.

³ Comp. Rhode, p. 182 sq. 345.

⁴ Very different opinions have been entertained respecting the etymology of this name. By far the most probable derivation is that maintained by Danz in *Meuschen N. T. ex Talm. illustr.* p. 727 sq. and by Buxtorf *sub voce*, from the Latin *metator*, which is explained

distinguish between the higher and lower *Metatron*, (which last, stands in the same relation to the higher, as the higher does to the most high God,) as it occurs in numerous passages in the

by Suidas, ὁ προαποσιτέλλομενος ἄγγελος πρὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος. The appellation appears to have been derived from Is. 63: 9, where the Revealer of God is called the Prince of the Countenance of Jehovah. Comp. Elias Levita, *Tishbi* f. 53, in Eisenmenger, p. 396, "The *Metatron* is the Prince of the Countenance, שר הפנים, and it is said of him, that he is that angel who always looks upon the face of God." In favour of this derivation is also the fact, that the word *metator* is very common in the Rabbinical writings in the sense of *legatus*, as the synonyme of שליח, comp. Buxtorf c. 1191. Danz l. c. p. 725; that *Metatron* as an appellative occurs demonstrably in the same sense, comp. *Breschit Rabba* in Buxtorf c. 1193; that the Rabbins with tolerable unanimity give the meaning of ὀδηγός as the signification of this word, although they differ from one another in the etymology; and finally, that the majority of the Rabbins give distinctly this etymology. Comp. the passages in Danz l. c. p. 724 sq. — Next to this, the derivation from the Latin *mediator* has the most probability. The *Metatron* bears in the *Sohar* the name כמורה דהאמצעית, *columna medietatis*. Comp. Sommer *Theol. Sohar*. p. 36. Still the word *mediator* does not elsewhere occur in the Rabbinic language; and moreover none of the reasons favour this derivation, which speak for the former. — Another has still less to support it, which was given by Majus, *Theol. Jud.* p. 72, and last by Meyer, *Blätter f. höhere Wahrh.* IV. 188, from μετά and θρόνος, i. q. ὁ μέτοχος τοῦ θρόνου, ὁ σύνθρονος. But μετάθρονος is not even so much as a Greek word, and still less can it be shown, that it has been naturalized in the Rabbinical dialect. Further, the Rabbins founded the whole doctrine of the *Metatron* on passages of the Old Testament, and every probability would go to show that they borrowed the name from the same. But there are no passages where the name Sharer of the Throne, σύνθρονος, is given to the Angel of God. Finally, that the name was originally not peculiar to the Angel of Jehovah merely, is of itself decisive. We produce here only a single passage, where it occurs in this more general sense. *Jalkut Rubeni* in Danz, l. c. p. 731, *Si non fuerit justus in hoc mundo, tunc Shechina vestit sese in quodam Metatron.* Compare all the passages where an inferior *Metatron* is spoken of. — But least of all can we give our approbation to the most recent hypothesis, that of Schmieder. He derives the word, (l. c. p. 41 sq. *Excursus de Mitatrone*,) from the Persian *Mithras*. For this derivation there is nothing more than a slight resemblance in the sound of the two words. The resemblance of nature, which is particularly urged by Schmieder, is only apparent. The *Metatron* of the Jews appears as the supreme revealer of the hidden God, as partaker in his nature and his majesty, as we have already seen; like the Or-

Jewish writings.¹ The doctrine of the inferior Metatron, whom many suppose to be Enoch, is probably founded on Ex. 32: 34. The higher Metatron is not unfrequently identified with the Shechina, the habitation of God in the world. Thus it is said for example in the book *Tikkune Sohar*, "The Metatron is the very Shechina, and Shechina is called the Metatron of Jehovah, because he is the crown of the ten Sefirae."² Yet other

muzd from whom all revelations were derived. On the contrary, the Mithras is an inferior being, created by Ormuzd, a valiant combatant indeed in his host, but who stands back far behind the great Bahman, the king of the Amschaspands. The passages from Plutarch (*de Is. et O. c.* 46) and the Zend books, where Mithras is called a mediator, furnish a foundation for a relationship between Mithras and Metatron only apparent. For the Metatron of the Hebrews mediates in all the relations of the hidden God with the creation. On the contrary, Mithras is called mediator only so far as "he mediated during the struggle between Ormuzd and Ahriman to render the influence of the last harmless." The doctrine concerning him has also more of a physical than a moral import; comp. Rhode *Das Religionssystem des Zendvolkes*, p. 264 sq. In fine, as the original appellative signification of the name decides against its being borrowed from the Persians, so no analogy at all can be adduced for this etymology; while the borrowing of names from the Greek and Latin is, in many instances, found to be susceptible of demonstration. Comp. e. g. *Armillus*, the Greek ἄρμιλλος, and *Matrona*, which occurs so frequently in the Cabbalistic writings.

¹ The failure to distinguish between these has led Eisenmenger into great confusion. We adduce here only one or two passages: *R. Ruben fil. Hoschke* in Danz l. c. p. 736, "Shechina longe excelsior est Henocho convenienter cum illo quod per traditionem accepi, fore metatorem magnum et metatorem parvum, quorum magnus est ipsissima Shechina, e qua ille emanat et de nomine ejus. "Shechina vocatur Metatron." In another passage: "Invenimus in Sohar, quod duo sint metatores, Metatron maximus et Metatron parvus creatus." Comp. other passages in Danz, p. 730, 735. That the assertion of most Rabbins, that מִטַטְרֹן with Yodh denotes the superior, and without Yodh the inferior Metatron, is incorrect, is shown by Schmieder, l. c. p. 28, from the Paraphrase of Jonathan on Gen. 5: 24, where the orthography with Yodh is admitted, although the inferior Metatron is the subject of remark.

² See Glaesener *Theol. Soharica*, p. 37: "Metatron est ipsissima Shechina, et Shechina Metatron Jehovahae vocatur, quia corona est decem Sefhirarum." Comp. the array of proofs in Danz, in *Meuschen N. T. ex Talmud. illustr.* p. 733 sq. Edzardi *Tract. Berack.* p. 232.

passages show that they distinguished the Metatron and the Shechina in another respect; and identified the Metatron with the Shechina, only so far as the latter concentrated and represented itself in a personal way in the former. Thus it is said in the book *Eshel Abraham*: "Metatron is the column of mediation, in whom appears that holy one blessed in his Shechina.¹ And in another passage:² "The Supreme God and his Shechina are *within* the Metatron, that is to say, he who is called Shaddai." Still more plainly is this expressed in a passage of Rabbi Moses Corduero: "The angel here is the vestment of the Shechina, and the Shechina conceals itself in the midst of him, and shows his operations by him. Yet he is not the Shechina itself, but, if it were proper, I would call him the place of the Shechina's exile."³ And again Rabbi Moses Corduero says:⁴ שכירה החומה בתוך מטטרון, "the Shechina is included in the Metatron." From these and other passages it appears, that they conceived the relation of the Shechina to the Metatron to be about the same, as the Persians did the relation of the fire *Orvazeshte* to Ormuzd.—The Metatron is not created, but emanates. Comp. R. Moses ben Hoschke: "It is manifest from this that there is a Metatron of emanation and a Metatron of creation who is his herald. The Metatron of emanation is he who appeared to Moses in the bush."⁵ He is united with the Supreme God by a oneness of essence. R. Bechai says: "The Rabbins explain the words אל תמר בר 'thou shalt not change me for him,' (in such a way that you shall think me one, and him another,) and God says this to Moses that he may understand that both are one, and most intimately united, without separation. He is the Lord himself and at the same time is the ambassador of the

¹ In Danz l. c. p. 735, "Columna medietatis est Metatron, in quo apparet sanctus ille benedictus in Shechina sua."

² Sommer l. c. p. 36, "Deus O. M. ejusque Shechina sunt *intra* Metatronem, quippe qui vocatur Shaddai."

³ In Danz l. c. p. 736, "Angelus hic vestimentum est Shechinæ et Shechina occultat sese in ejus medio, suasque ipsa ostendit operationes per eundem. Non tamen Shechina ipsa—sed si dicere fas esset Shechinæ vocarem exilium." Comp. other passages in Knorr a Rosenroth *Kabbala demulata* I. p. 528.

⁴ In Sommer, p. 37.

⁵ In Danz l. c. p. 737, "Manifestum hinc est, quod sit Metatron emanationis et Metatron creationis, qui est nuntius. Metatron autem emanationis est ille, qui Mosi apparuit in rubo."

Lord.”¹ He is called in the Talmud שר העולם, *the Prince of the World*.² He is the visible revealer of God. In the Book Sohar³ it is said, “Metatron is the garment of Shaddai.” He is called in the Talmud,⁴ the angel “whose name is as the name of his Lord.” He has the dominion over all creatures. So the Book Sohar: “Metatron is the servant of Jehovah, the senior of his household, the beginning of his creatures, exercising his dominion over all things, which are committed to him. God Supreme hath indeed delivered to him the dominion over all his hosts.”⁵ Othioth Rabbi Akkiva holds the following language:⁶ “The Metatron is the angel, Prince of the countenance [of Jehovah]; the angel, Prince of the law, Prince of wisdom, Prince of strength, Prince of majesty, Prince of the temple, Prince of kings, Prince of rulers, Prince of the high and exalted and the many and noble Princes that are in heaven and upon earth.” All the splendid attributes which are ascribed to him singly in other places, are united in a remarkable passage in the Cabbalistic Book *Rasiel*, in Edzard, p. 234.

That this doctrine is originally a Jewish doctrine and not at all borrowed from the Persians, is evident from the fact, that it is explained from the Old Testament in all the passages where it occurs [in Jewish books]. There is always either a definite quotation of the passages where the מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה is mentioned, or a manifest reference to them. For its high antiquity there are many reasons. That the doctrine existed in the time of the LXX, appears from Is. 9: 5, where they translate אֵל יוֹצֵץ אֵלָּהּ by *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*, probably, as Gesenius correctly remarks,

¹ In Edzardi *Tract Tolmud. Berachoth* p. 231. “Rabbini p. m. verba אל תמר בר explicarunt: ne permutes me in illo (ut alium me, alium illum esse putes), dicitque hoc ideo deus ad Mosem, ut intelligeret, utrumque unum esse et arctissime unitum absque separatione. —Est ille dominus ipse et legatus domini.”

² Comp. the passages in Sommer, l. c. p. 45.

³ Sommer p. 38. “Indumentum טוֹ שר״י est Metatron.”

⁴ *Tract. Sanhedrin* in Sommer l. c. “Cujus nomen sicut nomen domini sui.”

⁵ In Sommer, l. c. p. 35. “Metatron servus Jehovae, senior domus ejus, qui est principium creaturarum ejus, dominium exercens super omnia, quae ipsi sunt tradita. Tradidit vero ipsi dominium deus O. M. super omnes exercitus suos.

⁶ Eisenmenger II. p. 396.

for theological reasons, to signify that in the Messiah not the Supreme God but his Revealer would appear. R. Alshech on Gen. 18: 2, represents this doctrine as traditional: "Every angel spoken of in Scripture absolutely, is Metator, the prince of the countenance, whose name is like the name of his Lord, according to the language of our doctors, in commenting on the text of the Bible: Lo I send my angel before your face etc. and, Lo my angel shall go etc."¹—Further, had this doctrine been of later origin, it could not have obtained its great diffusion; it occurs not only in the cabbalistic writings, but in those of the most diverse character. Besides, it is found not only in the Talmud, but it appears in the book Sohar, already perfectly formed. There are strong reasons for supposing that this book, as to the principal parts which compose it, was written at a very early period; although numerous later interpolations must have occurred, as is the case in almost all Jewish writings.² But Schmie-der correctly remarks: "The cabbalistic doctrine concerning the Metatron in the book Sohar, bears the marks of such cultivation, that it could not be recently invented in that agè, but seems to have employed the frequent thoughts of many, and to have been perfected by their labours."³ Many passages of the New Testament too make for the antiquity of this doctrine, particularly the Pauline epistles; in which one can hardly avoid supposing, that the expressions which were in use among the Jews respecting the Metatron were applied to Christ, and with perfect propriety, as we shall afterwards see; inasmuch as the *יְהוָה יְהוּדָה*, or the Metatron, was to appear in the Messiah.⁴ The resemblance

¹ In Danz, l. c. p. 734. "Omnis angelus absolute dictus in scriptura est princeps facierum Metator, cujus nomen est sicut nomen domini ejus, secundum sermonem doctorum nostrorum p. m. ad textum biblicum: Ecce ego missurus sum angelum ante facies tuas etc. et Ecce angelus meus ibit etc."

² Comp. some of these in Tholuck, Stellen aus dem Sohar, Berl. 1824. Vorrede.

³ L. c. p. 25. "Cabbalistica de Mitatrone doctrina in libro Sohar ita exculta est, ut nec illa ætate recens inventa, sed variis multorum meditationibus versata et aucta jam fuisse videntur."

⁴ Comp. e. g. the passages adduced from Othioth R. Akkiva with Eph. 1: 21 seq. In Sohar f. 77. Sulzb. Sommer l. c. p. 35, the Metatron is called *מְקוֹם שֶׁל מְקוֹם*, *הַחֵלֶת בְּרִייתוֹ שֶׁל מְקוֹם*, "the beginning of the creatures of God." Comp. *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* Col. 1: 15. The Me-

between the New Testament passages and those of the Rabbins is so great, that it could not be accidental. And finally, it speaks for the antiquity of this doctrine, that it occurs even in Philo: "To the archangel and eldest Logos, on account of his peculiar excellence, the Father who begat all things, has given to stand as the one who divides that which is made, from Him who made it; and he is the object of supplication to the mortal destined for immortality, the ambassador of Him who leads to obedience."¹ Yet it cannot be maintained that the age of the *name* Metatron, as the exclusive designation of the archangel, is equally ancient with the doctrine itself. It follows from the remarkable passage of Rabbi Menachem of Rekanat,² that the archangel was originally called by a multitude of appellative names, until at last one of them, Metatron, came to be a standing name, a kind of *nomen proprium*. By Jonathan in Ex. 3, the Angel of Jehovah is called *Segansagel*; and in *Jalkut Shimoni*,³ and numerous other passages, he is called Michael.⁴

We believe then that we have shown from sufficient evidence, that by the *Angel of Jehovah* is to be understood the Revealer of God, who, partaking of his divinity, and united with him by a oneness of nature, was the mediator of all the communications of God at first to the patriarchs, and afterwards to the visible theocracy. This Revealer of God was expected in future times as a great restorer. This appears from many passages of the Old Testament, in which divine names, attributes, and actions, are attributed to the Messiah. If the Messiah is admitted to be God, then he could stand in no other connexion with the Supreme God, agreeably to the whole religious system of the Old

tatron is called the Majesty, the Veil of God, the one through whom God is known, the one who bears the image of God, the one according to whose image man is created. R. Bechai in Edzard, l. c. p. 232. *Jalkut Chadash* p. 237. *Sohar* l. c. and p. III. f. 91. Sulz. Sommer p. 36. Comp. εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, Col. 1: 15. ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. 1: 3. 2 Cor. 4: 4.

¹ Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum Haeres*, p. 50. Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δι' ἀρετὴν ἐξαιρέτων ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθ' ὅριον σίας τὸ γινόμενον διακρίνη τοῦ πεποιηκότος· ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀφθάρτον, πρεσβυτηὶς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπἄκουον.

² In Eisenmenger, p. 374.

³ In Eisenmenger, p. 375.

⁴ Comp. Danz, l. c. p. 733, 734.

Testament, than that in which they supposed the *Malak Jehovah* to stand. And more than this, Mal. 3: 1 testifies to the identity of both in the most definite manner. There the Messiah bears the name מְלַאֲכֵי הַבְּרִית, *the Angel of the Covenant*, either in the general sense of בְּרִית, the angel who mediates every engagement between God and men; or in its special sense, the angel who concluded the covenant with the Israelites on Sinai. By this appellation the Messiah is shown to be identical with the מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה, whose agency in the giving of the law on Sinai, though not expressly mentioned indeed in the Mosaic narrative, is yet sufficiently established, in part by analogy, and in part by the direct testimony of the prophets. And since the מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה in the passages where he is expressly mentioned, has the names אֱלֹהִים and יְהוָה alternately, he is not unfrequently to be understood as spoken of, where the language throughout applies to Jehovah alone. Comp. e. g. Gen. 32: 24 sq. with Hos. 12: 4—6; also Ex. 3, where the Angel of Jehovah makes himself known as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and as the deliverer of the Israelites out of Egypt, with Ex. 20: 3 where the Angel of Jehovah is not mentioned, and Jehovah says, "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of Egypt." If it was the office of the מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה generally, to mediate in the communications between the invisible God and men, then must his interposition be supposed where it is not expressly mentioned. As proofs of known identity of the מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה and the Messiah in the Old Testament, perhaps two other passages may also be quoted, viz. Hos. 3: 5, if we consider יְהוָה as synonymous with כְּבוֹד יְהוָה, the visible appearance, the Shechina of God, which concentrates itself in the מְלַאֲכֵי יְהוָה; and Mich. 5: 1, if we translate the word מוֹצֵאוֹת *outgoings*, "whose outgoings are from eternity," i. e. who from eternity goes out from the invisible God and reveals him. The identity of the Angel of Jehovah and the Messiah is implied in Is. 9: 5, where the same name is attributed to the Messiah, which in Judges 13: 18 the Angel of Jehovah gives to himself.

This identity of the Angel of Jehovah, or the Metatron, with the Messiah, was acknowledged by the later Jews; as the passage above quoted from the LXX has proved. The same is presupposed by the writers of the New Testament, as a doctrine generally received; as appears from passages to be adduced below. We quote, as in point here, another remarkable passage from the *Sohar*: "When his servant is spoken of, the servant of

Jehovah is understood, the senior of his house, prepared for his service. But who is he? He is Metatron, as we have said, that will hereafter be united with a body (i. e. will assume a human body) in the womb of his mother."¹ But what raises this identity of the יהוה מלאך and the Messiah to the most indubitable certainty, is the testimony of the New Testament. Christ appears in the New Testament as the mediator of the old covenant; to him is every thing ascribed which in the Old Testament is ascribed to Jehovah and his Revealer. In John 1: 11 it is said, that Christ came *εἰς τὰ ἴδια*, and *οἱ ἴδιοι* received him not. In the Old Testament the people of Israel always appear as יהוה נהנה, the possession or inheritance of Jehovah. According to John 12: 41, Isaiah saw the glory of Christ and spake of him; on the contrary Isaiah in c. 6, the passage quoted, saw the glory of Jehovah. In 1 Cor. 10: 9 it is said: *Μηδὲ ἐπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφρων ἀπώλοντο*, "Let us not tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted him, and were destroyed by serpents." According to this passage Christ was the leader of the Jews through the wilderness, and was tempted by them. On the other hand, according to the account in the Pentateuch, they were led by the יהוה מלאך; and according to Num. 21: 5—7, they tempted Jehovah. According to 1 Pet. 1: 10, the spirit of Christ spake by the prophets; on the other hand, the prophets themselves always refer their prophecies to Jehovah. According to Heb. 11: 26, Moses preferred reproach for the sake of Christ, *ὄνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, to the treasures of Egypt; while according to the history in the Old Testament, he underwent all sacrifices in the service of Jehovah. According to Heb. 12: 26, the voice of Christ at the giving of the law shook the earth; according to the narrative in the Old Testament, it was Jehovah who did the same.

In *apparent* opposition to these stand a few other passages, which have been urged by Augustine in support of the opinion, that by the יהוה מלאך Christ is not to be understood, but sometimes one, and sometimes another created angel. One of the least difficult is Acts 7: 53, where Stephen says the Jews

¹ Sommer l. c. p. 35. "Cum dicitur servus ejus, intelligitur servus Jehovae, senior domus ejus, paratus ad ministerium ejus. Quis vero ille est? Metatron hic est, sicuti diximus, futurus ut conjungatur corpori (i. e. corpus humanum adsumat) in utero materno." Comp. other passages in Edzard *Cod. Talm. Berachoth* p. 230.

have received the law *εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*, “by the ministration of angels.” When Stephen speaks of angels, (following the Old Testament, comp. Deut. 33: 2. Ps. 68: 18,) who were concerned in the giving of the law, in the plural number, he was far from wishing to deny that one among them, infinitely exalted above the others in power, took the lead as the Supreme Revealer of God.¹ That to Stephen such a supreme *ἄγγελος κυρίου* was very well known, appears from v. 30; according to which the *ἄγγελος κυρίου* appeared in the bush to Moses, whose voice is immediately called *φωνὴ κυρίου*, comp. v. 35, 36. Indeed in v. 38 it is expressly said, that this angel had spoken with Moses and the people on Mount Sinai. But the name *ἄγγελος* as applied to Christ, will appear the less remarkable, inasmuch as he has in Heb. 3: 1 the name *ἀπόστολος*, which corresponds with it.—The same remarks hold true in relation to the passage in Gal. 3: 19, where the law is said to be *διαταγείς δι’ ἀγγέλων*, “ordained by angels.”—More difficult is the passage in Heb. 2: 2, where the law appears to be placed below the gospel, because the first was given by the ministration of angels, while the last was made known by the Lord himself, and *δι’ ἀγγέλων* and *διὰ τοῦ κυρίου* stand here in manifest opposition. But that it cannot be the intention of the writer to ascribe the giving of the law merely to the inferior angels, excluding from it the Revealer of God, appears from c. 12: 26, according to which the voice of God at the giving of the law shook the earth. He can therefore maintain the superiority of the gospel above the law, only so far as the revelation made by the Lord as *יהוה מלאך יהוה* was more incomplete than that made by his becoming man; so that we must indeed make a distinction in a certain respect between the *יהוה מלאך יהוה* and the Son of God; and not venture to say, as the fathers and most of the old theologians did, that the *יהוה מלאך יהוה* is precisely identical with the *Son of God*.

That the Mediator of the New Testament, as *יהוה מלאך יהוה*, mediated in all the communications of God to the people of the old covenant was, if we except the fathers above named, the unanimous doctrine of the ancient church. The fathers of the first synod at Antioch, in a letter sent to Paul of Samosata before his deposition, declare that *ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτὸς κύ-*

¹ Comp. *Sohar* f. 96 ed. Solisb. (Edzardi *Tract. Talm. Berachoth* p. 227.) “Quando divina majestas habitat circa hominem, tum innumerum alii exercitus sancti adsunt ibi simul.”

ριος καὶ θεὸς ὢν, μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος, "the Angel of the Father, being himself Lord and God, the Angel of the great Council," appeared to Abraham, and Jacob, and to Moses in the burning bush. Justin Martyr shows,¹ that Christ spake to Moses from the bush, and says that he was named the Angel of the Lord, ἐκ τοῦ διαγγέλλειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ποιητοῦ τῶν ἀπάντων, "from his announcing to men the things which belong to the Father and Maker of all."² Theodoret says on Ex. 3, "And the whole place shews that it was God who appeared. And he called him an angel also, that we might know that it was not God the Father who appeared, (for whose angel is the Father?) but the only begotten Son the Angel of the great Council."³

Let us now collect in a small compass the result of the whole preceding investigation. To the Messiah is attributed in the prophetic writings a divine nature along with the human nature; but in such a way that every polytheistic conception is excluded by the implied essential oneness with the Supreme God. It was expected that in the Messiah, the Angel, or Revealer of Jehovah, who had already frequently appeared in time past, and who had mediated in all the communications of God with the Israelitish nation, would assume the human nature, and would redeem and make happy the Israelites as well as all the heathen nations.

Here the question arises: If now the distinction between the revealed and the invisible God already existed under the Old Testament, in what consists the advantage of the New Testament in this respect above the Old? In *this*, we reply, that the

¹ Dial. cum Tryphon. p. 265. ed. Thirlb.

² Comp. *Apol.* 1 p. 91. *Constitut. Apost.* V. 20. ed. Coteler. I. p. 325. Irenaeus c. *Haeres.* IV. 7. §. 4. Theophilus II. 31. Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 1, 7. Tertull. c. *Prax.* 7, 16. Cyprian c. *Jud.* II. 6. Hilar. *de Trin.* IV. §. 32. Eusebius *Demonstr. Evang.* 5, 10. sq. Cyrill. Hieros. p. 322. ed. Ox. Cyrill. Alex. in *Erod.* l. 1. Opp. I. 262. Chrysost. *Hom.* xlviij, in *Gen.* Ambrose *de fide ad Grat.* Opp. T. II. p. 450. ed. Bened. and others.

³ *Interr.* 5 in *Ex.* Opp. T. I. ed. Hall. p. 121. Καὶ ὅλον δὲ τὸ χωρίον δεικνύσι θεὸν ὄντα τὸν ὁφθέντα. Κέκληκε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἄγγελον, ἵνα γινώμεν ὡς ὁ ὁφθεὶς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ· τίνος γὰρ ἄγγελος ὁ πατὴρ; ἀλλ' ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος.

distinction between the Revealer and the unseen God had to be kept back more from view in the Old Testament ; so that it might easily appear founded less upon a relation in the Godhead itself, than upon a relation to those to whom the revelation was made. Because in the Old Testament the mediator commonly spoke and acted in the name of God whom he revealed, which could not be otherwise so long as the *lóγος* had not yet become flesh, the Revealer and the Revealed lost themselves in each other ; and thus conceptions similar to those of the Sabellians might easily arise. Under the New Testament, on the contrary, the distinction between the Revealer and the Revealed appeared as the distinction between Father and Son. By this means religion derived a double advantage. It was on the one hand rendered more spiritual, and on the other more perceptible to the senses. More spiritual, inasmuch as the former limited conceptions of the spirituality, omniscience, and omnipresence of God, which arose from the want of a separation of the Revealer from the Revealed, was taken away ; more perceptible to sense, inasmuch as the Son of God in his life, sorrows, and death, brought the divine nature into nearer proximity with humanity, than it could be by the transient appearances of the Angel of God under the Old Testament. Such a condescendence of God to fallen man is the condition, on which alone man could be made godlike.*

* Comp. Hess, *Jehovah the God of Israel*, in the Bibliothek f. heil. Gesch. Bd. 2.

ART. III. ON THE WANT OF AGREEMENT AMONG INTERPRETERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. WITH A CRITIQUE ON THE VARIOUS EXPOSITIONS OF MATT. V. 3—5.

By Prof. Tholuck, of Halle. Translated by the Editor.*

It is a matter of experience, that there is no greater source of disquiet to the young theological student, than the endless variety of opinions in respect to the doctrines of faith and the interpretation of Scripture, which are presented to him in the history of the church, and in the courses of exegetical lectures. Even laymen, when aware of the want of accord among theologians in this latter respect, are often not a little disturbed; and it has been a case of actual occurrence, that one and another have been ready to take refuge from this disquietude in the Pope; where, as they suppose, the solution of all difficulties is to be found. In the want of doctrinal perspicuity, which in our day is but too characteristic of many theologians, not a few have in reality so misunderstood the dogma of the Pope's infallibility, as to suppose that, in accordance with this doctrine, the temporal vicar of Christ must be able to impart infallible certainty to the decision of every disputed theological question, of whatever kind. They know not, or do not remember, the discrepancies of catholic interpreters, not merely with one another, but even with themselves; how Augustine, for instance, in four different passages of his works, has given four different expositions of one text, while no Pope has ever yet decided which is the correct one. Nor do they call to mind the cases, where, even in doctrinal questions, (such e.g. as that of the immaculate conception,) the temporal head of the church has left his followers without counsel, in spite of the most earnest enquiry and entreaty.

But who is there, who would not at the first glance be justly disquieted, and even despair of any certain way to the understanding of the Scriptures, when on a single passage not less than TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE expositions are placed before us? as is done by Weigand in his work on Gal. 3: 20. †

* From the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," by Ullmann and Umbreit, Jahrg. 1832, 2tes Heft, p. 325 sq.

† *Now a mediator is not of one; but God is one.*

To these the author subjoins the two hundred and forty-fourth, which also has since been eclipsed by later attempts. It were well worth while, thoroughly to weigh the causes of so enormous a discrepancy of opinion in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures,—a discrepancy of which the whole range of classic literature no where affords so portentous an example. This, however, would require a separate work; for such a treatise, in order to handle the subject fully, must embrace the whole field of the history of exegesis. The interpreters themselves must be divided into classes and schools; and then, in each case, the cause of their perverted exegesis be shewn from their history, and especially from their doctrinal errors; as might easily be done in respect to the followers of Origen, the schoolmen, mystics, Socinians, Arminians, the rigidly orthodox among the Lutherans, the disciples of Cocceius, etc. On the other hand, regard must also be had to the unavoidable want of exegetical helps, under which some periods have suffered; and also to the studied neglect of all such helps, arising from false principles; as for instance in the almost exclusively *edifying* commentary of the Halle school. And finally, it would be desirable, that on some passages of Scripture which have been particularly the objects of strife, as on Gal. 3:20 above cited, the causes of the different expositions should be pointed out; and, what in this instance would be especially necessary, the deviations themselves properly classed; by which means the enormous amount of *two hundred and forty-four* would at once be very considerably diminished.¹ Indeed, we have as yet historico-exegetical essays or monographs on only two passages of Scripture; viz. that of Schreiter on the parable of the unjust steward, Luke c. 16, which alas! is unsatisfactory, both in regard to the classification (although Keil was here consulted) and in other respects; and those on Gal. 3:20, by Anton, Keil, Bonitz, Zäuner, and Weigand. With these writings may also be ranked the essay of Gurlitt on the epithet *Boanerges*;² to which in regard to man-

¹ In this passage, the so called "philosophical" classification of the various interpreters, defended by Baumgarten, Gabler, Zäuner, viz. according to the conjectural aim of the apostle's argumentation, seems to be quite too uncertain. We regard the classification of Koppe, Bonitz, and others, according to the signification and reference of *μωσίνης*, as being much more certain and appropriate.

² *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, IIter Jahrg. 4tes Stück.

ner we must assign the first place, and which also exhibits the conciliating method proposed to be followed in the present essay.

Our purpose is not here to give a treatise which shall embrace the subject in all its interesting and instructive relations. We will regard it only in one point of view, viz. *A very large number of different interpretations are not CONTRADICTIONARY to each other, but present only a RELATIVE diversity; so that one by no means excludes the others.* This is a position we wish to establish by some examples.

The richer the mind, the richer the discourse. This is the very essence of rich and spirited discourse, that it casts on every side a peculiar light, like the diamond with its many faces. When Hamann said: "*Vox populi, vox dei*; the gods of the earth say *schismam*,"* this, like most of his words, was an apophthegm, which, whether read upwards or downwards, forwards or backwards, always gives a meaning. Rich yet simple; a water in which the elephant may wade and the lamb not drown, as one of the Fathers says,—this is the character of the Scriptures. Like nature they present variety in unity. Who, in reading John's Gospel, has not involuntarily been struck with the deep significance of language in this contemplative disciple! and through him with that of the Master, who is reflected in the mirror of his spirit! When the Master says, John 11: 9, 10, "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him;"—and when the disciple affirms, 1 John 2: 10, 11, "He that loveth his brother, abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth;"—who does not at once recognize the amphibology and deep significancy of these words? But this character of significancy does not belong to John alone, but to the whole of Scripture; yea, even to the Hebrew language, and to the Greek of the New Testament, which has derived a colouring from it. And one main source of the discrepancy of interpreters, has lain in their failure to perceive and appreciate this

* The emperor Charles V, as is well known, made as little scruple about the accusative *schismam*, as Frederic the Great did about his German orthography of the French language.

peculiarity of scriptural language. Many have not been wanting in the acuteness, which separates that which seems alike; but many have been destitute of that deeper penetration, which again searches out unity in that which has been separated. They have been satisfied with bringing forward several senses as admissible; but have neglected to search out the fundamental idea, in which these all flow together. It is natural to suppose, that this isolation of different senses and expositions of Scripture, would be most likely to take place in connexion with certain doctrinal tendencies; with those, namely, in which there is in general a deficiency in the power of intuitive vision, dread of a sound and holy mysticism, and a dead intellectual abstraction. It has indeed become common to name, as the representative of this latter tendency, Aristotle; and of the former, Plato,—but whether justly, we must doubt. We would rather say with Hamann: “If the outline belongs to the former, the colouring is from the latter.” But however this may be, the designation has become established; and we cannot refrain from quoting here the language of Goethe, where he subjoins to his description of these two representatives, just what we also would say of these two tendencies in the interpretation of Scripture.

“Plato,” says Goethe,* “is in relation to this world, like a blessed spirit, who chooses for a time to take up his abode here. His object is not so much to become acquainted with the world, because he knows it before, as kindly to communicate to it that which he brings with him, and which is so necessary to it. He penetrates the depths, more to fill them with his own essence than to explore them. He mounts upwards with longing to partake again of his original. All that he utters, has reference to one single principle—perfect, good, true, beautiful; the love of which he strives to enkindle in every bosom. Whatever of earthly science he acquires in particulars, melts, yea we might say, evaporates, in his method, in his discourse. Aristotle, on the contrary, is in relation to the world like a man, a master-builder. He is once here, and he must work and build. He inquires about the soil; but no further than till he finds a firm foundation. From that point to the centre of the earth, all the rest is indifferent to him. He marks out a vast circuit for his building, collects materials from every quarter, arranges them, piles them one upon another, and thus rises in regular pyramidal form into the air; while Plato shoots

* *Farbenlehre* II. p. 140.

up towards heaven like an obelisk, yea like a pointed flame. When a few such men appeared, who in a manner distributed themselves through human nature as the separate representatives of noble, but not easily compatible qualities; when they had the good fortune to express fully all their views, and this not merely in short laconic phrases, like oracles, but in extensive, complete and diversified works; when these works remained for the good of mankind, and continued ever onward more or less to be studied and observed: it follows naturally, that the world, so far as it can be regarded as thinking and feeling, was necessitated to yield itself to the one or to the other, to acknowledge one or the other as its master, teacher, guide.

“This necessity shews itself most clearly, in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. These, in the independence, wonderful originality, variety, totality, yea immeasurableness, of their contents, furnished of themselves no standard by which they could be measured; this standard must be sought from without and applied to them; and the whole choir of those who assembled for the purpose, Jews and Christians, saints and heathen, fathers of the church and heretics, councils and popes, reformers and opposers, all, so far as they attempted to interpret or explain, to counsel or supply, to prepare for use or put to use, did it either consciously or unconsciously in the Platonic or Aristotelian method; as we may be convinced, to mention only the Jewish school, by the talmudistic and cabbalistic mode of treating the Bible.”

The tact of the great poet, however little he might be acquainted with the details upon which his judgment of the whole is founded, has not led him wrong, when he finds in the Talmudists and Cabbalists the types of that two-fold method of interpretation of which we speak; only that, to speak with historical exactness, it is precisely in the interpretation of the Old Testament that both these tendencies often run together; as is shewn, for instance, by the *Rabboth* on the Pentateuch. Were we to designate those schools of Christian exegesis, which would belong to the side of the Talmudists; or, to speak so as not to be misunderstood, in which abstract intellect, a lifeless logic, with no power of intuition,* predominates; we should

* The word *intuition* is here and elsewhere to be understood in its primitive meaning, viz. *immediate mental vision*. It thus corresponds to the German *Anschauung*.—Ed.

not quote that school which would first occur to those who have never been familiar with the commentaries of a Thomas Aquinas, a Hugh of St. Victor, and a Richard of St. Victor, viz. the scholastic divines;—for both Hugh and Richard of St. Victor merit the name of *Mystics* quite as much as that of *Scholastics*, and Thomas with all his subtlety has also deep meaning in his expositions.—We should cite rather the Lutheran interpreters after the time of the reformation, as Balduin, Hunnius, Calov; the Arminians, as Grotius (who however is less affected by this error), Episcopius, Limborch (who is especially devoid of the power of intuition); all the Socinian writers; but more particularly also, those superficial rationalizing theologians, in whom strength of intellect and power of feeling are equally wanting, as Teller, Loen, J. C. F. Schulz (professor in Giessen, whose exegetical writings are a reproach to protestant exegesis); or, to mention names more known in recent times, Koppe, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others. And finally, we must also confess, that this abstract intellectual exegesis seems to us to predominate more than it ought, and to the disadvantage of that otherwise solid work, in the exposition of the Old Testament in Hengstenberg's Christology; and that, in this respect, what Olshausen has said on the interpretation of the Old Testament, appears to us to be far more correct. On the other hand, we cannot deny, that we likewise are not wholly in unison with the exegesis of Von Meyer, a man whom we highly venerate. With the principles of this excellent interpreter, we could indeed well accord; but there seems to us to be too great a want of plan and of consistency, both in the principles themselves and in their application. Yet to this venerated man will ever belong the merit—though unheard and disregarded by the many—of having first emphatically referred in exegesis to the fact, *that the different radii of the same circle can never fall in the way of each other*, draw them which way you will, from the centre to the periphery, or from the periphery to the centre. And this is the position which it is the object of the present essay to support by some examples.

Recent exegesis has begun to have a more correct feeling on this point. Lücke has much that is good and appropriate in this respect, in the first part of his Commentary on John. Thus he says (p. 575) in reference to the expression *ιδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, *to see the kingdom of God*: “The use of ἰδεῖν, in such and similar cases, manifestly points to something, to which

the exegesis of Kuinoel and others is constantly opposed; either from a dread of every thing deep, or from a deficiency in the power of intuitive contemplation. Such and similar expressions unveil to us the fact, of which the pious Hebrew in the light of revelation had indeed a presentiment, but in which the Christian has full faith, viz. the essential unity of knowledge and being. Whoever comprehends the speculative, fundamental ideas of Christianity, will not easily be satisfied, to see that which these figurative expressions of Scripture unite, or what the Scriptures convey in figure respecting the eternal unity of thought and being, torn in pieces and dissipated, by converting the significant figures into abstractions and abstract antitheses." With this too we may connect the striking and spirited remark (p. 577), with which he warns against the resolution of the figurative language of the scriptures in preaching: "It is this figurative style of the New Testament, through which, as is the province of hermeneutics to shew, the fundamental ideas of the Christian faith can alone be excited and presented. It is this very style, indeed, which is also the most intelligible to the people."—Winer also, in his Commentary on Galatians, has in several instances very properly put an end to the strife of interpreters, by connecting and uniting several expositions into one; e. g. in the explanation of *σάουξ καὶ αἷμα*, p. 46, 50. n. 6. Ed. 3. Why has not this skilful commentator also explained the difficult *ζηλοῦσθαι* in Gal. 4: 18, as Bengel did? whose exposition, uniting that of Beza and Grotius, seems to us satisfactory. The commentary of Olshausen has much that is excellent in this respect; as also the recent and excellent Exposition of the first Epistle of Peter by Steiger; where in the very outset the various interpretations of *ἐλπὶς ζωῆς*, c. 1: 3, are referred back to one fundamental idea, and so likewise the explanation of *τέλος* v. 9, by *finis* and *merces*, etc. The writer of this essay, in the course of continued study of the Scriptures, has ever more and more perceived what was wanting in this respect in the earlier editions of his own exegetical writings; and hopes that he has adopted essential improvements in the third edition of his Commentary on John. Compare the explanation of John 9: 5. 11: 9, 10. In his Exposition on Romans, some passages may yet be apprehended in a deeper sense, by connecting several interpretations. So Rom. 10: 4, where, instead of choosing between the different meanings of *τέλος*, (viz. 1. the end, 2. the fulfiller, 3. the object,) and selecting out one, the writer would now prefer to

connect all the three ; since there lies in the idea itself only one meaning, but in different relations : ‘The law terminates in Christ ; consequently it has in him its end, but attains also its object ; and its object is its fulfilment.’ If now the one is here really contained in the other, why should not the apostle, when he used this word, have had this three-fold relation before his mind ?

We select here the first verses of the Sermon on the Mount, in order to ascertain by trial, how far the manifold interpretations that have been given of the first beatitudes in this divine discourse, may be referred back to common fundamental ideas. For this purpose, however, it will be first necessary to present a complete view of the expositions of the verses in question.

In verse 3 there are two methods of construction ; the usual one, and that first suggested by Olearius and more recently adopted by Michaelis and Paulus, which connects τῷ πνεύματι with μακάριοι. With constructions, however, we have here nothing to do ; and the less with this particular one, because, since the examination of it by Wolf and Knapp, it has very few adherents. We therefore turn at once to the different views which have been taken of the words οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι. Here the question presents itself, whether πτωχοὶ is to be understood *corporeally* or *spiritually*, of the *external* or the *internal* man.

The first, as is well known, has ever been the opinion of Roman catholic interpreters ; who founded upon this passage, as a *dictum probans*, the doctrine of voluntary poverty ; as Burgensis, Hermann a Lapide, Zegerus, and many others. These had been already partly anticipated by the Fathers, in a view very nearly allied, if not entirely the same, with theirs. Clemens Alexandrinus, in his treatise *Qui dives Salvus*, c. 17, takes the words, it would seem, in the following sense : “ Those who feel in their hearts that they are poor ; whether they are actually poor or rich ; ” so that thus understood, we might with Beausobre regard 1 Cor. 7 : 29 as parallel : ‘ Let those who have, be as though they had not, ’ καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες, ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες. This sense is followed by Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Jerome ; except that with these, the stricter catholic view became more predominant. Among the modern catholics also, Kistemaker explains it in a manner similar to that of Clement ; with a comparison of Ps. 62 : 11. 1 Cor. 7 : 30, 31.—And what was still more sur-

prising to us, who are now accustomed not to think of external poverty in this expression, we find the phrase referred to external poverty even by the reformers, as Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon; although Luther on this very passage contends strongly against the merits of a voluntary poverty. He explains it, however, by "poverty before God, heartfelt poverty, i. e. so that one does not place his confidence, consolation, and pride in earthly things." So Melancthon: "Pauperes spiritu, i. e. *vera patientia* tolerantes paupertatem." So too Grotius among the later commentators; except that in his way, he robs the idea still more of the biblical colouring, by alluding to the *μεψιμοισμοί* (discontented).

To this view, since the earliest times, that of *internal* poverty, or poverty in *spirit*, stands opposed; and the passage has been accordingly so explained, with a greater or less degree of depth, by Chrysostom, Augustine, Macarius, Erasmus, Calvin, Pellicanus, Piscator; and also by those Lutheran interpreters who elsewhere adhere more closely to Luther, as Chemnitz, Hunnius, Calov; and in more recent times, after Knapp's example, all the commentators, except Paulus, who chooses to follow a meaning of his own. Among these later ones, however, the passage has been viewed in a more superficial light. De Wette, who here and in the Psalms always supposes a reference to the party of the politically oppressed,—who also are the pious, the humble,—stands between these two opposing applications of the words to external and internal poverty, and connects both.

But within the limits of this latter mode of application also, there are many shades of difference, according as it is apprehended with more or less depth, as we have said above. Among the ancients, Macarius has explained it best, in his twelfth Homily. Chrysostom takes the word *πτωχός* as in itself the figurative designation of internal poverty, and compares Is. 66 : 2; the words *τῷ πνεύματι* he explains, 'of their own mind, will;' so that he in this way favours the later catholic exposition. Augustine understands here the "humiles et timentes deum;" but *πνεῦμα* he explains of the "spiritus inflatus hominis,"—of the "ferocia hominis non regeniti." It is strange that Erasmus here fully coincides with him; as he does, by suggesting as an antithesis the *μέγα πνεῦμα* of the Greeks. Pellicanus connects the ideas of external and internal poverty. Calvin endeavours with much skill to unite Matthew and Luke (6: 20) in this manner: "In Luke, *πτωχοί* stands in a tropical

sense, 'Blessed are they who beg. But as this trope is ambiguous, since all who beg do not feel their poverty, Matthew subjoins the phrase τῷ πνεύματι, 'Blessed are those who beg, provided they feel their poverty.' Among recent rationalist interpreters, it is matter of particular censure, that they have regarded this poverty only in reference to intellectual knowledge, a poverty of understanding and judgment. Bahrdt seems to have understood the words like Clement: "Blessed are they who have few earthly desires." Stolz looks only at knowledge: "Blessed are they whose minds are open to the truth." Bolten expresses an effect or consequence of *πτωχεία τοῦ πνεύματος*, "Blessed are the humble." Teller specifies a social, rather than religious virtue: "Blessed are the modest." Kuinoel also takes knowledge only into view: "Qui agnoscunt, quam rudes sint doctrinae divinae." Fritzsche is worst of all; for according to his exposition, the kingdom of heaven is shut against all scholars: "Fortunati qui ingenio et eruditione parum florent."

Of this simple declaration, therefore, the sense of which would seem so plain, there exists a great variety of explanations. Can there be one found, which will include in itself a great part, at least, of those which have been specified? Is it possible to remove the main point of difference?—so that, according to the view of one portion of interpreters, the language may refer to external poverty borne with humble submission; and, according to the mind of others, to poverty in spirit, or humility? Many have supposed, that all depends here on the circumstance, whether Matthew be interpreted by Luke (6: 20), or Luke by Matthew. Luke, it is said, is manifestly speaking of external poverty; and if we will not do violence to his language, we must either concede that the two Evangelists ascribe each a different phrase to Christ; or Matthew must be interpreted according to Luke, and be understood as speaking of external poverty. So reason Maldonatus, Grotius, Olearius, and many others among the moderns. It cannot, however, but be matter of surprise, how so many eminent exegetical scholars could entertain the opinion, that Luke is clearly speaking of the externally poor. It is only necessary to examine the text of Luke a little more closely, in order to be convinced of the contrary. If the beatitude has reference solely to what is external, then also of course the promise and the threat can have only the same reference. But who would undertake to refer *χορτασθήσεσθε* and *πεινάσητε* to a fulness of earthly goods and to physical hunger alone? Would it

not be far more natural to say, that Christ has comprehended, inseparably, both external and internal poverty, external and internal suffering, as one, both in the beatitude and in the threatening and promise? According to the divine purpose, internal suffering and penitence should be awakened by external sufferings; and according to experience, as the night of the ancients was the fabled mother of the gods, so also the night of suffering is usually the parent from which that which is holy is born. Whoever enjoys abundance of apparent good, and consequently contentment, so far as the earthly part of man is concerned, will least of all be disposed to feel that the *ἀληθινά*, the true riches, as Christ so beautifully calls them, Luke 16: 11, are wanting to him, or that he is not *πλούσιος ἐν θεῷ*, Luke 12: 21. Compare also the denunciation which James, in the manner of the prophets of the Old Testament, holds against the rich, c. 5: 1—3. It is there said in v. 5, they have “nourished their hearts,” and consequently have satisfied their wants with specious good. The rich man in Luke c. 16, and he who enlarged his barns, are also given us as types.—This more general apprehension of the phrase is also most visibly confirmed in the establishment of the primitive church, and in the founding of particular churches in every age; where it was always the poor, the externally oppressed, in whom the longing after spiritual deliverance was first awakened; 1 Cor. 1: 26. James 2: 5.

Proceeding now from this experience, we can explain the fact, that even in the Old Testament the words *עָנִי*, *דָּל*, *עָשִׂיר*, *אָבְיוֹן*, refer in many places not merely to the external state, but also to the religious and moral character; so that a certain kind of double sense is found in them. Those words which express a condition of suffering, express also that the suffering is that of innocence; e.g. *עָנִי-אָרֶץ* Job 24: 4. *דָּל* and *עָנִי* Jer. 26: 6. *אָבְיוֹנִים* Ps. 12: 6. 69: 34, and often in the Psalms;—that the external depression is connected with the internal, and produces humility of heart; comp. especially Is. 66: 2, where *עָנִי* is parallel with *נָבָה רוּחַ* and *עַל-דָּבָרֵי*. In Syriac and Chaldaic the word *ܡܫܝܚܐ*, *depressed*, has also the signification *humble*, in Rabbinic *נָמַךְ*; and the word *ܚܢܘܬܐ* in Syriac has also the meaning *religious*. It is a beautiful passage of Tertullian, (adv. Marc. I. 14,) where he speaks of Christ; how, in the rich consolations he gives to the poor, the depressed, the widow, and the orphan, as compared

with the rich promises of the same kind in the Old Testament, he eminently shows himself to be the Son of his Heavenly Father.

The same two-fold internal and external reference of the words in question, is also found in the New Testament. We cannot doubt that it exists in *πτωχοί*, Matt. 11: 5. Luke 4: 18. 1: 53; and also in *πλούσιος* Matt. 19: 23, 24; for although only earthly riches had previously been spoken of, yet, in the mouth of Christ, *πλούσιος* in this passage had probably a wider meaning. Here belongs too *οἱ μικροὶ οὗτοι* Matt. 10: 42. 18: 6, as used of believers. Vice versa, in 1 Cor. 4: 8, the expression *κεκορησμένοι ἐστέ* refers chiefly to the *internal* state, though an external reference is not therefore excluded; the Corinthian church was more opulent than many others, and in v. 10, 11, Paul contrasts their opulence with the external indigence and meanness of the apostles.—Such a kind of double sense we here assign to the *πτωχοί* and *ἐμπελησμένοι* of Luke.

In the main point, then, there would consequently be no discrepancy between Matthew and Luke; nevertheless, it may be said, they would still not say precisely the same thing, because in Matthew this double sense is excluded. Assuredly this is excluded, so soon as we translate the phrase by “poor in spirit,” and under *spirit* understand the object of the poverty, that which is wanting; for then *πνεῦμα* would be referred to the divine Spirit. But is this sense of the word probable? We think not. First, the expression, “Blessed are those who are poor in the Holy Spirit,” would be too remarkable. It might indeed be said, that this means no more than that they ‘feel themselves poor;’ but that such is the actual meaning of the expression is not so apparent from this interpretation, as from that which we shall give below. Further, the form of expression imitates the Hebrew; but no one in the Heb. phrases *עני ריח*, *נבה ריח*, etc. would think of understanding the Holy Spirit. We therefore understand *ריח* of the human spirit, *in which* one is poor; and in this view the idea lies much more clearly, that those are meant who *feel themselves poor*. De Wette: “Blessed are those who suffer in spirit.” If it be thus translated, there is no reason why we should not assent to the sense which Clement gives: “Blessed are they who have not enough, but who feel in their heart that they are poor.” This poverty now may be external or internal, according as the heart seeks a sufficiency, satisfaction, more in external or in spiritual wealth.—In this our mode of

interpretation, therefore, Matthew and Luke are first of all brought into unison; and then, too, both those two classes of interpreters, who refer the words of Christ either to external or to internal poverty exclusively.

The way is thus opened also for the removal of another discrepancy. A different character is given throughout to the interpretation of Scripture, according as the interpreter clings fast every where to the immediate circumstances and relations of time and place, or attributes to Jesus an eye to survey all coming ages, and a spirit to break the bread of life to all the human race to the remotest generations. This question came under serious discussion in the controversy of Stäudlin and Keil, respecting the grammatico-historical interpretation. Stäudlin denied that this was sufficient; because it takes into account only the existing historical relations, while the view of Christ embraced the succession of ages. Keil, on the other hand, did not hesitate directly to affirm: "This very position, that Jesus intended to reveal eternal and immutable truths to *all* ages, may be a matter of doubt; for however true it may be, that the essential doctrines of Christianity, in accordance with the divine plan, must be regarded by all future ages as eternal truths; yet it seems to me quite as doubtful, whether Jesus had any knowledge of this plan of Providence; and whether therefore, in his declarations, he could have had any reference to posterity!"*

In these first verses of the Sermon on the Mount, also, many interpreters have dwelt only on the immediate historical relations, and have in this way narrowed the sense exceedingly. No one has done this in a more superficial manner than Gratz; and before him, Wetstein, and also Le Clerc, as we shall see in treating of v. 5. Thus, holding fast to the language of Luke, many say that Jesus, in opposition to that Pharisaic pride which contemned the people, intended to attach the lower classes of the people to himself, and to make himself friends and disciples of those among whom on the whole there was less corruptness; as is confirmed by his choice of the apostles from the lowest order. There is certainly some truth in this representation; although this proceeding of the Saviour must be apprehended in a somewhat deeper sense. Nor does our interpretation exclude such a reference as the above. We believe it was the Redeemer's purpose, to draw to himself the despised classes of men, the externally oppressed; just as he compares himself in the para-

* *Analekten von Keil und Tzschirner, B. I. St. 1. p. 63.*

ble, to the man who collected his guests from the highways and hedges. So in the words: "Come unto me, ye weary," we assume an allusion to those who are oppressed externally and to the needy. Thus then De Wette's reference to the politically oppressed, would also be properly included in our conception of the passage.

If we now look at the modifications which the idea of *poverty in spirit* has received, especially among the moderns, we shall be able to assign them all a place under our interpretation, as single patterns or elements of the general idea of poverty in spirit. Whoever knows and feels himself poor in spirit, he is *humble*; as Chrysostom, Augustine, Bolten, and others have presented this side of the idea, though, as Knapp has justly shewn, in a partial manner. Whoever feels himself poor in spirit, feels also that he has not the right knowledge of religion, and that he must receive further and better religious instruction; as is said by Stolz, Kuinoel, and others. Only for the exposition of Fritzsche, we can find no place. The opposite to *ingenium* and *eruditio*, is *stupidity* and *want of learning*. That however Christ should pronounce those blessed, who feel themselves stupid and unlearned, is hardly to be supposed; for this deficiency even He will not remove; since he came not into the world to form intelligent and learned scholars, but to "save his people from their sins!"

Passing over the promises, both in the third and fourth verses, we proceed now to the second beatitude, in v. 4. Here too we find among interpreters the diversity, that some refer it more to external suffering, others more to internal sorrow for sin; while some, as Zwingli and Pellicanus, connect both. This external suffering again is understood by some in a merely local sense; as by Gratz, who thinks only of the political oppression of the Israelites at that period. Others are aware that Christ could not have pronounced those to be blessed, who merely suffer; and they therefore seek in this suffering some religious element, which Christ had in view. According to Maldonat, Wetstein, Hezel, and others, Christ had before his mind only such as are subjected to *θλιψεις* on account of their belief; although in that case it is difficult to see how this beatitude differs from v. 11. According to Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa, and others, he thought only on the temporal loss which a conversion to Christianity brought with it. Luther, Grotius, and others, have here also assumed *patient endurance* as the religious element; but

then this beatitude would not differ from that in v. 3, according to Luther's interpretation. But by far the greater part both of the earlier and more recent interpreters, recognize in *πενθοῦντες* a prevailing or exclusive allusion to the sorrow of penitence, to sorrow for their own and others' sins. So Chrysostom, Ambrose, Hilarius, Jerome, Bucer, Musculus, Calov, Hunnius, etc.

Our exposition embraces, in this instance also, all these different references and relations. We have seen how suffering, according to the biblical mode of viewing the subject, is connected with a susceptibility for eternal things. As the night of the ancients is the mother of the gods, so the night of affliction manifests itself as the womb in which is conceived the true *λύπη κατὰ θεόν*, 2 Cor. 7: 10. (*Πενθεῖν* is stronger than *λυπεῖσθαι*; the latter is *to grieve, be chagrined*; the former, *to mourn*, which also manifests itself by outward signs.) Hence the gnomic wisdom of the Hebrews recommended to go to the house of mourning, rather than to the house of feasting, Ecc. 7: 1, 4; and the words which designate suffering, as *לָךְ*, *עָנִי*, *נִכְהָרְרִי*, connect with it also, as we have seen, the idea of internal depression. The passage before us contains, without doubt, an allusion to Is. 61: 2, *παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας* (*סִימְכִי*); and these *יְרוּשָׁלַיִם* are the citizens of Jerusalem humbled under divine judgments. When Luke represents Christ as pronouncing a woe over those *γελῶντας νῦν*, these are manifestly such as dread the seriousness and sorrow of repentance; just as James had in his mind this expression of our Lord in Luke, in that apostrophe to those who were so secure in the enjoyment of the goods of this world: "Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep; let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness."*—According to this view, Christ here, as in Matt. 11: 28, does indeed invite, among the afflicted and suffering, those also who are oppressed by external necessity and temporal evil; and thus places himself, as in Matt. 11: 28, in contrast with the proud and worldly scribes, who would have nothing to do with the despised and oppressed people; or he also invites those who wish only for such a Messiah and kingdom as shall fully satisfy all external wants. Bengel remarks: "Fere tales hic 'nominantur, quos mundus proculcat.'" But since it is not the crown of thorns alone which makes the

* James 4: 9, *ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μεταστραφήτω, καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν.*

Christian ; since suffering alone does not give a title to participate in the kingdom of God ; since there is also a *λύπη τοῦ κόσμου*, a sorrow of the world which only brings death, *θάνατος* ; so Christ, in pronouncing in general terms those blessed, who suffer externally, intends only those who through their sorrow, *λύπη* are brought to repentance, *μετάνοια*, 2 Cor. 7: 10. This application of the Saviour's words, gives here, as in Matt. 11: 28, the literal and the deeper meaning ; and is adopted by all those interpreters who take *οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι* as referring to the internal man. Thus understood, we find in v. 4, as compared with v. 3, an advance,—the feeling and consciousness of one's own internal poverty, awakens sorrow ; from this springs humility, of which v. 5 speaks ; and that which is expressed negatively in vs. 3—5, is affirmed positively in v. 6, viz. the painful consciousness of that which is wanting in us, becomes a longing after righteousness, *δικαιοσύνη*.

We turn now to verse 5, in which we shall consider both the beatitude and the promise.

In this beatitude, *πραῦς*, *gentle*, taken in the usual classic signification as the opposite of *ὀργίλος*, *θυμοειδής*, *angry*, *passionate*, designates a quality which in the New Testament is particularly required of the disciples of Christ. In the discourse of Christ himself, are many maxims directed against passionate anger, as c. 5: 22—26, 43—45. 6: 12, and elsewhere ; and in Matt. 11: 29 the Saviour exhibits himself to his followers as the model of *πραΐτης*. The translators have therefore, almost without exception, given *οἱ πραεῖς* by *mites*, *mansueti*, i. e. meek, mild, gentle ; and interpreters have found in the passage a blessing pronounced upon some preeminent and lovely christian virtue ; instead of which, however, Christ might here have adduced any other with equal propriety ; as e. g. chastity or beneficence. Those only who have dwelt particularly on the local circumstances, regard here this prominence of the virtue of gentleness as necessary ; because Christ, as they suppose, intended to counteract in his disciples all tendency to rebellion.

We must, however, first of all, turn our attention to the fact, that *mansuetus* and our English *gentle*, by no means cover the whole sense of *πραῦς*. In the Septuagint, *πραῦς* corresponds to the Heb. *קַנַּי* and *קַנְי*. These two words are synonymous ; the Kethib often reading *קַנְי* where the Keri reads *קַנַּי*. The ground idea is *oppressed*, *afflicted*. Gentleness and humility

are more usually found in the afflicted, than in those who enjoy uninterrupted prosperity; hence, in the mind of a Hebrew, the ideas of *afflicted, humble, gentle*, became associated. Compare on v. 3 above. The Syriac translator has here *ܦܨܚܘܬܐ*, which also designates gentleness and humility, but more especially means *humble*. In those passages of the New Testament also, where *πραΐς* occurs, the idea of humility is in like manner generally included. The apostle James is particularly abundant in his commendations of *πραΐτης*, by which, most clearly, he understands that *ἐπεικεία, meekness, (Lindigkeit, as Luther has it,)* in which gentleness and humility are so delightfully blended, and mutually presuppose each other. From the apostle's description of heavenly wisdom, James 3: 13—17, we readily distinguish, how, in his ideal model of a genuine disciple of Jesus, love, compassion, gentleness, and humility, are all intimately blended. When in c. 3: 13 he places *ζῆλος* and *ἐριθεία* in contrast with *πραΐτης*, and in c. 1: 21 admonishes men to receive the truths of Christianity *ἐν πραΐτητι*, he opposes himself just as strongly to pride and conceit, as he does to anger and passion; for what else than conceit could be the ground of that love of strife against which he contends? When Peter, in 1 Pet. 3: 4, requires of Christian females a *πνεῦμα πραῦ καὶ ἡσύχιον*, he understands by it that meek, quiet, unpretending spirit, which never puts itself forward. In 2 Cor. 10: 1 we find *ταπεινὸς εἶναι* made parallel with *πραΐτης* and *ἐπεικεία*; and elsewhere this virtue, *πραΐτης*, is closely connected with *ταπεινοφροσύνη*, so that at least the near affinity of the two is apparent; Matt. 11: 29. Eph. 4: 2.—Hence, in the passage before us, we have to understand in *οἱ πραεῖς*, the same class of persons who in the Psalms are called *עַנְיִים*. Indeed, these words of Christ are actually borrowed from Ps. 13: 11; where the Septuagint also has *οἱ πραεῖς*. They are the meek and humble believers, who must suffer, who on that very account are treated with contumely, and who it is supposed may be thus scornfully treated with impunity. Ps. 4: 3. 13: 4. al.

It follows, that this beatitude also has, first of all, the temporal and local aim to destroy the rebellious hopes, which the carnal Israelite might have entertained from the Saviour's advent; and to teach, that an entrance into the kingdom of God cannot be won with weapons of the flesh; John 18: 36. In the world, the principle holds good which the rebellious Britons express

in Tacitus:* “Nihil profici patientia, nisi ut graviora tanquam ex facili tolerantibus imperentur;” “patience avails nothing, except to impose severer requisitions upon those who seem ready to bear them;” but in the mode of contemplating the world which Christ introduces, it is declared, that *οἱ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν*. The *πραεῖς* are those, as Augustine says after Rom. 12: 21, “qui vincunt per bonum malum,” “who overcome evil with good.”—At the same time, the declaration in this verse carries forward the development of that right frame of spirit which must ever mark the true denizens of Christ’s kingdom; for out of that affliction which our Lord in v. 4 pronounces blessed, proceeds an humility which makes no claims either on God or man.

The mode in which the promise in this beatitude is apprehended, depends partly on how *οἱ πραεῖς* is understood, and partly on the manner in which interpreters have been wont to explain the language of Scripture, whether meagerly, partially, or as the word of the Spirit. The different interpretations which have been given of these words, may here be divided into two classes. So early as among the Fathers, we find the distinction, that the one portion recognized in the passage only a promise referring exclusively to the present life; while the other portion saw only one referring exclusively to a future life. To the first class belongs Chrysostom, and after him Theophylact and Euthymius. He understands under *γῆ* the *good things of this world*, which (he says) are promised by Christ in Matt. 19: 29. Mark 10: 29, to such as for his sake have suffered the loss of their possessions. Godliness, as Paul says, has the promise both of this life and of that which is to come, 1 Tim. 4: 8; and whoever seeks first the kingdom of God, to him shall all other things be added thereunto, Matt. 6: 33. Christ then here gives to the anticipated question of his disciples: “Lo, we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?” an answer similar to that in Matt. 19: 28, 29.—By far the greater part, however, of the ancient interpreters, belong to the other class, who find in the words a promise of heavenly rewards. So Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Macarius, Jerome, Augustine, and others; and Chrysostom also allows, that many under *γῆ* understand the *γῆ νοητή* or spiritual world.

* Vita Agric. 15.

Some of these intérpreters, it is true, take $\gamma\eta$ directly as a symbolic designation of heaven; others prefer to understand by it a region exalted still higher than the heavens, *οὐρανοί*, with the description of which Gregory of Nyssa occupies himself particularly. They all appeal to the $\text{עָרָא} \text{בְּרָאשֵׁית}$ in Ps. 142: 6 (5).

Of modern commentators also, many refer the promise to earthly good, and others to heavenly. Among the former are Luther, Melancthon, Beza, Grotius, Hunnius, Hammond, Stolz, Paulus, etc. Yet the expositions of all these intérpreters assume a different character, according to the mode in which they endeavour to demonstrate and exhibit the fulfilment of the promise. Those are the most meagre of all, who, like Grotius, find the fulfilment of the words of Christ in the friendships which the gentle-minded acquire for themselves; much as we would say in English, 'He prepossesses the whole world in his favour.' Others, as Hammond, dwell upon the circumstance, that the gentle usually avoid contention, and so remain in possession of their goods. Others think, that the *πραεῖς* are really so elevated in spirit above all earthly strife, that they actually possess, as it were, all the goods of this world. Luther and Melancthon make it a prominent idea, that earthly rulers, whom God has set as a terror to evil doers, will be so directed, that suffering innocence shall in the end obtain its rights: "See, Christ here rebukes such silly saints, as think this or that one is lord of the whole earth, and has a right not to have any trouble, but may make a noise and hubbub, and commit violence, etc.—God will doubtless take care, that his word and his ordinance shall remain, and that thou, according to this promise, shalt possess the land." Understood in this way, there would lie in these words, compared with v. 39, a source of comfort for those who yield an unconditional obedience to every command of our Lord.—Le Clerc assigns to the words a merely local sense. According to him, in looking at those pacific Christians, who in the rebellion of Judea against the Romans would not take up arms, Christ designed to say:* "Blessed are the gentle, who for their gentleness will be approved by the powerful, and not compelled to till the earth like others of a more warlike disposition."

* "Felices judicandi mansueti, quia mansuetudine sua grati erunt rerum potentibus, nec solum vertere cogentur, ut (alii) qui sunt indolis ferocioris."

Of the latter class, who refer the promise to the rewards of the heavenly world, are Zwingli, Maldonat, Calov, Wetstein, Kistemaker, etc. They understand by *the earth* in Ps. 37: 11, the land of Canaan; but Canaan, as elsewhere, the type of the kingdom of glory, the heavenly reign of Christ; as Wetstein expresses it, Christ has interpreted the Psalm mystically. Hezel has a somewhat different view, and translates: "They shall enjoy the privileges of God's people." He takes therefore the whole phrase in the Old Testament in a wider sense, "to be constituted as God's people;" and supposes it, in this extent, to be transferred in a higher sense to the citizens of the New Testament kingdom.

Among the moderns we find also a third class of interpreters, who stand between the other two, and make a two-fold application of the words, or rather combine in one, the reference both to the goods of this world and of the next,—likewise with various modifications. To this class belong Erasmus, Calvin, Piscator, Chemnitz, Glassius, Bengel, etc. Erasmus in his paraphrase,—and so too Glassius,—combines a number of applications, rising as it were, by different steps.* The views of Bengel and Calvin, are full of spirit. "The humble sufferers," says Bengel, "receive at last the earth as their inheritance; and in the meantime they triumph even upon earth in their humility and depression; for all things work together for their good; and the whole course of worldly things tends therefore to their triumph, to their glory." Calvin points to the justice of God in the infliction of divine judgments, as manifested in the whole course of this world; to this the meek and humble Christian may entrust his cause, as that of oppressed innocence. At the same time he lays open the back ground, as it were, of the promise—the prospect of the final judgment. His language is beautiful: "The men of this world regard them-

* "Sed haec est nova dilutandae possessionis ratio, ut plus impetret ab ulro largientibus mansuetudo quam per fas nefasque paret aliorum rapacitas. Placidus qui mavult sua cedere quam pro his digladiari, tot locis habet fundum quot locis reperit amantes evangelicae mansuetudinis. Invisa est omnibus pervicacia, mansuetudini favent et ethnici. Postremo si perit possessio, miti damnum non est, sed ingens lucrum; perit ager, sed incolumi tranquillitate animi. Postremo, ut omnibus excludatur mitis, tanto certior est illi coelestis terrae possessio, unde depelli non poterit."

selves as secure only by taking vengeance upon injuries; and they protect their lives with force and arms. But when it is once felt, that Christ is the only guardian of our life, we have nothing to do but hide under the shadow of his wings.”*

If we make Ps. 37 : 11 the point of departure in interpreting this passage, we shall perceive that this explanation of the words is the most appropriate. We must here, however, first mention an ingenious suggestion of Heumann, which Michaelis also has adopted. He refers the promise, it is true, to this world, but still to spiritual goods; and on this account we mention him here in the third class of interpreters.† Dissatisfied with all previous explanations of the passage, Heumann supposes a better sense may be derived by comparing it with Rom. 4: 13. There it is said that God promised Abraham, his seed should become *κληρονόμος τοῦ κόσμου*, in which is manifestly implied, that the Abrahamic religion should fill the whole earth, and be received by all the nations. From that passage, therefore, may be derived for the one before us this easy and natural sentiment: “The humble disciples of Christ must not despond; their cause will one day triumph, so that all the world shall do homage to their faith.”

If now, among all these different acceptations, only one afforded the correct sense, we should really be in a situation of great embarrassment. But it is particularly in this very passage, that we shall be able to perceive, how each of these different modes of apprehension presents a single aspect of the sense; and how that alone approves itself as the only correct one, which includes and combines all the others in itself.

The declaration of Christ is a citation from the Old Testament, as we have seen. We begin with the explanation of the passage in the Psalm; from which it will appear, whether Christ has attributed to the Old Testament passage another and foreign sense; or has here, as elsewhere, purified, expanded, and profoundly apprehended the Old Testament ideas. In Ps.

* “Non aliter se tutos fore confidunt filii hujus saeculi quam si acriter quidquid illatum fuerit mali, vindicent, atque ita manu et armis vitam suam tueantur. At vero quum statuendum sit Christum unicum esse vitae nostrae custodem, nihil aliud restat nisi lateamus sub umbra alarum ejus.”

† This exposition is found in *Poecile sive Epistolae miscellaneae*, T. III. p. 376.

37: 11 it is said, **וְיִרְשׁוּ אֶתְּ אֶרֶץ**; v. 29 **יִרְשׁוּ אֶתְּ אֶרֶץ** **צְדִיקִים**; **וְיִשְׁכְּנוּ לְעַד עֲלֵמָה**; comp. v. 9 and 22, and Ps. 15: 13. In contrast with these promises, it is said of the **מַרְעִים**, *evil doers*, Ps. 37: 9, 10, 22, that they shall be cut off, and their very place destroyed; compare especially v. 34—37. Likewise in Prov. 2: 21, 22, it is said in the Septuagint, *ὅτι εὐθείς κατασκηνώσουσι γῆν, καὶ ὅσοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται, οἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξωθήσονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς*. "For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect remain in it; but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." In all these and many similar passages, the idea of *retribution* lies at the foundation; sooner or later the justice of God, which pervades his government of the world, will manifest itself in the triumph and exaltation of suffering innocence, and the destruction of the iniquitous. Now it may with certainty be assumed, that **אֶרֶץ** in these passages does not designate the *earth* in general, but *Palestine*, the promised land; indeed **רַב אֶרֶץ** is the phrase so often repeated, by which the possession of Canaan was promised to the Israelites in the desert. The Psalmist hopes, consequently, from the future, that the promise thus made to the whole chosen people, will finally be fulfilled to the servants of God; that at last these alone will have possession of the promised land. And this is precisely the Messianic expectation, that only the righteous will one day dwell in the Holy Land; Is. 62: 12. 60: 21. We thus obtain, consequently, as the background of that general confidence in the future manifestation of the divine justice, the future expectation of the most glorious exhibitions of it in the kingdom of the Messiah. Irreligious men will see in these hopes of the Psalmist, as in those of the prophets, only a pious enthusiasm. But contemplated from the stand-point of revealed Christian faith, they appear to us as real and absolutely essential. The Christian is first convinced, that the justice of God manifests itself throughout all history in the triumph of suffering innocence. Why should the Christian not have this conviction, when even Esop, in reply to the question of Chilon, How God was occupied? gave this striking answer: "He abases the high, and exalts the low!" and when Bayle the skeptic calls this an *abrégé de l'histoire humaine*, and affirms, that a whole book might be written *de centro oscillationis moralis*. That 'the history of the world is the

final judgment of the world,* has become a trite maxim among us. Still, that this holds in every case, that in every case the *πραΐς* triumph, who would affirm? Only sometimes, as Bacon says, does Nemesis inscribe her admonitions along the great high-road of humanity in such prominent lines, that all who pass must read. Hence the history of the world is a judgment of the world, but not the final one; and what the stream of time sweeps off unjudged, unpunished, unrewarded, it bears towards the ocean of eternity, there to receive its final retribution. Hence the last great day of judgment forms, as Calvin strikingly suggests, the back-ground of the whole course of God's judgments in the world. But what, according to the Christian revelation, will be the result of the judgment of this great day? It will be the awful separation of the children of the kingdom, from those who are cast out. The great scene where both have hitherto lived together, will be changed. The earth, which with man was subjected to the curse, participates in the glorification of the children of God, Rom. 8: 21; there arises a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness, 2 Pet. 3: 13. On this new earth will then be founded the new Jerusalem, the abode of God among men, Rev. 21: 1—3. Then will those holy sufferers receive the kingdom prepared for them of the Father from the beginning; then will they reign with the Son, as they have suffered with him; Matt. 25: 24. 2 Tim. 2: 10. Rev. 3: 21. This is the last result of that judgment of the world, which stretches throughout all the history of the world. This also is the last and deepest meaning of the promise, the sense of which we are endeavouring to explain.

If now, from this point of view, we look at the diversified interpretations of this passage, we find them all included in that which has just been given. First, then, Christ promises, that the *πραΐς* in general, under the Father's protection, shall triumph over the enemies of God, even in the present world. Thus far the manifold applications of these words to earthly goods are modified; and, in fact, the triumph of pious suffering over its opposers is brought about in all these various ways; sometimes because rulers protect it; sometimes because its sorrows win the sympathy of compassionate hearts; sometimes because true peace of mind elevates the soul above all sorrows;—and finally, as the result of the great day will shew, to those who love God all things must work

* Die Weltgeschichte is das Weltgericht.

together for the best. The whole course of worldly things has for its object their glorification ; their humiliation therefore is at all times only apparent. But further than this, the words of Christ point us to a future time, when they will be fulfilled in a strict and literal sense. Then will the new and glorious earth be the *ἔκτυπον* of Canaan. Then will Christians enjoy in full the privileges of the people of God. Then will they inherit heaven ; for heaven then will be on earth.

ART. IV. DISCOURSE ON THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

By Eugene Burnouf, Professor of Sanscrit in the *College de France*. Translated by the Editor.*

In appearing for the first time in this chair, the duty which I am most eager to fulfil, is to address the homage of my sincere acknowledgments to the memory of the learned scholar for whom it was established ten years ago. I ought less than any person to forget, that if by efforts which are often too little estimated when once crowned with success, M. Chézy had not introduced into France the study of the Sanscrit tongue, we should still have been ignorant perhaps of the first elements of that idiom ; or must have derived our knowledge of it exclu-

* This article is taken from the *Journal Asiatique* for March 1833, and presents a distinct and eloquent, though very general survey of a vast and most important field. The author, M. Burnouf, although still a young man, is among the most eminent of the *savans* of France, particularly in the department of Asiatic, or rather Indian, philology and literature. This discourse was delivered in 1832 on his accession to the chair of Sanscrit, vacated by the death of M. Chézy. His tribute to the memory of his predecessor is retained.

M. Chézy was a victim of the cholera. Indeed, how striking and terrific have been the ravages of death among the learned men of Paris during the past year ! Chézy, Abel-Rémusat, Saint Martin, Champollion, Cuvier, Kieffer,—all these are names whose early loss science must long deplore, as among her brightest ornaments.—Ed.

sively from the works of English and German scholars. M. Chézy succeeded, alone and without aid, in acquiring a knowledge of the Sanscrit; he was the first professor of it in this chair; and although the study of this language, within the last five years, has made greater advances in Germany than in France, yet M. Chézy, besides the merit of having secured to his country an honourable priority, has still the farther merit of having enlightened by his counsels, if not by his lessons, the first steps of those celebrated men, who have almost naturalized this tongue among our neighbors. More than twenty years of toil had rendered him familiar with this previously unknown idiom; he knew it as one knows that which he has been compelled to learn alone. To a great aptitude for languages, M. Chézy joined an acuteness of perception and a penetration, which assured him of success, where others would have encountered only insurmountable obstacles. Accustomed as he was to struggle with those difficulties which the study of the languages of the East every where presents, he sought every opportunity of exercising the rare sagacity of his intellect; and it may truly be said, that the efforts requisite in order to advance in this painful career, not less than his individual taste, were the cause of that predilection which he ever manifested for the subtile refinements and ingenuity of the Indian poetry. Nothing in all this branch of the Brahmanic literature remained unknown to him; he had read every thing which the royal library possesses in this department; and this extensive reading, while it augmented his skill in understanding the texts, had also fully developed in him the feeling of their poetic beauties; and it had rendered the expression of them so familiar to him, that imagination seemed to have as much to do in it as erudition itself. It is to the happy union of these two qualities, which are so commonly regarded as incompatible with each other, that we owe the fine edition of the Indian drama *Sacntala*; and we may well believe, that had it not been for the pestilence which has proved so cruel a scourge to the orientalists of France, these same merits would have been available to us in other works, adapted less perhaps to add to the reputation of M. Chézy, than to minister to our instruction and delight.

If, as the successor of a master who knew how to throw around the study of the Sanscrit so many allurements, I come to occupy your attention with the same subject, I have need to reckon upon the increasing interest which has been excited, since the

commencement of the present century, by those questions which relate to the language, the philosophy, and the religion of ancient and modern India. Born of yesterday, the study of the Sanscrit already appears in the first rank among the objects most worthy the attention of the philosopher and historian ; and this preeminence it owes less indeed to its novelty, than to the number and importance of the problems to which it gives birth. How would Leibnitz have been struck with surprise, who divined with the instinct of genius, a hundred and twenty years ago, the common relationship of the dialects of Europe, and sought to discover in Asia the cradle of all these tongues,—with what surprise would he have been overwhelmed, had it been pointed out to him, that beyond the Indus there was preserved a language admirable in its structure, rich in literary productions of every species, and presenting the most striking analogies with the Greek, the Latin, the German, and the Slavic dialects ! This language the English have made known to us ; it is the Sanscrit of the Brahmins. The ties of kindred which connect it with the idioms of Europe are incontestible ; and this result, the most remarkable of those which philology has yielded in our days, is also most clearly demonstrated.

You anticipate already the immense career, which this unexpected result opens in the field of ethnographic and historical speculation. The discovery of the affinity of the Sanscrit to the Greek, the Latin, the Slavic, and the Celtic, has not only introduced a new principle into the classification of the languages of Asia and of Europe, by substituting the observation of real relations for the divination of imaginary resemblances ; it has also given rise to one of the most interesting problems upon which the critical skill of the historian has been called to exercise itself. What causes serve to explain the intimate relations of idioms separated from each other by distances so immense ? A powerful migration, setting off from the banks of the Indus and the Ganges,—would it have spread over the surface of Europe a single language, which, subjected afterwards to various influences, would have become thus modified, and the parent of new ones, of which ours are now but the scattered fragments ? Can we recognize, by comparing the idioms of Europe and that which this migration must have brought along with it, the traces of an ancient language peculiar to Europe, with which the more perfect, more cultivated idiom of Asia has been mingled ? Or

on the other hand, has this tongue, instead of being the mother of the European dialects, been only their sister ; and must their common origin be referred to some unknown idiom, and thrown back into a period of impenetrable darkness, because it has escaped the recollections of history ? If we cannot hope that these problems will ever be completely solved, we have at least the right to affirm, that a knowledge of the Sanscrit is the only source from which light can be thrown upon them. Besides, even though the historical question were to remain unsolved, still the fundamental identity of the Sanscrit, the Greek, and the Latin, is a fact already established ; and we may add, that this result cannot but gain in certainty, the more the comparison is extended to new dialects of the same family, and the farther the analysis descends into the minuter details of their structure. But, this fact is in itself of the very highest importance for the history of the formation of the classic tongues of Europe. Not only does the Sanscrit itself, the study of which has almost alone given rise to one of the most curious of the philological sciences, I mean that of comparative grammar, receive from the affinity of these idioms the most striking illustrations ; but the analytical method to which it has been subjected by scholars like Bopp, Humboldt, and the Schlegels, must, if applied to the ancient languages, renovate the study of them, and replace their etymological part upon a solid basis.

It is, without doubt, a happy privilege for India, that its sacred tongue has the advantage of being allied to the idioms which form the basis of learned education in the West, and of recalling to us those steps in the progress of language, which have had so remarkable an influence upon the civilization of modern Europe. But if we look at this language in itself, and demand from it that which we seek from the study of every foreign idiom, the means of becoming acquainted with the people to whom it belongs,—we do not fear to affirm, that the Sanscrit is destined to become the instrument of the most beautiful discoveries. For the thirty years since a knowledge of this idiom has revealed to Europe the existence of a world so long forgotten, the industry of English and German scholars has been directed almost solely to reconnoitre, rather than to solve, the numerous questions which arise from a view of institutions both civil and religious, and of manners and customs, such as those of which India presents to them the novel spectacle. Every step which has been taken in the solution of one problem, has almost immedi-

ately given rise to another ; and even those efforts which seemed most sure of arriving at the object in view, have only caused it to retire to a greater distance. A literature inexhaustible, a mythology without limits, an infinite diversity of religious sects, a philosophy which embraces all difficulties, a legislation as varied as the castes for which it was made,—such is the *ensemble* of the documents which India has preserved for us in respect to its ancient state ; these are the materials by the aid of which science must reconstruct the history of the celebrated people, whose genius they attest.

At the head of the literature of India, criticism, in accordance with tradition, must place the *Vedas*, which the Brahmins regard as revealed by the Supreme Intelligence. These books have never yet been translated ; but the illustrious Colebrooke has given a description and learned analysis of them ; and Prof. Rosen has given short fragments, which are to be followed by a translation of the *Rigveda*. But the importance of these ancient compositions, in relation to philosophy, has already been appreciated. Never, perhaps, did human thought venture with more of perseverance and audacity, upon the explication of those great problems, which for ages have not ceased to exercise the intelligence of man. Never did language more grave or more precise, more flexible or more harmonious, lend itself to the expression of images, which man invents to describe what he cannot see, and to explain what he cannot comprehend. If the novelty of the conceptions sometimes causes surprise, we must attribute it to the impotency of human reason to pass the bounds by which its flight is limited. But the spectacle of the attempts which reason thus makes to pass those bounds, is always one of the most curious which can be presented to philosophy ; and it is a trait already exceedingly characteristic in the history of a people, that the productions of its genius which are evidently the most ancient, should also be those in which the labour of thought and the inventions of the spirit of system are carried to the highest point. I do not speak of the poetry of the Vedas, of which we as yet possess only comparatively brief extracts. Like the primitive poetry of every people, it is simple and elevated ; but this double character belongs to it, perhaps, more than to that of any other nation. Man seldom appears in it ; at least in those fragments which we as yet possess ; and the disordered movement of his passions does not disturb its calm uniformity. But nature is

there chanted in all her grandeur; and we know not whether even the brilliant scenes which she daily brings before the eyes of man, have ever inspired any thing more ideal or more pure, than the religious hymns of the Vedas. Yet man also has not been forgotten in the other productions of the religious spirit of India; and the grand epopees which trace the heroic history of the Brahmins and of the warrior caste, shew him to us in the midst of a state of society, which unites to the refinements of the most advanced civilization, the simplicity of primitive manners. One of these poems, the *Râmâyana*, is already in part published; and W. Schlegel is at this moment engaged upon a complete edition of it, with a translation in Latin. The other, the *Mahâbhârata*, has furnished to Prof. Bopp of Berlin the subject of some very interesting publications; among which, the first place may be assigned to the charming episode of *Nâlus*. Ranked among the monuments of Indian sacred literature, the great poems of the *Râmâyana* and the *Mahâbhârata* are sometimes counted in the number of those religious and moral writings called the *Puranas*; with which, indeed, they have perhaps some points of resemblance, while they far surpass them in poetic merit. The *Puranas* form the depository of the popular mythology. Supporting themselves upon the Vedas, from which they profess to be derived, they chant the origin and adventures of divinities more material, and, I venture to say, more human, than the simple deities of the ancient books. They are systems of theology and cosmogony; at the close of which is recounted the heroic history of the two glorious dynasties which have shared the empire of northern India; and then the whole is completed by a compend of the religious and moral duties imposed on man in the present life. The *Puranas* are, as it were, encyclopaedias of the faith and science of India; and it may serve to give an idea of the extent and novelty of the Indian literature, to state, that these encyclopaedias are eighteen in number, and that scarcely a few fragments of them are yet known.

After matters of faith, come duties; or, rather, in a country where a religious principle lies at the foundation of society, duty is not separated from faith, and law derives its force from religion. The most respected of the books of law, that of *Manu*, is regarded as having been revealed by *Brahma*, the creator of the world and the god of wisdom. This code takes up man at the moment when he issues from the hand of his

Maker, and conducts him through all the periods of his earthly existence, to the most elevated limit at which he can arrive,—to his final enfranchisement and repose in the bosom of God. It is a composition of the highest interest, in which nothing that relates to the destiny of man is omitted; in which all is regulated, his future as well as his present state, because the one is the consequence of the other; because, according to the Brahmins, a man gains in this world, by his actions, the place which he will one day occupy in the series of beings who succeed each other upon the constantly changing scene of the universe. By the side of the law of Manu, the Indians place other codes, which have not yet all come to us in their complete form; but the fragments of which prove with what care the relations of the different members of society have been fixed, and what importance the science of right had in the eyes of the most ancient sages; for it is to the Brahmins, whom tradition reveres as the first teachers of the society founded by them, that these collections are attributed; and the antiquity assigned to them is not surpassed, except by that of the Vedas. The works on law have given birth to one of the richest branches of the Sanskrit literature. Skilful commentators have applied themselves to the interpretation of these venerable monuments; and to the solution of the difficulties which result from the present application of them to a social state, resembling in its principle, indeed, that for which these codes were formed, but which nevertheless must have received important modifications, through the lapse of time and the shocks of numerous and violent revolutions.

If now we leave the fields of religious faith and of legislation, and turn our view upon the freer productions of the mind, philosophy and literature properly so called, we meet with compositions not less extended, with questions not less curious, and, in spite of the admirable labours of Colebrooke and Wilson, not less novel. Philosophy, it is true, does not separate itself from religion, with so much immunity, in the East as in the West. With a few exceptions, it reposes almost wholly upon revelation; and promises to the search after truth the same recompense, which religion permits faith to hope for. But, although thus circumscribed in regard to both the boundaries of its developement, philosophy does not therefore hesitate to treat with freedom all the questions which the wisdom of antiquity embraced in its researches. In the past, the origin of the world;

in the present, the faculties and passions of man ; in the future, his destiny, that of the universe, and, above all, his relations with the supreme intelligence, from which all emanates and to which all returns ;—these all constitute the inexhaustible subject of those profound philosophical speculations, where the facts of every science are collected and confounded, physics and psychology, natural history and metaphysics ; but where even modern analysis cannot but admire the grandeur of thought and the originality of invention.

These meditative habitudes, which presuppose, while they also develop, the most powerful intellectual faculties, have not exclusively occupied the sages of India ; nor, in transporting them into the ideal sphere of abstractions, have they left them cold and insensible to the spectacle of the emotions of the human soul, the view of which awakens, among all nations, the sentiment of poetry. The Indians have been poets, as well as philosophers ; perhaps even they have been philosophers only because they were poets. With them, every idea is animated with the colouring of poetry ; and every discourse is almost a hymn. A rich and flexible idiom lends to the chants of the poet an exhaustless store of images and forms. Splendour or simplicity in the expression, the natural or the grand in thought, these are some of the characteristics of that so sparkling poetry, of which it is more easy to feel, than to define, the beauties. It comprehends the greatest variety of species ; from the expression of the abstract ideas of the Vedas, down to those *jeux d'esprit*, which would have in themselves very little merit, even did they not furnish the melancholy proof of a declining literature. The epopee, the drama, and the ode, have their place in this poetry ; and that genius which has produced so many works, some of which would be regarded as *chefs d'oeuvre* in the eyes of the most polished nations, in fixing in a critical manner the laws of these various compositions, has given in some sort a last memorial of its strength ; and has shewn, that if a happy instinct was able to give birth to these productions, a power of ingenious analysis was also able to appreciate and describe them.

In the midst of all these treasures, we feel one regret ; it is that we do not find among them the history of the nation, of which they will ever constitute the glory. We are ignorant, in effect, almost completely, of the political history of ancient India ; and it is, as it were, by an act of faith, that we believe

her to be ancient ; since among all these productions, the fruits of a most poetical imagination, of the boldest meditations, of the most practised reason, there have as yet been found no historical works, and we know not in what period of the world to place these monuments of the existence of a people, who have preserved in respect to their fortunes a silence so inexplicable. In all these proofs, so various and striking, of a long and learned culture, there is wanting the very proof of their antiquity, the indication of their date. The labour of ages has been only able to accumulate, one upon another, these gigantic cosmogonies, these immense poems, these profound treatises of philosophy and of legislation. But when did this labour commence ? And this activity, which has been continued down to a period so near to us and almost under our own eyes, is it of yesterday, or does it go back, as the Brahmins believe, to the first ages of the world ? When such questions can be raised in respect to the literature of a people, criticism must be permitted to entertain its doubts ; but we must also concede, that its boldness loses much of its merit. Skepticism, nevertheless, has attacked the fabulous history of India with as much ardour, as the Brahmins manifest *sang froid* in affirming its truth ; and, because their mythological periods attribute to Indian civilization an antiquity surpassing belief, there has been a propensity to deny the existence of any thing ancient among them. Because the Brahmins have demanded too much from the easy credulity of the nations to whom they have given laws, the suspicious criticism of some Europeans has refused them every thing. But that good sense, which does justice to the exaggerations of the oriental imagination, and which still knows how to admire their poetry and boldness of conception, should be on its guard against the excesses of a skepticism without nobleness ; and because it is impossible to prove that the Vedas did actually issue from the mouth of Brahma himself, it is nevertheless not permitted to affirm that they are a recent work, destitute alike of authenticity and of value. Who knows, when the entire mass of Indian literature shall have become accessible to the researches of erudition, whether it will not be possible to find there some historical intimations, which may permit us to discover their origin and trace out their developement ? Until that epoch, caution, which is every where a merit, is here a duty ; and it is not too much to exact from criticism, that it should first learn, before it presumes to decide.

For my own part, I believe, for the honour of science, that the labours of the learned men who have devoted their lives to the study of India, will not be fruitless for the ancient history of that country. I indulge the hope, that the union of so much effort will one day terminate in reconstructing the most brilliant, and perhaps the richest literary history, which a people could offer to the curiosity and admiration of Europe. Without doubt, that which we know of it is very little in comparison with that which we do not know; but we may say with a just confidence, that if we do not yet know all, we are still no longer absolutely ignorant of all. The object, the possession of which is to be the recompense of our toil, is in part concealed from our view; but we know with certainty that it is not inaccessible, and even now we have some glimpses of the route by which it will be possible for us to approach it.

Let the monuments of Indian literature be all translated or explored by criticism; let the libraries of Europe obtain a complete collection of them; let the language be as generally studied and known as that of some other civilized nations of Asia; then shall we be able to present a delineation of this literature, and thus make known the people which has preserved it to our times. The want of historical works will certainly leave many chasms in this delineation; but the great traits of civil and political history in India will follow in part from the history of ideas; and as to the rest, the possession of the second will perhaps console the philosopher for the loss of the first. The system of religion, the historical traditions, the laws and usages, will all be illustrated by the light arising from the constant and protracted comparison of the diversified productions of the Sanscrit literature. Thus, supporting himself upon numerous and decisive documents, the historian will recognize the ancient India of the *Mahâbhârata* and the *Râmâyana*, in India such as we find it at the commencement of the eleventh century of our era, at the time of the Mussulman invasion. Fourteen centuries before that epoch, he will find it again in the descriptions which the companions of Alexander carried back to Greece; and he will then be able to affirm, that the language, the religion, the philosophy,—in one word, that the state of society, of which the writings of the Brahmins are the products and the image, already existed four centuries at least before our era; and, however remarkable the fact, he may further affirm, that this state

of society could not have differed much from that, which we still see in our days established throughout the whole of India.

Further back than that epoch, it is true, all the documents, national or foreign, leave the historian in profound darkness. But this darkness cannot remain altogether impenetrable to the torch of philosophy and criticism. Thus the invasion of Alexander would properly become a fixed point, from which to take our departure in order to ascend into ages anterior, and there seek to discover, if not the date of the formation of the Brahminic society, at least the proof of its more ancient existence. We should ask ourselves, whether a people which, three hundred years before our era, had arrived at so high a point of culture, must not previously have passed through ages of trial and of effort. For, if it be permitted to accord to the vivacity of oriental genius the gift of almost spontaneous productiveness, and of overleaping at a single bound the interval which separates infancy from riper age; still it cannot be denied that nations, in order to become united and established, have need of the lessons of long experience; and that the physical developement of nations is every where subjected to laws almost invariable, the regular operation of which leaves room, in some degree, to conjecture their longer or shorter duration. We should, above all, interrogate the language, that method of expressing thought which is always more simple in proportion as it is more ancient; we should inquire whether its forms teach any thing respecting its age; what place it occupies in the family to which it belongs; and then the question, changing its theatre, should embrace all the dialects allied to the Sanscrit, and transform itself into a problem of comparative philology and ethnography. Out of India, an ancient and as yet almost unknown idiom, that of the books of Zoroaster; in India itself, two dialects, which may be said to be derived from the Sanscrit, the *Pali* and the *Prakrit*; these would afford a field for curious observations and analogies of the highest interest. The ancient idiom of Bactriana, the *Zend*, resembling in its structure the Sanscrit and the dialects derived from it, but less polished and more rude, would carry back the historian to the remotest date which can be determined in the developement of these noble languages. The comparative analysis of the *Zend* and the Sanscrit would enable him to be present, as it were, at the first essays towards their formation, and would almost unlock to him their secret. The striking resemblance of

these two idioms would lead him to recognize the fact, that the nations which spoke them, could formerly have constituted only one and the same people; and this main fact, illustrating and uniting into one cluster the scattered traditions so imperfectly comprehended, would give a high degree of probability to the hypothesis, which assumes that from the countries adjacent to the Oxus, and from the western slope of the mountains in which this river has its source, descended the colony, which came, in times certainly very ancient, to conquer the northern portions of Hindostan.

Here then we behold, what an immense horizon would spread itself out before the eye of the historian; and here the question, already so vast, respecting the origin of civilization in India, would acquire still greater magnitude. From the summits of the Himlaya to the extremity of the peninsula, a powerful and intelligent race have left the deep traces of their domination. In every portion of that happy region, they have founded cities and erected temples. Religion, art, science, all are their work. They have lived on this fertile land which they have civilized, as if they had been born there. And now an hypothesis, to which more than one fact gives some validity, pretends that this race are strangers there, and that the country, the theatre of their wonderful culture, has not always been their own! Did then this privileged people find the soil of India vacant; or did they wrest it from its more ancient possessors? And if they were there established only by conquest, has every vestige of the vanquished been totally effaced? Far from it; and the hypothesis which attributes the civilization of India to conquerors from the north-west, finds here new support in a matter of fact. Under the apparent unity of Indian society, the observer recognizes without difficulty the variety of elements which compose it. The unity is in the religious and civil institutions, which an enlightened race have been able to render predominant; the variety is in the tribes, or rather nations, which have been forced to receive them. Those castes thrown back into the last ranks of the social hierarchy, what are they but the fragments of a vanquished people? The difference of their teint, of their language, of their manners and customs even, which distinguishes them in a manner so decided from the caste of the Brahmins, does it not furnish the most evident proof that they are the offspring of another race? To select but a single one of the numerous features of their marked originality,—how

can one explain the existence, in the same country, of two systems of language so radically unlike each other, as the Sanscrit of the Brahmins and the dialects which prevail exclusively in the South of India? If these dialects were the result of one of those changes, to which we know the Sanscrit has not been less exposed than every other tongue which has long existed, we should have to acknowledge, no doubt, that they are posterior to the arrival of the Brahmins in the Dekkan. But these dialects differ from the Sanscrit, both in their words and their grammatical forms; and therefore we must conclude that they are anterior to the introduction of the Sanscrit into the South of India, and history may admit them as unexceptionable witnesses of the existence of a people established of old throughout the greater portion of the Indian peninsula.

These hints have conducted us to the remotest limits to which criticism can proceed without the fear of losing herself. Indeed, if she has the right to interrogate language, when history no longer responds to her inquiries, she must yet renounce the hope of finding among a people any thing anterior to the language which it speaks. But, to attain to this limit, how many researches are to be made and questions to be solved! To explore all the monuments of the Sanscrit literature, to compare them among themselves, to classify them so far as this can be done; then, when it shall be recognized that these monuments are still only those of the nation which has given to India its faith and its laws, and that this nation is not the only one of which the traces are there found, to study the popular idioms, to examine whether they exhibit any affinity with other tongues foreign to the Indian continent; in one word, to join to a knowledge of the Sanscrit that of four or five other dialects, for which an acquaintance with the learned idiom of the Brahmins affords but feeble aid;—such is the series of labours to which he must devote himself, who would compose a history of the literature and philosophy of India, worthy to be ranked among the great historical productions of our epoch. Even were all the details of this plan to be placed in full light by two centuries of research and labour, it would still be difficult for a single individual to embrace the whole. But when we see scholars like Colebrooke and Wilson, surrounded by all the aids which a long sojourn in India could accumulate, profoundly versed in the knowledge of numerous idioms, men to whom no branch of human knowledge remains unknown, abstain from touching this

magnificent subject, we may affirm with truth, that it surpasses the powers of any single man, and that the time has not yet come when it is permitted to attempt even a sketch. It is not that these learned men, and those upon the continent, Schlegel and Lassen, Bopp and Humboldt, have renounced the hope of ever knowing India, for which their works have already done so much; but all these scholars, to whom historical and philological science will ever be indebted for the most interesting discoveries, have well understood, that it is necessary to advance in this new career at a regular pace. They have wished to apply to the study of India those processes of investigation, which in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries advanced so much the knowledge of classic antiquity; and it must be said to their honour, that, of all the labours of which that country has been the object, those which have been directed in this sure path of criticism, are as yet the only ones which have produced genuine fruit.

As to ourselves, coming after these illustrious men, to profit by their lessons and to be enlightened by their examples, we shall not have the presumption to attempt that which without doubt is impossible, since they have not dared to undertake it. We would recall the instructions of the learned master who has preceded us in this chair; and we would not forget, that if we are all animated by the desire of becoming acquainted with the ancient civilization of the Brahmins, the surest means of arriving at this knowledge, is to remain faithful to the destination of our prescribed course, and consecrate all our exertions to the study of their language. It is then to the study of the Sanscrit tongue, that we are to apply together all that we have of constancy and zeal. Instead of ambitious sketches on the history of literature in India, which must for a long time yet to come remain imperfect, let us analyze the learned idiom in which this original people expressed themselves; let us read the immortal monuments which attest their genius; and thus we may console ourselves, for having renounced for a time the idea of presenting you a picture of the wonders which they created, by the assurance of having contributed to put it in your power to trace for yourselves some of its features. Let me venture however to say, that although this course must be consecrated to philology, we will nevertheless not therefore banish from it the study of facts and ideas. We will not close our eyes on the most brilliant light which has ever dawned upon us from the East; and

we will seek to comprehend the grand spectacle presented to our view. It is India, with its philosophy and its mythic tales, its literature and its laws, that we study in its language. It is more than India, it is a page in the origin of the world, in the primitive history of the human mind, that we essay to decipher together. Think not that we would hold out this noble aim to your efforts, in the vain desire of soliciting for our labours a popularity which they of themselves cannot obtain. We have the profound conviction, that in the same degree as the study of words, if it be possible to present it without that of ideas, is useless and frivolous; so that of words considered as the visible signs of thought, is solid and prolific. There is no genuine philology without philosophy, nor without history. The analysis of the phenomena of language is also a science of observation; and if it be not itself the science of the human mind, it is nevertheless that of the most wonderful faculty by the aid of which the human mind expands and multiplies itself.

ART. V. ON THE STANDING STILL OF THE SUN AND MOON,
JOSH. X. 12—15.

From the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung." Translated from the German by the Editor.*

The passage in question has ever been a prominent mark for the attacks of the enemies of revelation; and recently Bretschneider has several times appealed to it, as a palpable proof of the untenableness of the ancient view respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures. Pious theologians in former times, and still more in recent days, are visibly in embarrassment, how they shall meet these attacks. To point out by a thorough investigation

* This article is taken from the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung* for Nov. 1832, No. 88. That work is conducted by Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin, and the article bears evident marks of being from his pen. It is here inserted without note or comment, as presenting the suggestions of a learned and pious man on a very difficult passage of Scripture, without intending to express any opinion on the merits or demerits of the view itself.—ED.

how this may be done,—to show by an impartial examination of the passage, how on the one hand, we need make no dangerous concessions to opposers ; nor, on the other, instead of something supernatural, defend what is merely of human invention, and thus at the same time bring suspicion upon the real miracles of Scripture,—is the object of the present essay.

We are well aware, that the result at which we have arrived, will from the very outset be an object of suspicion to many. We certainly least of all desire, that it should be eagerly seized on by pious minds, without severe scrutiny. The same process has so often been applied, from a spirit of false concession, in the case of real miracles, especially during the last half of the preceding century,—so often, in order to satisfy men, has God been robbed of his own,—that caution is here an imperious duty. We foresee also, that the opposers of revelation will strive to represent our attempt as arising from one and the same cause with the former objectionable course, viz. the embarrassment in which we are placed by an unnatural view of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. All this, however, cannot restrain us from the execution of our purpose. We have confidence, that the reasons we shall offer—and these alone deserve consideration—will convince the well disposed, that they, and not bias, have brought us to this result. We believe, that to speak the truth is at all times timely, and brings forth fruit. We come therefore without fear to the point.

The voluntary surrender of the city Gibeon, was the occasion of the speedy subdual of the whole territory which afterwards fell to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. It hastened the mutual alliance of the kings of this region ; of whom the king of Jerusalem, the chief city of the Jebusites, is mentioned as the most powerful. The attack of these allied kings was first directed, not against Israel, but against Gibeon, which had deserted their common cause. Joshua being informed of this, hastened immediately from the camp at Gilgal to the aid of the besieged Gibeonites. He marched with his army by night, a distance of twenty-five or thirty miles, and reached Gibeon early in the morning. This first battle of the Israelites in Palestine, terminated in their favour. The enemy were discomfited, and fled in a southern direction, in order to throw themselves into their strong cities. The first place mentioned to which the Israelites pursued them, is Bethoron. According to 1 Chron. 7:24, there were two cities of this name, Upper and Lower

Bethoron. With this statement coincides the narration before us ; it speaks of an 'ascent of Bethoron,' v. 10, and of a 'going down of Bethoron,' v. 11. Probably Upper Bethoron lay on the height, and Lower Bethoron at the foot of the descent. Thence the enemies fled to Azekah and Makkedah, lying south of Bethoron, the first about parallel to Jerusalem and west of it. A destructive hailstorm, which overtook the flying foe, without injury to the pursuing Israelites, made the latter feel that they had won the victory not by their own might, but only in the strength of the Almighty, who had given success to their arms ; while it taught the former, that not human injustice, but the judgment of God, was the cause of their misfortune.

After this, the narration proceeds as follows : Josh. X. 12—14.

“Then spake Joshua to the LORD in the day when the LORD delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. *Is not this written in the book of Jasher?* So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the LORD hearkened unto the voice of a man : for the LORD fought for Israel.”

We will first exhibit cursorily the different views which have been given of this passage. They may be reduced to four classes.

I. The opinion which has obtained the most supporters in earlier times, is that which takes the passage in its strictly literal sense, viz. that the sun did actually stand still at the command of Joshua, and thus made a double day. The earliest writer in which this view is found, is Jesus Siracides, who says, c. 46: 4, “Was not one day as long as two?” So late a writer also as Buddeus borrows from this view of the passage an argument against the Copernican system! The grounds of this opinion are best exhibited in Buddeus *Hist. Ecc. Vet. Test.* p. 828 sq. in Calmet, *Bibl. Untersuchungen*, translated by Mosheim III. p. 1 sq. and in Lillenthal, *die gute Sache der Offenbarung*, V. p. 154 sq. IX. p. 296 sq.

II. Others follow indeed the literal acceptation, but are inclined to the assumption, that it was not the sun, but the earth that stood still ; they assert, at least, that the contrary cannot be proved from the passage before us. So Mosheim in his notes

to Calmet as cited above, p. 45, remarks: "In common language, natural phenomena are not described just as they actually are, but as they appear to the senses, and especially to the eye. This mode of speaking, too, except in the circle of the severer sciences, is the correct and proper one; because we thus speak of things just as they appear to all the world. Even learned men cannot and will not abandon it in common life; thus they say, e. g. "the moon shines," although strictly she has no light of her own, but only borrowed light; "the sky is blue," "the sun rises and sets," etc. The Scriptures, therefore, if they are to be understood by the majority of those for whom they were written, and are not to enter into physical deductions and thus lead the reader away from their true object, must necessarily be conformed to the idiom of common life."—Without stopping to decide, at present, whether these remarks are applicable to the case in hand, we would still observe, that it would be difficult for any one successfully to call in question their general correctness. The *optical* manner of speaking in respect to natural phenomena, is found in the Bible from the first book to the last; in the discourses of Christ, not less than in the story of the creation. This is only a single example of the universal method of the Scriptures, to exclude every thing which could in any way divert attention from their sublime aim. Compare the striking remarks of Keppler, in the essay, "Theologie u. Naturwissenschaften," Evangel. K. Z. Jahrg. 1830. p. 404.

III. Others suppose that unusual atmospheric phenomena supplied the place of the sun and moon, after they had ceased to shine; and that in half poetic imagery, this occurrence is represented as if the sun and moon themselves had remained beyond the usual time above the horizon. It is easy to conceive, that this class must include under it a great variety of particular opinions; since free room is here given to arbitrary conjecture, and every one is at liberty to look through the whole circle of the phenomena of light, and choose for himself what he will. Thus J. D. Michaelis supposes, that after the hail-storm, the heavens were illuminated by lightning;* this lightning enabled the Israelites to pursue the enemy, and hindered the latter from concealing themselves, or making any stand. Spinoza thinks the beams of the setting sun were refracted through the hail. Le Clerc also thinks of refractions, such as those by means of which, in the polar circle,

* *Das Wetterleuchten*, i. e. lightning at evening without thunder.

the sun is visible above the horizon, while he is yet actually below it. And so other hypotheses of the same sort.

IV. Others take the whole description, throughout, in a poetical and figurative sense. So the Jewish philosopher Maimonides, *More Nebachim* II. c. 53. According to him, the prayer of Joshua only asks, that God would leave him time enough to rout his foes, before the approach of night. God heard his prayer, and delivered them into his hand, and gave him so complete a victory, that he could have wished no longer day, in order utterly to destroy his enemies. The same view seems to have been adopted by Vatablus, professor at Paris in the time of the Reformation; he paraphrases the passage of Joshua thus: "Lord, let not the light of the sun and of the moon fail us, until we shall have fully overcome our enemies."

If now we pass to a scrutiny of these various views, it is at once obvious that the *third*, in all its modifications, is untenable. If we assume that it is the writer of the book who speaks in this passage, we must understand every thing literally and strictly; for he employs throughout a simple historical style and mode of exhibition, without any rhetorical or poetical ornament or exaggeration. It is therefore absurd to assume, that in this single instance, he has forgotten himself, and made it, by his manner of expression, impossible to ascertain with certainty the simple course of events. But it is no less absurd, with some others, to assume that Joshua and all his host, in their ignorance of natural appearances, were deceived, and mistook the light of a halo or mock-sun for the prolonged light of the sun itself. Such a deception is surely without example; and only the strongest prejudice could find it possible or probable. Even a child would at once distinguish between the two.—If, on the other hand, we assume that the writer only quotes the words of another, and of a poet, then again all ground for this opinion vanishes. We have then no reason for thinking of any peculiar natural phenomena at all. Only ignorance of the bold and figurative language of oriental poetry, or an excess of prosaic prejudice, could believe, that the figurative expressions of an oriental poem, not even claiming the character of divine inspiration, must necessarily require an historical basis of this sort. In this case, the *fourth* interpretation is without scruple to be preferred to the third. Compare the 18th Psalm, where David's victory over the enemies of the theocracy, is described under the figure of a terrific tempest accompanied with an earthquake; and this

not by way of comparison, but so that the overthrow actually appears as the consequence of the tempest. Compare too the triumphal song of the children of Israel after their passage through the Red Sea, Ex. c. 15; the triumphal song of Deborah, Judges c. 5, where according to v. 20, even 'the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.' Compare also many lofty poetical passages in the prophets, e. g. in Habakkuk; and we shall easily see reason to confess, that the present passage is surpassed in boldness by many others even in the Bible itself.

From these remarks upon the third class of interpretations, it is already apparent, that in deciding whether the first or second opinion,—for in this scrutiny these may well be taken as one,—or the fourth, is to be regarded as the correct one, all depends on the fact, whether the passage contains the words of the writer of the book, or not. If the first be true, then it is an established point for *all*, that the author of the book really believed in the actual occurrence of the greatest of all miracles; and further, for those who acknowledge the divine authority of the Old Testament, it is then also an established point, that the facts were really so. In this case, such persons would not suffer themselves to be led astray by any arguments however specious, which might be brought against this view of the narrative. But if the latter be the case, and the words are not from the author of the book; then it is only a carnal love of wonder, which may be well set off against a carnal dread of miracles,—or a carnal spirit of contradiction running parallel to a carnal pliability towards the spirit of the times, and which is ever the more active, the more glaring the contrast,—that could here insist upon the strict and literal acceptance of the figurative mode of expression.

That a part of the passage does not come from the author, but is borrowed from an ancient poem, is beyond all doubt. The author himself quotes, in v. 13, the *Book of Jasher*, i. e. the Book of the Upright; and that this was a poetical book, is apparent, both from the poetical character of the words here allowedly borrowed from it, in which the parallelism of members cannot be mistaken; and also from the fact, that in 2 Sam. 1: 18, this same book is referred to, as containing the elegy of David over Saul and Jonathan. In all probability it was a collection, formed by degrees, of poems in praise of theocratic heroes; for the name יִשָּׁרִים, *Jesharim*, the Just or Upright, is elsewhere employed to designate the true supporters of the theocracy.

The further question now arises, whether that which immediately follows the direct citation, is also taken from this poetical book, or is the language of the author himself. If the latter be the case, the miracle would still remain firmly established. For since a poem may contain historical truth, it would follow from the fact that the author had here stated the matter in plain prose as an historical fact, that the poet also in this case had adhered closely to the truth of history. But the probability here is at least preponderant, that the whole passage has been inserted from the poem. More particularly must we take into view the last verse, v. 15, "And Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, unto the camp to Gilgal." If we attribute this verse to the author of the book as his own words, we shall have difficulty to know what to do with it. That Joshua actually returned at the same time with his whole host to Gilgal, is an impossible supposition; for in v. 16 the author proceeds directly from the point at which he left off in v. 11. He narrates in detail, how Joshua prosecuted his victory, and how his host made an excursion into the more southern regions, still more remote from Gilgal, and there captured the cities of the hostile kings. Then, in v. 43, for the first time, it is related, how Joshua, after he had subdued their whole territory, returned with his host to Gilgal. Interpreters have here attempted to remove the difficulty in two ways, both alike inadmissible. Some, as Calvin and Masius, declare the verse to be spurious, without any sufficient external evidence, without being able to appeal to any certain analogous instance in the whole Old Testament, and without its being possible to see how it could ever occur to a glossator to interpolate the verse here, in a place so entirely inapposite. And although the verse is omitted in the Septuagint version, at least in the oldest manuscripts, the Alexandrine and the Vatican, this circumstance, in connexion with the character of the version in other respects, proves nothing more, than that the ancient translator, no less than the later interpreters, felt the difficulty; and therefore chose to cut the knot, which, in conformity with his views, he could not untie.—Others, as Buddeus, endeavour to remedy the matter in a less violent way, by a different interpretation. They translate: "And Joshua *purposed* to return to Gilgal." Joshua was on the point of doing this, but changed his purpose on hearing that the five kings were concealed in the cave at Makkedah. But such a purpose even, is here scarcely conceivable. Would it have been like Joshua, thus,

by a precipitate retreat to Gilgal, to deprive himself of all the fruits of his victory, and not seize at once upon the favourable opportunity, so evidently presented by God himself, for getting possession of the whole land, which, indeed, he otherwise would have to undertake at a later period with infinitely greater toil and danger? Besides all this, in v. 43, the same words are literally repeated. If they are there to be understood of an actual return, a different acceptance of them in the passage before us, can be regarded only as an untenable expedient.

To all this we may add, that the poetical mode of expression does not exist in v. 12 and the first half of v. 13 alone; but is likewise too obvious to be overlooked in the second half of v. 13 and in v. 14. This Masius himself acknowledges, one of the most sharp-sighted and learned of the older commentators on this book; although he remains true to the miraculous view of the passage. He says: "There can be no doubt that the words, 'So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day,' are rhythmical, and are borrowed from the Book of Jasher. The whole mode of expression and the construction show this very clearly."—We would further merely refer to a circumstance, which in itself, it is true, can afford no sufficient ground of proof, viz. that the miracle ascribed to Joshua, of causing the sun and moon to stand still, is nowhere else mentioned in Scripture; that the prophets and Psalmists, who are so full of praise to God for his miraculous deeds in the early history of Israel, do not allude to it by a single word, while they recur again and again to miracles which are comparatively of less magnitude, as the passage through the Red Sea and through the Jordan; that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, in his narration of the effects of faith under the Old Testament, passes it by without notice, although he cites the example of Rahab, the falling of the walls of Jericho, etc. etc.

We proceed now to give an outline of our own views in respect to the whole passage. The writer, after describing the two glorious exhibitions of the divine favour towards the Israelites, the victory which the Lord gave them at Gibeon, and the hail with which he destroyed the flying enemy, breaks off the thread of his narrative for a moment, in order to insert a passage from an ancient poem, in which the great actions of this day have been celebrated. Joshua, as the poet narrates, spoke to the Lord, "Sun, stand thou still on Gibeon, and thou moon,

in the valley of Ajalon." It is easy to see how it might be said, "Joshua spake to the Lord," although this is immediately followed by the address to the sun and the moon. The demand of Joshua is only apparently directed to them; it was the LORD OF HOSTS who was strictly addressed. Here the question first of all arises, at what time and place Joshua uttered this wish, or rather, at what time the poet makes him utter it. The word *then* cannot guide us in fixing the time; for it is manifest that it does not refer to what immediately precedes, i. e. the flight of the enemies to Azekah, so as to imply that Joshua first uttered the words after arriving at that place; but it refers to the whole course of events during the day, the whole victory over the enemy. This is obvious from the words which are added to mark more definitely the meaning of *then*: "In the day when the LORD delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel." We must therefore look around for other marks of time. In v. 13 it is said, that the sun stood still in the midst of heaven. It was therefore about noon, when Joshua uttered the command. With this time coincides also the place, as specified in v. 12. The words, "Sun, stand thou still on Gibeon, and thou moon, in the valley of Ajalon," can be explained only on the supposition that they were spoken at Gibeon. There, in the tumult of battle, Joshua commands the sun to stand still. At the time of moonshine, he hopes to be at Ajalon in pursuit of the flying foe; there, the moon shall not withdraw her light, until he shall no longer need it. Ajalon, according to Josh. 19: 42. 21: 24, was a city in the territory which afterwards fell to the tribe of Dan, lying southwest of Gibeon, and consequently in the region towards which the flying kings must first turn, and afterwards did actually turn their course, and not far from Azekah.—The poet, therefore, makes Joshua, in the midst of the battle near Gibeon, utter the wish, that the sun and moon may stand still; that is, in plain prose, that the sun may not go down, the day not come to an end, before the defeat of the enemy shall be completed. This wish is fulfilled; and the poet, in v. 13, narrates this, by continuing the same figure which he had begun: 'Joshua routed completely the foe, so that the day seemed to have been prolonged, and to have been equal to two.' In v. 14, the poet goes on to extol in general terms the glory of the day. When he says, "there was no day like that before or after it," it would surely be doing violence to the language even of an historian, to de-

rive from these words a proof of the miraculous prolongation of the day ; but if the words belong to the poet, it will be the less necessary to search for some event in history, which, compared with the standing still of the sun and moon, would be equal to it in importance. We need only compare the language in Joel 2:2. The poet then closes with the return of Joshua and his host to Gilgal. The details respecting the pursuit of the kings, the capture of their cities, etc. are no longer adapted to poetry, but belong to the history ; the thread of which the author of the book of Joshua again takes up in v. 16, at the point where he had broken off in v. 11.

Our wish is, that this essay may lead others to a deeper investigation of the subject in question ; and we shall rejoice, if in this way an opportunity may be afforded us, either to correct our views, or to confirm and develop them further.

ART. VI. INTERPRETATION OF EXODUS VI. 2, 3.

By E. Ballantine, Assistant Instructor in Union Theol. Sem. Prince Edward, Va.

2 וַיְדַבֵּר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה ;
 3 וָאֵרָא אֶל־אַבְרָהָם אֶל־יִצְחָק וְאֶל־יַעֲקֹב בְּאֵל שַׁדַּי
 וְשְׁמִי יְהוָה לֹא נֹדַעְתִּי לָהֶם :

2 And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am JEHO-
 3 VAH: And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

The difficulties and obscurities of the word of God, are justly considered as worthy of all the time and labour which may be bestowed in relieving and illustrating them. Still these difficulties and obscurities are doubtless of different degrees of importance ; and the importance of each one is to be determined

by its intimate or remote, its little or extensive connexion with the system of revealed truth. The real meaning, whatever it is, of the passage just cited, has plainly a strong bearing on the subject of the divine nature and names, the gradual revelation of divine truth, and the different modes of the administration of divine government in different periods of the world.

It is equally plain, that however unimportant the signification of proper names may generally be, the true interpretation and force of this passage is involved in the true signification of the sacred name JEHOVAH, to which God so solemnly and formally calls the attention of Moses. The signification of this name is then the first thing which demands our attention.*

The bare history of this term would occupy a larger space than can well be allowed for this whole article. I shall, therefore, introduce nothing more than may be necessary for the elucidation of the subject. Superstition seems to have exhausted upon this name of Deity all its strength. From an age as early as that preceding the Septuagint translation, none but priests dared to pronounce it, and they only on particular occasions. The "ineffable name" was supposed to have a reference the most sacred and mysterious to the nature of the Deity, and to carry with it a power of which mortals might well fear to occasion the exercise. But to let these absurdities pass, the following are the principal significations of the term which have been proposed.

1. It has been supposed to express, not any divine attribute, as the other names of God, but *the divine nature itself*. Thus the Jews call it יהוה, the name of his essence or substance. This may not be far from the next following supposition.

2. It is said to imply simply *real existence*, that which *is*, as distinguished from that which is not. In the words of Leigh, it signifies, "*O ὢν, ens, qui est, et revera subsistit vel existit. . . . Nomen Dei proprium, quo distinguitur ab idolis, quae non sunt, non existunt, sed finguntur.*"

3. To the idea of existence others add that of *necessity*—'the necessary existence.'

4. Others subjoin that of *eternity*—'eternally existing.' Augustine calls it 'nomen aeternitatis.'

* See, in connexion with the following remarks, the Essay of Prof. Stuart on the meaning of *αἰδιος* in Vol. I. p. 733 of this work; particularly p. 738 sq.—ED.

5. It has been explained as signifying, *Essentia necessario existens, omni potestati per se praedita*, 'an essence necessarily existent and omnipotent.' The idea of *power* is derived from the root יהיה, to which that signification is assigned, upon what testimony I am ignorant.

6. Others make it signify an *immutable* essence.

7. The idea of immutability is extended also to the *will* and volitions, so as to make the name express *a being, or essence, of unchanging purpose*, i. e. *faithful*, constant in performing his word and especially his promises.

8. Rosenmüller combines the last two ideas, *An eternal Being, immutable in essence and purpose*.

9. Others add to the idea of independent existence, that of the *source of existence to all other things*. This is Leigh's full definition: "O ōν, ens, qui est et revera subsistit vel existit, et per quem facta sunt omnia quae sunt et existunt." Another has it, "Essentia existens per se, ex quo, in quo, per quem et propter quem sunt quaecunque sunt." Le Clerc, with this idea, derives the term from the future Piel or Hiphil of יהיה, *to cause to be*; and he appeals to Is. 42: 5 and 48: 2, as instances of a reference to this signification of the name.

10. The word יהיה, *Jehovah*, has been derived from יהיה, *destruction, calamity*, signifying therefore *the destroying one*,—destroying all the enemies of his people.

11. Dr A. Clarke is entirely singular and also inconsistent with himself in other places, when he considers the signification of the name יהיה to be declared in Ex. 34: 5, 6, "And Jehovah descended in the cloud . . . and proclaimed the name of *Jehovah* . . . Jehovah, Jehovah God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, abundant in mercy and truth," etc. Comp. 33: 18.

The proper vowels and true pronunciation of this word have also been matters of great dispute. Some maintain that its present pointing is correct, יהיה, *Jehovah*. But many other modes are adopted by different learned men. The principal of these are יהיה, יהיה, יהיה, יהיה, יהיה, *Yähvoh, Yêhevoh, Yähävêh, Yêhvêh, Yehävêh*. These forms have been derived from the supposed significations of the word, or from information as to its sound, occurring in ancient writers. It has been represented in Greek, variously: *Ἰαώ, Ἰεωά, Ἰαβέ*, and other forms are met with. But, very little can be learned from the mode of writing a name in a foreign language, especially the

Greek; and the difficulty is made much greater in this name, by the nature of its letters, which are all quiescent. Neither can we argue with any certainty from the *signification* to the form of the word; for proper names, in Hebrew, frequently vary greatly from the grammatical form of the significant words which compose them. In proof of this remark, I need only refer to the names of Jacob's sons and their significations as declared, Gen. 29: 31—30: 24. The quiescent letters especially are subject to great change in the manner of enunciation, as is well known to every one even slightly acquainted with the Hebrew.

A knowledge of the true pronunciation of the term is, however, not at all necessary to the point in hand, which is its true signification. The sources of information on this point are, (1) The etymology; (2) References made to its signification in the Bible; (3) The meaning of other words and phrases and even institutions, which we may have evidence to believe have a significancy synonymous with it. And the probability or the proof will consist, not in the bearing of all or part of the evidence derived from one of these sources; but in the coincident and uncontradicted testimony afforded by all.

All the evidence which we have on the subject concurs, I think, in supporting the *second* of the interpretations which have been enumerated, viz. that the name Jehovah expresses the *real existence* of the Deity; and that its particular use is to express the contrast in this respect between the true God and idols. 'Ο ὢν, ENS, QUI EST, ET REVERA SUBSISTIT VEL EXISTIT. NOMEN DEI PROPRIUM, QUO DISTINGUITUR AB IDOLIS QUAE NON SUNT, NON EXISTENT, SED FINGUNTUR.

It will be readily seen that the name, according to this interpretation, though it does not in itself *express*, yet *supposes* the existence of divine attributes. In the word Jehovah, *existence* is affirmed; and that of which it is affirmed is GOD, whose character and attributes are supposed to be already known or elsewhere declared. Other things were clothed with the attributes of Deity by the vain imaginations of men; but of these, as thus endued, *real existence* could never be affirmed. JEHOVAH expresses the *real existence of a Being who possesses all the attributes of Deity*, and is used to contrast that Being with all false deities.

This meaning of the name is supported by its etymology. All, I believe, except the supporters of the *tenth* opinion alone,

derive it from הָיָה or הִיָּה, which signifies *to be, to exist*. Only the uniform evidence then of the *use* of the term, could warrant those interpretations which add the ideas of necessity, eternity, immutability, etc. That is the simplest interpretation and most agreeable to etymology, which gives to the name the simple idea of *existence*.

Further, this is the idea of the name to which reference is constantly made in the Bible. Jer. 10: 3—10, "He cutteth a tree out of the forest . . . they deck it with silver and with gold, they fasten it with nails and with hammers that it move not; . . . they must needs be borne because they cannot go. Be not afraid of them, for they cannot do evil, neither also is it in them to do good. Forasmuch as there is none like unto thee, O JEHOVAH; thou art great, and thy name is great in might. . . Silver spread into plates is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz, the work of the workman, and of the hands of the founder; blue and purple is their clothing; they are all the work of cunning men. But JEHOVAH is the true God, and an everlasting king."—Here the whole object is to affirm *real existence* of God, and to deny it of idols, and Jehovah is the name of God used. See also Jer. 16: 19—21, "Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit. Shall a man make gods unto himself, and they are no gods? Therefore I will this once cause them to know. . . my hand and my might, and they shall know that *my name is JEHOVAH*," i. e. that I, and not idols, am the living God. Isa. 42: 8, "*I am JEHOVAH*; that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images;" I Jehovah, the only living God, will not suffer graven images to be regarded as the true God. In Ps. 83: 17, 18, David prays against the enemies of Israel: "Let them be confounded and troubled forever; yea, let them be put to shame and perish; that men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the Most High over all the earth."—It is no objection that in the passages quoted and similar ones, different attributes of God are brought to view. We cannot even in idea separate existence from the thing or subject existing; nor any better from the qualities or attributes of that subject. Like an epithet in language, it is nothing independently of its subject. It simply lays a foundation for, and affirms reality of, qualities or attributes. Any appeal or reference therefore to existence, must be the existence of subjects with their qualities and attributes.

And just here is doubtless the ground of the obscurity in which the present question has been involved.—I shall quote no more texts at present. The strength of the evidence for the opinion maintained, will appear in the collected views and facts brought forward in the following discussion.

One fact more must be illustrated preparatory to the interpretation of Ex. 6: 3; and that is, that the Mosaic dispensation, aside from its typical character, by which it was a shadow of good things to come; apart from that treasure of hopes and promises and those provisions and means of grace which it had in common with the patriarchal; was instituted with the specific and grand design of declaring and maintaining *that*, which the name **JEHOVAH** expresses, *viz.* **THE REAL EXISTENCE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD**, in opposition to false deities. I cannot bring this to view better than in the words of Jahn.* After remarking that the knowledge of God and our relation to him, is the sole good of men, and that therefore God revealed himself to the men of the old world, he adds: “But it was difficult to preserve this knowledge of God among sensual men. . . Four centuries after the flood, superstition and idolatry had crept in on all sides, and their influence at last became universal. . . The Israelites became so infected with the idolatry of Egypt during their residence in that country, that all the miracles they witnessed there, at the Red Sea, and at Mount Horeb, were scarcely sufficient to . . . bring them to the constant worship of the true God. . . God therefore provided for the nation such a civil constitution as was closely interwoven and inseparably connected with the worship of the true God. . . . He made the worship of the one only true God the fundamental law of his institutions. The God who created heaven and earth, who caused the deluge, who revealed himself to the ancestors of the Hebrews as the Most High, and now as Jehovah . . . in short, he who alone is God, . . . he was set forth by Moses as their national and tutelar Deity.”

This was the celebrated theocracy of the Hebrew nation. It began and ended with the Mosaic dispensation; constituted the ground upon which that dispensation was built, Ex. 19: 5—8. 20: 1, 2; had an extensive influence upon its institutions, and formed the bond by which it was held together. The theocracy therefore is an essential and integral part of the Mosaic dis-

* Heb. Commonwealth, pp. 31—33.

penation, and constitutes its grand and peculiar feature. The typical parts of that dispensation were only enlargements of what had already existed under the patriarchal, and derived all their meaning and worth from what actually belonged to the christian dispensation. To the theocracy, then, as constituting what is peculiar and distinctive in the Mosaic dispensation, we refer when we speak of that dispensation. Its grand object was to hold forth the character of God as *Jehovah*; i. e. as the only living and true God.

This view of the spirit and design of the Mosaic institutions is supported and proved by the testimony of the Bible. Ez. 20: 5—13, "Thus saith Jehovah your God, In the day when I chose Israel . . . and made myself known to them in the land Egypt . . . saying, I am Jehovah your God; then said I unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt; I am Jehovah. . . . But they . . . would not hearken unto me. . . . Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt. . . . And I gave them my statutes and showed them my judgments; . . . also I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign . . . that they might know that I am JEHOVAH that sanctify them," or set them apart for myself. See also Ex. 19: 5—8. Deut. 29: 10—18. Ps. 78: 5—9. 81: 4, 8—10. Deut. 4: 5—19. From this design of this dispensation is explained the prominence and severity of the laws against idolatry. See Ex. 20: 3—5, 22, 23. Deut. 17: 2—6. c. 13. c. 14: 2, 3. And the ground we are maintaining is supported by the fact, that the prohibition of idolatry is frequently strengthened by an appeal to the name *Jehovah*. Lev. 26: 1, "Ye shall make you no idols or graven images . . . neither set up any image of stone to bow down unto it; for I am *Jehovah* your God." See c. 19: 31. Here is also additional proof as to the meaning of the name.—The object then of the Mosaic institutions was to maintain the knowledge and worship of the true God.

But on the other hand, it is also expressly declared, that the object of these same institutions was to make known God as *Jehovah*. In Ex. 29: 45, 46, God, after having instituted some parts of the tabernacle service, says, "And I will dwell among the children of Israel. . . . And they shall know that I am *Jehovah* their God, that brought them forth, etc. I am *Jehovah* their God." In Ex. 31: 13, God's sabbaths are declared to be "a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may

know that I who sanctify you, i. e. who set you apart for myself, *am Jehovah.*" Placing then these two declared designs together, we deduce the inference, that the name Jehovah expresses that which it was the great object of the Mosaic institutions to promote, viz. the truth that God, in opposition to all false deities, is the only real and true God. The declared design of the Mosaic institutions *interprets* the name Jehovah; and all the Scriptures which make known the one, fix and establish the signification of the other.—There is then a peculiar and intimate relationship between the name Jehovah and the Mosaic dispensation, so far as it is peculiar and has any thing distinct from both the patriarchal and christian.

Further: It was not only the object of the Mosaic institutions to make known God as Jehovah, i. e. as the only really existing and true God; but this was also, during the whole length of that dispensation, the grand end and design of *God's providence in the world.* The state of the world and the prevalence of idolatry at the commencement of that period, have been mentioned. Egypt had gone farthest in idolatry. Pharaoh knew not Jehovah, Ex. 5: 2; and even the Hebrews appear to have forgotten that he was the only true God. See Ex. 3: 13. Ez. 20: 5—8. Now therefore God commenced that train of Mosaic providences, the object of which was to make him known as *Jehovah*, the only really existing and true God. This was the design of the wonders in Egypt, in reference to the Egyptians; Ex. 7: 5, "*And the Egyptians shall know that I am Jehovah*, when I stretch forth mine hand upon Egypt." This is particularly stated in reference to most of the ten plagues, Ex. 7: 17. 8: 10, 19, 22. 9: 16, 29. 12: 12. 14: 4, 7, 18. Indeed the learned Bryant maintains, that each of the plagues was directed against some one of the deities of Egypt, and was designed to exhibit their powerlessness and vanity, and the greatness on the other hand of the true and omnipotent God. These wonders were designed to teach the same thing also to the Israelites; Ex. 6: 6, 7, "I am Jehovah; and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians . . . and ye shall know that I am *Jehovah your God.*" See Ex. 10: 2. 14: 31. Deut. 4: 34, 35, 39. The design of his providences towards Israel in the wilderness was just the same, viz. to make known *Jehovah*, the one living and true God. See Ex. 16: 6, 12. Deut. 29: 6. 4: 35. See also Num. 14: 13—16. The support and exhibition of the same great truth was the object of the divine prov-

idences in the world during the whole period of Israel's abode in Canaan. King Hezekiah prayed in the very spirit of that dispensation, when he sought deliverance from Sennacherib, Is. 37: 16—20. His appeal is to the name JEHOVAH: "O Jehovah of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth. Incline thine ear, O Jehovah, and hear; open thine eyes, O Jehovah, and see; and hear all the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent to reproach the living God. Of a truth, Jehovah, the kings of Assyria have laid waste all the nations and their countries, and have cast their gods into the fire; for they were no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone: therefore they have destroyed them. Now therefore, O Jehovah our God, save us from his hand, *that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art JEHOVAH, even thou only.*" See also Solomon's prayer, 1 K. 8: 59—61. Also 1 K. 20: 13, 38, "Thus saith Jehovah, Because the Syrians have said Jehovah is God of the hills, but he is not God of the vallies, therefore I will deliver all this great multitude into their hand; *and ye shall know that I am JEHOVAH.*" See also Ez. 39: 21, 22. 36: 21—23, 36. 20: 10—44.

Keeping now in view this specific character and design of the Mosaic dispensation and providences, we arrive, it appears to me, at a natural and very appropriate interpretation of Ex. 6: 2, 3, "And God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name אֱלֹהֵי שְׂדֵי, *El Shaddai*; but by my name יהוה, *Jehovah*, was I not known to them."—It is a formal declaration by God himself of the commencement of a new dispensation of religion and providence, the grand design of which was to make known God as JEHOVAH, the only true and living God. As if he had said: 'The system of religion and providence according to which I made myself known to the patriarchs, was founded and regulated on different principles, and had a different spirit and object from that which is now about to commence. That system had particular reference to the character and attributes of God as expressed by his name אֱלֹהֵי שְׂדֵי. The principles, spirit and object of the dispensation now to take place, are to have immediate reference to that truth concerning God which is expressed by the name יהוה, viz. THAT HE ALONE IS THE LIVING GOD.'

This view of the passage derives important illustration and proof from Ex. 3: 14. There, God, in answer to the inquiry of Moses, what he should say to the Israelites when they asked the name of the God who sent him, says, "אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי, I AM THAT I AM. And he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, אֲדֹנָי, I AM, hath sent me unto you."—Were we entirely ignorant as to the meaning of both of these passages, still no doubt could exist as to their being closely connected and strictly parallel with each other. Chap. 6: 2 is addressed to Moses, while chap. 3: 14 is a message to the Israelites, and both have reference to the same matters, viz. God's former revelation to their fathers (compare c. 3: 13, 15) and their own deliverance from Egypt; they are intended apparently for the same purposes; relate both to a name of God; and the two names differ from each other but in a single letter or prefix. Accordingly, all interpreters agree in admitting the close parallelism and connexion of the two passages. But in c. 3: 14, the name by which Moses is commanded to make God known to the Israelites, expresses simply the idea of existence: "אֲדֹנָי, I am, hath sent me unto you." This then was the truth respecting God, which it was the great object of Moses' commission to make known. Here is independent and direct proof for the ground we have taken as to the Mosaic dispensation; and therefore of itself, even supposing no relation between the two passages, confirms the above interpretation of c. 6: 3, which rests on that ground. But the actual relation of the two passages is morally certain; and the name יהוה, *Jehovah*, evidently derived from this verb, הָיָה, *to be*, certainly therefore expresses the same idea, i. e. of simple existence, in opposition to non-existence.

It will be seen how exactly the proof here as to the signification of the name Jehovah, tallies with that which was derived from the references to its meaning in other passages, and from its special connexion, as shewn above, with the declared object of the Mosaic institutions. The convergency of evidence from such different sources, is an indication of truth, and supports also all the particulars from which that evidence proceeds. In the relation of these two passages lies also proof, I think, that the name Jehovah does not imply the idea of *cause* or *source of existence* to other beings and things. All the collected evidence which has been adduced, refers us for the signification of the name, not to the Piel or Hiphil forms of the verb, denoting causation

of existence, but to the simple Kal form, which merely affirms existence—the form which we actually find in c. 3: 14, “אֲנִי־יְהוָה, *I am*, hath sent me unto you.” I think we have reason enough also to set aside the seventh interpretation of the name, given above, viz. *faithful in performing his word*, and especially his promises. *To be*, and *to be faithful*, are very different things; and yet by a mental deception, one has been transmuted into the other. *To be—to be immutably—to be immutable in volition or purpose—to be immutable as to one’s word or promise—*this is the process. But the idea thus obtained is never applied, by its supporters, to the name, except in this one passage; and I think it may safely be said, that the explanation of the passage has supplied the interpretation of the name, and not the interpretation of the name the explanation of the passage. It was plain that the words, “But by my name Jehovah was I not known to them,” could not mean that this name of God was unknown to the patriarchs. Such passages as Gen. 15: 2 and 22: 14, where the name could not have been supplied by the historian, proved the contrary. Some other sense was therefore sought for; and the next idea most natural was, that the *meaning* of the name was unknown to the patriarchs. Then, the circumstances and context of this one passage only, were consulted for the meaning of the name. And as God was now about to commence the fulfilment of the promises made to the patriarchs, this was supposed to be the fact referred to; and the name יהוה, *Jehovah*, was without any other proof explained to signify *God’s faithfulness to his word*; and this idea was derived from its root יהי, *to be*, either by the process above detailed, or through one of the causative conjugations of the verb, *to cause to be*, i. e. to bring into existence that which had been promised. And yet this interpretation of the passage, unsatisfactory as it is, has been adopted by almost every body, learned and unlearned.

That the name Jehovah was not unknown to the patriarchs, is certain, as has been remarked. The interpretation of the last clause of Ex. 6: 3, founded on the views which have been presented, will be, that the fact of the real existence of the true God, was not, under the patriarchal dispensation, as it was under the Mosaic, *the great central truth* of the system, which it was the great aim of its institutions and providences to illustrate; to which constant appeal was made; on which the pious built their hopes; and in reference to which they presented their prayers.

"I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by the name of **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*; but by my name **יְהוָה**, *Jehovah*, was I not known to them."

It will be pleasant to see how facts support the interpretation just given. In Genesis the name **יְהוָה**, *Jehovah*, occurs very frequently; but except in one place, apparently as a mere name to designate the Deity. See c. 12 throughout, and c. 15: 2. 16: 13. 18: 14. 21: 33. But when any thing more than mere designation is intended, other names are used; and most frequently **אֱלֹהֵי**, *El*, either alone, or in connexion with others. Gen. 16: 13, "And she (Hagar) called the name of Jehovah that spake unto her, **אֱלֹהֵי רְאָיָה**, *thou God (El) of vision*," i. e. who exhibitest thyself. Gen. 28: 19, "And Jacob called the name of that place (where God had appeared to him) **בֵּית-אֵל**, *Beth-el*." Gen. 31: 13, "I am **אֱלֹהֵי בֵּית-אֵל**, *El, the God of Bethel* . . . now arise, etc." See c. 46: 3. 49: 25. In this last place, both names are used: "Even by **אֱלֹהֵי**, *El*, the God of thy father who shall help thee, and by **שַׁדַּי**, *Shaddai*, who shall bless thee." In other places, the appeal is to the name **אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה**, *El Elyón*, the Most High God, Gen. 14: 18, 19, 20, 22; or to **אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם**, *El Olám*, the everlasting God. But in five places, **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*, is used. It will be seen that these are all cases of solemn appeal to the character and attributes and prerogatives of God, as expressed by this name. Gen. 17: 1, "Jehovah appeared unto Abraham, and said unto him, I am **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*; walk before me and be thou perfect." Gen. 28: 3 Isaac says to Jacob, "**אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*, bless thee." Gen. 35: 11, "And God said to him (Jacob), I am **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*; be fruitful and multiply, etc." Gen. 43: 14, Jacob says to his sons, "And **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*, give you mercy before the man." Gen. 48: 3, "And Jacob said unto Joseph, **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*, appeared unto me at Luz, and blessed me." The word **שַׁדַּי**, *Shaddai*, never occurs in Genesis separate from *El*. If the reader chooses to carry the investigation farther, he may examine the following passages: Gen. 18: 25. 15: 2, 8. 24: 3, 7, 12. 26: 24. 27: 28. 28: 13. 31: 42, 53. 32: 9. 48: 15, 16. In all of them, the Deity is not merely mentioned, but there is a reference or appeal to his character and attributes. It will be observed, that whenever the name *Jehovah* occurs, it is always in connexion with some one of the names of Deity, which, as has been seen, it was customary in appeals to Deity to use alone. There is but one other

place of appeal to the Deity, which I have found in Genesis; and that is the only one where the name Jehovah is used singly. In c. 15: 7, God says to Abraham, "I am יהוה, *Jehovah*, that brought thee out of the land of the Chaldeans to give thee this land to possess it." May there not be here a reference to his 'serving other gods' in that country? See Josh. 24: 2. Yet even here Abraham does not forsake the genius of the dispensation under which he lived. He immediately answers, "אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה, *Adonây Yehoveeh*, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it."

It is curious to observe in all this, the coincident usage of the book of Job. If we leave out the narrative parts of the book, i. e. the first chapter, with the exception of v. 21, which was spoken by Job; the second and forty-second chapters, and the short formulae of introduction to the speeches of the parties, viz. 38: 1. 40: 1, 3, 6; the name יהוה, *Jehovah*, occurs, if I am not mistaken, but four times in the whole book; three times in c. 1: 21, and once c. 12: 9. In all these it is not clear, that it is used otherwise than as a mere name of designation. The term אֲדֹנָי, *Adonây*, occurs once; אֱלֹהִים, *Elohim*, five times in the two first chapters, and four times in other places; אֱלֹהִי, *Eloah*, occurs forty-two times; אֱל, *El*, fifty-three, and שַׁדַּי, *Shaddai*, thirty-one times. These names are always used separately; but the three last are frequently found corresponding to each other in the poetic parallelism. In many of the passages there is a reference and appeal to the character, attributes, and prerogatives of Deity, as expressed by these names. The reader may if he pleases, consult the following; the name *Shaddai* occurs in all of them, which our translators always render by the word 'Almighty.' Ch. 5: 17. 6: 4, 14. 8: 3, 5. 11: 7. 13: 3. 15: 25. 21: 15, 20.—Do not the facts just stated constitute of themselves proof, that the history of Job belongs to the patriarchal age? Here again, converging testimonies unite; and coincidences establish the several particulars between which they exist. I acknowledge that the facts just stated with regard to the books of Genesis and Job have greatly surprised me. I had not calculated on such a correspondence between facts and my interpretation of Ex. 6: 3.

In a singular and striking sense, then, God was not known to the patriarchs by his name Jehovah. That name was not his 'memorial' among men—the object of fear, the foundation of hope, 'the strong tower' to which his people continually resorted.

But all this *was* true of this name under the Mosaic dispensation, and the change took place at this specific time of God's speaking to Moses. Ex. 6: 2, "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, *I am Jehovah*; and I appeared, etc." Verse 6, "Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, *I am Jehovah*; and I will bring you out, etc." Verse 7, "And ye shall know that *I am Jehovah your God*."* Verse 8, "I will give it you for an heritage, *I am Jehovah*." In verses 28, 29, this change, then introduced, is noticed and declared: "And it came to pass, *in the day when Jehovah spake unto Moses in the land of Egypt, that Jehovah spake unto Moses saying, I am Jehovah; speak thou unto Pharaoh all that I say unto thee*." We now see why these verses were written. It was hard before to know what they had to do in the chapter. But now they both give and receive, as I conceive, strong and convincing illustration. The same truth as to the importance and use of the name Jehovah under the Mosaic dispensation, is declared in other places: Is. 42: 8, "I am Jehovah, *that is my name*; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Hos. 12: 5, "And there he spake with him, even Jehovah, God of Hosts; *Jehovah is his memorial*."—But the fact is not only declared; it appears in uniform usage. Is. 12: 2, "Behold God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid; *for יהוה יהוה, Yâh Jehovah*, (a repetition of Jehovah expressing a strong reference,) is my strength and my song." Is. 26: 4, "I trust in Jehovah for ever; for *יהוה יהוה, Yâh Jehovah*, is everlasting strength." This name after God's speaking to Moses in Ex. 6: 2, 3, is the constant sanction of every command and every promise, and the ground which is laid for every fear and every hope. It forms the sublime introduction and sanction to the divine law, when God spake it with thunderings and lightnings from Mount Sinai. Ex. 20: 2, "I am *Jehovah your God*, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." See now Lev. 18: 1, 4, 5, 6, 21, 30. 19: 3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37. As the subject is interesting, and important in elucidating the character and genius of the Mosaic dispensation, the

* This expression 'your God,' 'thy God,' etc. is also new. It refers to the theocratic or Mosaic relationship established by God between himself and the Hebrew nation. See Ex. 19: 3—8.

reader will please to turn to the following passages; recollecting that the word LORD, when in capitals, stands for **JEHOVAH** in the original: Amos 5: 8. 9: 6. Jer. 10: 16. 46: 18. 51: 19. 16: 21. Is. 41: 1—4, 13, 17, 20. 42: 5, 6. 43: 3, 11—17. 44: 6—8, 24. 48: 2. Throughout the books belonging to the Mosaic dispensation, **אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי**, *El Shaddai*, occurs but once, viz. Ezek. 10: 5. If that instance could be exchanged for the corresponding one under the patriarchal dispensation, Gen. 15: 7, the usage, in conformity to God's declaration in Ex. 6: 3, would be perfect. And yet I would not have it done; by this one case under each, the two systems seem to recognize each other, and their common relation to the same *one* God.

We have then, in all this, the exact counterpart of what was found to be true under the patriarchal dispensation—a use of the name Jehovah, and an importance given to its significant meaning, which it has been shown, are recognized in several passages, and which throw the light of the Bible itself upon the design and meaning of God, when he said, Ex. 6: 2, “*I am יהוה Jehovah;*” and c. 3: 14 “*אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה, I am, hath sent me unto you.*” This result has been equally surprising with the other; the two, forming the exact counterpart of each other, just meet, with their broad and uniform array of facts, the corresponding counterpart clauses of Ex. 6: 2, 3. Can there be any more doubt, that the interpretation we have given is the true meaning of the passage?

Two very interesting subjects receive a good deal of light from the facts brought to view in the preceding discussion. The first is, the distinctive character of each of the three dispensations; the relative importance of the patriarchal and Mosaic; and the relation of each of these to the Christian. We know from the Bible, that one important feature of the Mosaic was, that a great part of its rites, ceremonies, and institutions, were shadows and types of the great realities of the Christian dispensation; and we know too, that it contains provision for the conversion, sanctification, and salvation of men. But it is remarkable that in both these respects, it agreed with the patriarchal. This, by the way, explains a great deal of the significant use, under the Levitical dispensation, of those names of Deity, which according to Ex. 6: 3, have a peculiar connexion with the patriarchal. Thus, **אֱלֹהֵי**, *El*, one of these, occurs in the books written under the Mosaic institution in about one hundred and fifty places; and sixty-three of these are in

the Psalms alone. Now, however this may be accounted for, by supposing that this name is more poetic or ancient than the rest, a part at least of the cause of this, is doubtless the fact, that the Psalms deal principally in subjects, with regard to which persons under all the dispensations are on common ground. As to the glory of God, personal sanctification, dependence on God and the hope of salvation, Abraham and David felt alike, and looked to and found consolation in the same attributes and promises of God. The distinctive feature of the Mosaic dispensation was, as has been shown, the theocracy; the grand scope and end of which was, to hold up and teach to men the great truth expressed in the name **JEHOVAH**.

It is equally plain, from Ex. 6: 3, that the patriarchal dispensation in its spirit, end, doctrines, commands, and promises, had special reference to God as *El Shaddai*. What the actual significancy of this name in this connexion is, and what the actual distinctive genius of that dispensation was, are subjects of very interesting and important inquiry. I can barely enter upon them here. The thoughts that have suggested themselves are few, and not thoroughly examined or carried out. We know that the patriarchal dispensation was the first form under which God established his church among men—that church, for the salvation of which, the great plan and covenant of grace were instituted, to which all the promises of grace, and help, and pardon were given; and which now rests upon those original promises which were given to the patriarchs. If then we look around for the fundamental character of the first dispensation, we naturally turn first to these promises and this covenant, as the most important feature. Its few types and ceremonies were grounded entirely upon these, and only looked *forward* to their actual accomplishment under the gospel. To be sure, the covenant and promises are the common property of the church under every form; but they belonged first to the patriarchs. It is then to this dispensation as **THE REPOSITORY OF THE COVENANT AND PROMISES OF GOD TO MAN**, that we suppose the name **אֱלֹהִים**, *El Shaddai*, to have reference—that name in connexion with which God revealed himself as *the source of all good*, of all the good which as the *Almighty God and Father*, he confers on man. I acknowledge that I have not at hand any etymological testimony to support this sentiment; and therefore I made the above remark; but there is this in its support, that whenever the covenant and promises of grace are appealed to, it is

in connexion with one or both of these names; and whenever there is an appeal or a reference to God as a God of goodness, and mercy, and help, the fact is the same. He is then spoken of as *El*, or *El Shaddai*. As to the covenant made with Abraham, consult the well known formula, Gen. 26: 24. 28: 13. 32: 9; and especially Ex. 3: 6, keeping in mind that according to the New Testament, the Abrahamic covenant is the covenant of grace. And for the idea of other references to this same name, consult those enumerated on p. 741. The references in the Psalms to God, under the name of אֱלֹהִים, *El*, would also greatly illustrate this point; and also the meaning under the theocracy, of the phrases, 'my God,' 'thy God,' 'your God,' etc.

But the whole of this essential and fundamental part of the patriarchal dispensation is common to it with the Christian. Christ and his apostles built the Christian church upon these same promises and covenant. See Luke 24: 27. Acts 3: 13, 25, 26. Rom. 3: 16, 17. Gal. 3: 7, 14—17, 21, 29. These parts of the patriarchal system, which were referred to and expressed in the divine name אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, have become, with the difference of the great prospective promise of Christ having been fulfilled, the fundamental portions of the Christian system.

All this was also recognized in the Jewish system. But it constituted its internal, and if I may say so, its hidden substance. Its outward form and features, and its external operation had another object—an object not immediately connected with the great plan of man's salvation. The state and tendency of things among depraved and debased men made this necessary. While the system of grace, as first founded, was more privately exerting its influence, and leading souls to heaven; the state of the world required that God should turn aside from his great and permanent scheme of grace, and institute a dispensation of things, and carry on a system of providence, which should have for its great object, to prevent men from entirely forgetting his existence. When this object had been accomplished; when the state of the world called no more for this extra machinery; it was dissolved and removed, and the original system, with its primitive principles and objects, was brought out again into exclusive prominence and with ten-fold efficiency.

This view of the genius and relations of the different dispensations, will of itself afford a solution of the remaining topic of

inquiry, viz. The relative importance of the different *names* of Deity, and the relation of each to the Christian dispensation.—The name JEHOVAH, is certainly not to us what it was to the Jew. To him, it expressed that great truth respecting God, which it was the grand design of his system to illustrate and enforce. To him there was a sacredness and an importance attached to the name, which certainly well accounts for the huge mass of superstition which came to be connected with it.—And by the way, the very fact of the existence of this superstition, confirms our doctrine of the peculiar relation of this name to the Jewish dispensation. It is the recognition of that connexion by ignorance and stupidity themselves;—but it at the same time proves the existence of an enlightened knowledge of this connexion, during the better ages of that system.—Here also are converging testimonies strengthening each other. We have the whole Jewish nation, during its whole history, supporting the views which have been presented.

But to us this peculiar importance and sacredness of the name *Jehovah* have passed away with the system with which they were connected; and אֱלֹהֵי שֹׁדַי, *El Shaddai*, the precious name of God which expresses the character in which he first made himself known as *the designer and founder of the glorious scheme of grace*, is the name which has the first and most intimate connexion with all that we under the gospel want and hope for. Still the name יהוה, *Jehovah*, is not done away, any more than it was unknown to the patriarchs. As in reference to Enoch, Heb. 11: 6, so in reference to us, it may be said that “he that cometh to God must believe that HE IS, as well as that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” As long as THERE IS a God, so long will the name *Jehovah* be one of his appropriate epithets; and it may be said that every other name of God implies this one, as every character and attribute implies the existence of a subject possessing them. The name *Jehovah*, then, is still an important sacred name of God, and to be associated forever with the other names by which the Deity has made himself known. This is beautifully and strikingly asserted by God himself, Ex. 3: 15, immediately after declaring himself the great אֲדֹנָי, I AM. “And God said moreover to Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, *Jehovah Elohim*, of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me un-

to you. *This is my name forever, and this is my memorial throughout all generations.*"

There is one view too in which the name יהוה, *Jehovah*, has an essential, peculiar, and unchangeable importance. On account of its peculiar character and signification, it can never be appropriated to any but HIM WHO IS REALLY GOD; and we have seen that its distinctive use is to affirm *real Deity* of him to whom it is given, and to deny it of all others. This is its only relevancy and power. Yet it is given most plainly and absolutely to Christ; and that too, during the very existence of a dispensation, the great object of which was to maintain the *exclusive Deity* of the one living and true God. Mal. 3: 1, "Behold I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and JEHOVAH whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in." Is. 40: 3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH; make straight in the desert a highway for our God." Jer. 23: 5, 6, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

ART. VII. ON THE DURATION OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

By Henry Mills D. D. Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theol. Sem. at Auburn, N. Y.

THE kingdom of Christ, as mediator, is a delegated dominion; but it is not therefore necessarily limited in its duration. The rule which he maintains, as head over all to his church, could not be exercised without attributes truly divine. As God, he will ever live,—as God-man mediator he *may* ever live and reign, the glorious medium of blessings to his people, the unceasing object of their love and worship, to the eternal glory of the Father. That all the purposes of his government will have been answered on the subjection of his enemies, and his authority thenceforth cease, is not for us to determine. The extent of

the divine purposes in raising Christ to the throne, can be known by us, only so far as God himself may give instruction.

What, then, is the voice of the Scriptures on the duration of this kingdom?

That Christ will abide *priest* forever seems as fully declared as language can do it. And if eternally a priest, why not eternally a king?

But the Scriptures do not withhold their clear testimony to the perpetuity of his kingdom.

In the original promise to David, 2 Sam. 7: 16, which is continually alluded to in subsequent prophecies respecting the Messiah, God declares, "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever."

Isaiah says, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever." Is. 9: 6, 7.

Daniel declares of the kingdom which the God of heaven should set up, 2: 44, that it "shall never be destroyed,"—but "shall stand forever,"—and of him whom he saw in vision like the Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven, 7: 14, "There was given 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."

And if any doubt should arise in regard to the sense in which the terms expressive of perpetuity are to be understood in these prophecies of the *Old Testament*, the interpretation of them in their fullest import seems confirmed by the language of the *New*. Thus it is said of Jesus by the angel who announces his approaching birth, Luke 1: 32, 33, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the LORD GOD shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

To the Son it is said, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," Heb. 1: 8. Ps. 45: 6.

The beloved disciple seems to apprehend no termination to the kingdom of his Redeemer, when, in his doxology to "the Prince of the kings of the earth," Rev. 1: 5, 6, we find him saying, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever, Amen."

Nor would it appear easy to reconcile the termination of Christ's rule with the language of the heavenly host when they cried, Rev. 5: 12, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing," while all in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, united in saying, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever;" or, again, with what we read Rev. 11: 15, "There were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our LORD and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever."

If it had been the special purpose of the Holy Spirit to guard against the idea that the victory of Christ over every enemy, and his judging of the world, should be followed by the resignation of his regal power, we can scarcely imagine how it could be done more fully than is actually done in the last three chapters of the Revelation. There we are told that *after* the judgment by him who sat on the great white throne; when death and hell had delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged, every man according to their works, and death and hell, and whoever was not found written in the book of life, were cast into the lake of fire,—*after* there was a new heaven and a new earth, and the New Jerusalem had descended out of heaven from God,—*after all this*, we are told that the Lamb was the light of this heavenly city, and that the pure river of water of life proceeded out of *the throne* of God and of *the Lamb*,—and that in this city there shall be no more curse, but in it shall be *the throne* of God, and of *the Lamb*.

Christ, then, will certainly have a throne, and his dominion shall be a source of blessings to his people, after his victory over death, their last enemy, and after their admission to the mansions of eternal rest.* And if any of his titles could assure us

* Compare Eph. 1: 21. 2 Tim. 2: 12. Rev. 3: 21.

that this dominion will be his in quality of Mediator, none seems more strikingly adapted for this purpose, than his title of *the Lamb,—the Lamb that was slain.*

Thus far the Scriptures seem united in the testimony that Christ, as Lord and King, shall reign forever.

But we are told that, after all, there is one passage which explicitly declares that Christ will relinquish his regal power; and, although it is acknowledged to be the only one of the kind, we are not, on this account, the less obliged to receive whatever it clearly teaches. It remains, therefore, to inquire into its real import. It is found 1 Cor. 15:24—28.

The apostle had been just speaking of the victory which Christ, at his coming, shall obtain over death by the rescue of his people from the power of death, in their glorious resurrection; and, having declared the fact of such deliverance, he proceeds: "Then cometh the end, or consummation, (that glorious result to which the promises of God and the hopes of Christians are specially directed,) when he shall restore or re-establish* the kingdom to God, even the Father,—when he shall destroy or quell all rule, and all authority and power, i. e. all opposing rule, every enemy." Here, we conceive, nothing is said of Christ's mediatorial kingdom; but the kingdom spoken of is the dominion which the enemies of God and of his people have usurped, and which Christ shall eventually restore or re-establish to the Father, by putting down all opposition to his supreme dominion. The latter part of the verse is exegetical of the former.

The apostle proceeds, "For he must reign until he put all enemies under his feet,"—alluding to the language of the LORD unto David's Lord, Ps. 110: 1, "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" see also Ps. 8: 6, compared with Heb. 2: 8. Here, again, many have supposed it clearly implied that, when his enemies shall be subdued, Christ will cease to reign. But for such opinion we see no adequate ground. Christ is now reigning in the midst of his enemies, and they are encouraging themselves with the hope of success in their opposition. While controversy is sustained, the question is yet unsettled; his enemies may indulge the expectation of destroying his kingdom. God assures the Son of eventual success, by declaring that he shall reign until every foe, all that

* See Note A appended.

opposes his final triumph shall be subjected to his power. But why are we to conclude, when crowned with complete success, and *because* every enemy is submissive to the sceptre of his mercy, or made to bow to his avenging rod, that he must cease to reign, i. e. that he must cease to reign from the moment when all his enemies are made to feel and to acknowledge his right and his power? Rather we should infer that no doubt could exist of his ruling when all opposition to his dominion shall cease.*

The apostle goes on to say that "Death the last enemy shall be subdued. For," adds he, "all things he (the Father) hath subjected beneath his (Christ's) feet." He then proceeds to argue, "But since it is said, [*ἐν ἡ*, the Scripture says,] that all things have been subjected, it is plain that he is excepted who did subject all things to him." A delegated authority necessarily implies a supremacy in him who confers it. And every victory of Christ, in the exercise of this authority, must redound to the glory of the Most High. To secure, and eternally to exhibit this glory, in his triumph over every opposition, is the great object of the Mediator's reign. This the apostle would teach us when he adds, "But when [*ὅταν δὲ*] all things are actually subjected to him, even then [*τότε καὶ*] the Son himself will be subject to him who did subject all things to him, † *that God may be all in all*"—i. e. that it may be seen and acknowledged that God every where, and in all events, *is Supreme*.

The apostle had just taught in v. 27, as all admit, that Christ, in the exercise of his regal power, while subduing the enemies of God and of himself, is subject to him who had made him head over all. But if, according to the usual exegesis of this latter verse (28), we regard the Son as subject to the Most High, only in consequence of relinquishing his mediatorial kingdom,—we make him as Mediator to hold the supreme, not a derived dominion; and thus the apostle is made to contradict in this, what he had said in the preceding verse, and what is abundantly taught elsewhere.

We therefore conclude that the language of Paul in this verse, both by itself, and from its connexion, gives no support to the opinion that Christ shall leave his throne; but teaches rather, that, after the reduction of every foe, he shall, as before, continue to reign to the glory of God Supreme.

* See Note B.

† See Note C.

And, on a review of the whole passage, we find in it no discrepancy with those which ascribe perpetuity to the kingdom of Christ. We are therefore permitted still to believe, that, after the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ,—when death shall be destroyed,—when the judgment shall have passed, and his people shall have entered upon their eternal inheritance,—that he shall abide the source of their never-ending bliss,—shall continue Lord to the glory of God the Father, and, as joint occupant of his throne, shall reign forever and ever.

I conclude with a version of the passage in question in accordance with the preceding exegesis :

- 24 Then cometh the end, when he shall re-establish the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall subdue all [opposing] rule and all authority and power :
- 25 For he must reign until he put all enemies beneath his feet.
- 26 The last enemy, Death, shall be destroyed :
- 27 For he [the Father] hath [by decree] subjected all things beneath his feet. But since it is said that all things have been subjected, it is plain that he is excepted who did subject all things to him.
- 28 But when all things shall be [actually] subjected, even then the Son himself shall be subjected to him who did subject all things to him, that God may be all in all.

NOTE A.

The word *παράδωμι*, which our common version renders "deliver up," has the general signification of *handing* or *delivering* (a thing to one); and this meaning is variously modified by the circumstances in which the meaning is used. In the sense of *returning*, or *handing back* what had been previously received, no instance is adduced from the New Testament by our Lexicons, except this, and John 19: 30, *παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα*, which is no clear example of such meaning; nor do I find any elsewhere. The general idea of the word as it continually recurs, viz. that of *handing over* or *putting one in possession* of a thing, would adequately serve our interpretation of the present passage. In the LXX, however, we have at least one example of the precise meaning of the word which we suppose belongs to it here, viz. of

restoring to one the possession of what had been withdrawn. In Deut. 23: 15 it is said : Οὐ παραδώσεις παῖδα τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ, ὅς προσέθειται σοὶ παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, "Thou shalt not restore unto his master the servant, who has escaped from his master unto thee."

NOTE B.

Adequate reason, we think, has been given in the text for the use of the phrase "he must reign *until*, etc." without supposing that any termination of Christ's kingdom is designed. But if any are still disposed to think that the word 'until' implies such termination, we appeal to the numerous examples where the same term (Heb. 72 Ps. 110: 1, Gr. ἄχρις or ἕως by which alike the Heb. is rendered in the LXX and New Testament) will not admit of any such interpretation. Among other instances are found these :

- Gen. 28: 15. God says to Jacob "I will not leave thee, *until* I have done that which I have spoken to thee of."
 1 Sam. 15: 35. "And Samuel came no more to see Saul, *until* the day of his death." See also 2 Sam. 6: 23.
 Is. 22: 14. "Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you, *till* ye die."
 Is. 42: 4. It is said of the Messiah, "He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, *till* he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law."
 Ps. 112: 8. "His heart is established, he shall not be afraid, *until* he see his desire upon his enemies."
 Rom. 5: 13. "*Until* the law, sin was in the world."
 1 Tim. 4: 13. "*Till* I come, give attendance to reading."

See also Matt. 28: 20. 1 Cor. 4: 5. etc. etc.

NOTE C.

Storr, to whom the writer is mainly indebted for the views exhibited on the subject of this essay, (see his *Opuscula Academica*, Vol. I. pp. 269—282,) has given a different interpretation of this 28th verse. He regards it as exegetical of what immediately precedes, and would render it, "Since, moreover, all things have been subjected to him (by the Father), therefore, the Son himself also will be [is] subject to him who did subject all things to him, that thus God may be all in all." He makes ὅταν and τότε not adverbs of time, but the former to mark the protasis (seeing that), the latter, the apodosis (therefore). To the particle ὅτι he assigns the force of 'moreover,' which hardly aids his context; while the future "the Son shall be subject" he makes a logical future, or, in connexion with τότε, merely inferential, "it follows that the Son is subject, etc."

To the sentiment, which he thus derives from the verse, we cannot object; for it is merely an enlargement of what is found in the one previous. But the view we have adopted avoids the seeming tautology, adds an important idea perfectly apposite to the context, and requires no unusual meaning or construction of words or of forms.

ART. VIII. LITERARY NOTICES.

By the Editor.

I. CHAMPOLLION'S RESEARCHES. The too early decease of this distinguished scholar, will not, it may be hoped, prove so fatal to the science which he in a manner created, viz. the study of hieroglyphics, as was at first anticipated. His *Grammaire Egyptienne*, in which he has methodically developed the general principles of that science, and supported them by numerous examples, was happily completed before his death, and had received the last touches from the author's hand. This manuscript has recently been put to press, after various typographical attempts and trials to copy in the text itself the many citations and examples in Egyptian characters. These have at length been successfully imitated, and the public are assured, that the execution of the work will correspond to its importance. It is divided into fourteen chapters, subdivided into sections, and these again into articles. The first chapter, *Names, Forms, and Arrangement of the Sacred Characters*, has three sections and forty eight articles. The work will appear in one volume, small folio, of about 500 pages, and will be published in four *livraisons* or numbers, at the price of 12½ francs each.

At the same time, the materials collected by Champollion during his residence in Egypt are in a course of preparation for the press. All the designs will be published, together with the *autograph descriptions*, prepared by the author himself. * This great work will be composed of forty *livraisons*, *text and plates*; and it is supposed that the price of the whole will not exceed 400 francs. The collection will be scrupulously conformed to the plan arranged by Champollion himself, and to his manuscripts; so that the learned world will not long be deprived of these precious materials, such as the author himself left them; since there is no one who could, with any profit to science, take his place in a similar enterprise. *Journal Asiatique, Mars 1833.*

II. CRUSADES. The seventh and last volume of the **HISTORY**

OF THE CRUSADES, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, by WILKEN, appeared at Leipsic in 1832. The author commenced his researches on the holy wars as early as 1799, on the occasion of a prize-subject proposed by the Academy of Sciences at Göttingen; and the first volume of his History was published in 1807. This great work, therefore, is the fruit of more than thirty years of research and toil. The last volume is composed of two parts, containing more than 1000 pages, and is accompanied with tables, geographical plans, indexes, etc. This is now the most complete and perfect history extant of the crusades.

III. A BIBLE ATLAS, consisting of *twelve* maps from the best authorities, drawn by C. F. WEILAND, and illustrated with 160 pages of text by C. ACKERMANN of Jena, 4to. Weimar, 1832.—The maps refer to all the historical books of the Old and New Testaments; and are followed by a complete biblico-geographical lexicon or index. This is said to be the first work of the kind in Germany; and if it is executed with the usual elegance and accuracy of the Geographical Institute in Weimar, it cannot but prove a most acceptable as well as important work to all biblical students. It is very highly spoken of and recommended by Olshausen, in the Preface to Vol. II of his Commentary. Price in Germany, 1¼ rix dollar, or about \$1.

IV. CODEx APOCRYPHUS NOVI TESTAMENTI, e libris editis et manuscriptis etc. collectus, recensitus, notisque et prolegomenis illustratus à J. C. THILO. Tom. I. Lips. 1832. Price 4½ rth. = \$3 37½. This is a new edition of the collection published by Fabricius, containing the various spurious gospels and apocryphal books of the New Testament, which were current in the primitive ages among the heretical sects professing to bear the Christian name. Some of them are written in Arabic. They are all here reprinted, with corrections and illustrations. The work is to be completed in three volumes. Only the first volume has yet appeared, which comprises the spurious gospels, and contains 896 pages. The second volume is announced to be published in 1833.

V. J. A. H. TITTMANN DE SYNONYMIS IN N. T. LIBER SECUNDUS, post mortem edidit, alia ejusdem opuscula exegetici argumenti adjecit G. Becher. Lips. 1832. This volume contains: I. Lexici Synonymorum N. T. Cap. XI, idque ultimum, which treats of several words. II. Disputatio de loco Matt. 10: 34, 35, et Luc. 12: 49—51. III. IV. De usu Particularum in N. T.—two programmes on the use of *ἴνα*, *ὥστε*, (*ὡς*) *ὡστε*. See *Theol. Stud.* 1833. p. 487.

VI. WETSTENII NOV. TEST. GRAECUM. Editio altera, cur. J. A. Lotze, Tom. I. Rotterodami 1831. 4to. A mere reprint of Wetstein's edition; of which the text is useless and the prolegomena

exist in separate editions. The various readings are now of comparatively little importance; and the exegetical commentary, which at present is the most valuable part of Wetstein's volumes, would seem likely to be given to the public in a form better adapted to general use, in the work here next announced.

VII. Prof. THEILE, of Leipsic, announced in April 1832, that the exegetical part of Wetstein's N. Test. and all the remarks of the writers of *Observationes in N. T.* as Alberti, Elsner, Krebs, Kypke, Lösner, Munthe, Raphel, etc. were to be arranged together under his supervision, and published in one *Corpus Observationum philologicarum in N. T.* Such a work cannot but be exceedingly useful to the biblical student; we could only wish that it had fallen into the hands of a more judicious editor. The first part, containing the Gospel of Matthew, was to have been published in the autumn of 1832; but we have seen no notice of its appearance.

VIII. OLSHAUSEN'S COMMENTARY ON THE N. T. Vol. II. Königsb. 1832.—This volume contains three parts: I. Commentary on the Gospel of John. II. The History of our Lord's Passion, according to the four Gospels. III. Commentary on the book of Acts.—The work is to be completed in three volumes. We hope hereafter to make our readers better acquainted with some portions of this excellent Commentary.

IX. NEANDER'S HISTORY OF THE PLANTING AND PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF THE APOSTLES. *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel.* Vol. I. Hamb. 1832.—This is an enlargement of a course of lectures, which the author has been accustomed to deliver for several years, and which were always popular and largely attended. The work constitutes a rich and interesting historical commentary upon the book of Acts and the Epistles—books which cannot be studied in the most profitable manner, without an historical survey and orderly arrangement of all the particular events, and periods, and characteristics of the Apostolic age. This is here given to us by Neander in a manner adapted for popular use; while we every where perceive, that the author presents only the results of profound investigation and thorough acquaintance with his subject, thus aiming to supply also the wants of biblical students. In the winter of 1827—8, the Editor had the pleasure of attending the course of lectures referred to, in company with from 350 to 400 pupils of Neander;* and was so much interested, as to be at the very considerable expense of obtaining a manuscript copy of the course from the notes of students. It is

* Comp. Bibl. Repos. I. p. 20, 21.

therefore with high gratification, that he here finds the same matter, in an improved form, spread before the public; and he hopes that God may enable him to enlarge the sphere of its usefulness, by presenting it to the American public in an English dress. The writer has undertaken the translation of the work in question; and it is hoped the second volume may arrive in such season, that the whole work may be published during the coming winter, or early in the following spring.

X. H. A. SCHOTT, INVESTIGATION OF SOME IMPORTANT CHRONOLOGICAL POINTS IN THE LIFE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL. *Erörterung einiger wichtigen chronol. Punkte in der Lebensgeschichte des Ap. Paulus*. Jena 1832. This is a supplement to the corresponding sections of the author's *Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros N. T. sacros*, and enters more in detail into the subjects in question. He, like Neander in the work above mentioned, assumes a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome,—a point of great interest and importance certainly, but one on which the opinions of the most learned and judicious writers are, and probably will ever continue to be, divided.

XI. LÜCKE has also published, in continuation of his Commentary on the writings of John, an INTRODUCTION TO THE REVELATION OF JOHN AND TO ITS LITERATURE. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Litteratur*, Bonn 1832. This is to be followed by a Commentary on the same book.

XII. HENGSTENBERG'S CHRISTOLOGY, Vol. II. This contains a commentary on the whole book of Zechariah, and on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel. The work is to be completed in a third volume.

XIII. The three first chapters of Galatians have had the unusual fortune, of being subjected to critical investigation by a philologist of no less name than Godfrey HERMANN. The results he has given to the world in a programm entitled: *Memoriam J. A. Ernesti d. XII Sept. solemnè oratione—concelebrandam indicit G. Hermann. De Pauli Epistolae ad Galatas tribus primis capitibus*. Lips. 1832. If we may judge of this work from a notice of it by Lücke in the *Theologische Studien*, (Jahrg. 1833, 2tes Heft,) the theologians of Germany, while they are ready to welcome any sincere attempt to promote the interpretation of the Scriptures, from whatever quarter it may come, would yet be very much disposed, in the present instance, to suggest to the learned critic, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*. Hermann speaks of the *nimia theologorum diligentia in singulis prope verbis*, and this is well. But how little the alleged impartiality of non-theologians, and the most celebrated classical philology, suffice to lay open the stores of the New Testament, when there is not joined to them a familiar acquaintance

with the contents of the Bible and with Christian antiquities in general,—of all this the present programm is said to present a remarkable example. The following sentence would seem to indicate, that, whatever may be thought of the author's Christian theology, his claims are not less limited on the score of Christian faith: "Non dubitandum est, quin *multo maxima pars* primorum Christianorum, sicut hodie non pauci, Apostolici illi verius quam Christiani, credendo, quod facile est, quam pie casteque vivendo, quod difficile, Deo se probatum iri existimaverint."

XIV. FREYTAG'S LEXICON ARABICUM, TOM. II. The second volume of this great work is completed, and has been received. It was issued in two parts.

XV. MISCELLANEOUS. The following works on oriental literature are announced in the *Journal Asiatique*.

1. M. Caussin de Percival fils has in press a second edition of his *Grammaire Arabe-vulgaire*, augmented with numerous remarks on the dialects of Barbary. He is also occupied with a translation of a History of Egypt, by Ahmed Démirdashi, which comes down to the year 1169 of the Hegira, A. D. 1755. The history will be continued to the present time by means of a modern *Chronique* compiled by Abderrahman Djebrèti. This will complete the series of oriental historical documents on Egypt, from the conquest of that country by the Sultan Selim to our days.

2. M. Bianchi, royal secretary and interpreter of the oriental languages at Paris, is engaged in printing a new Grammar of the Turkish language. It will form a volume in large Svo, containing, besides the principles of grammar and syntax in very copious detail, numerous exercises selected from the best Turkish writers both in prose and verse.

3. M. Garcin de Tassy has in press an Appendix to his *Rudiments de la langue Hindoustani*. This will contain additions to the Rudiments, and especially a Preface, which the author might better have entitled: *A Memoir on the Hindustanee Language and Literature*. The work will also contain a collection of original Hindustanee letters, with a translation and several fac-similes, intended to exhibit the Persian written character in India, both the *Nastalic* and *Shikasta*, as also the cursive *Dévanagari*, which the Hindus sometimes employ in writing the Hindustanee.

4. M. Eugene Burnouf is about putting to press his *Commentaire sur le Yaçna*, one of the liturgical books of the Parsees, with the Sanscrit text of the unpublished gloss *Nériosengh*. The first volume is expected to appear during the present year.

5. The Asiatic Society of Paris published in 1828 an *Essai sur le Pali*, or sacred language of the Peninsula beyond the Ganges, with six lithographic plates, and notices of Pali MSS. in the Royal

Library; by E. Burnouf and Ch. Lassen. 8vo. Price 12 francs. Also *Observations* on the same work, by E. Burnouf. 3½ francs.

The following works, among many others, are announced in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* of Halle:

6. A new edition of Kirsch's *Chrestomathia Syriaca* is in the course of publication, revised and enlarged by Prof. Bernstein of Breslau.

7 "NIPPON, or Archives for the description of Japan and the neighbouring islands and countries," by P. F. VON SIEBOLD. In this work, the energetic and persevering Siebold is preparing to give to the world the results of his inquiries and observations, made during a residence of seven years in Japan. The public have already had occasional notices of him; and it is known, that he came into more intimate relations with that singular people, than any preceding traveller. The work is to consist of a series of papers; in which all his personal adventures and observations will be interwoven. It promises to lay open a new page in the history of nations and of mankind.

INDEX I.

HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS ILLUSTRATED.

I. Hebrew.

	א		ע
אֶהְיֶה . . .	739	נִרְשׁ אֶרֶץ . . .	705
אֶמְלֵךְ דָּשֶׁהָר . . .	470	וְשָׂרִים . . .	726
אֵל שְׂדֵי . . .	745 sq.	ל	
אֶל-מִשְׁחַח . . .	470	אֲנוּכְרִיס . . .	457
אֶרֶץ, <i>Palestine</i> , . . .	705	לְהַזְכִּיר . . .	472
ב		הַמְנַצֵּחַ . . .	472
בִּקְשׁ . . .	654	מ	
ג		מִזְמוֹר . . .	472
גַּתִּיחַ . . .	470	מִתְּחִלַּת . . .	472
ה		מִטְסָרוֹן . . .	672, 675
הַגִּיּוֹן . . .	475	מִכִּיד . . .	694
הַתְּנַבֵּא . . .	453	מִכְתָּם . . .	473
ח		מִלְאָכִי, <i>Malachi</i> , . . .	11
חֲנֻכַּת הַבְּנַח . . .	477	מִלְאָךְ יְהוָה . . .	655 sq.
ס		נִזְעָלוֹת . . .	476
סָבַל . . .	340	מַעֲשֵׂה . . .	206
י		מִשְׁכִּיל . . .	473
יְדוּחָן . . .	471	נ	
יְדִידוֹת . . .	476	נְבִיא, נִבְיָא . . .	453
יְהוָה . . .	730 sq.	נְגִינֹת, נְגִינָה . . .	474
יְרֵחַת אֱלֹם . . .	471	נְחִילוֹת . . .	474
יְרֻקִים . . .	22	נְבִיחַ רוּחַ . . .	695
		ס	
		סָלָה . . .	474
		עַל . . .	475
		עַל-מוֹת, עַל-מוֹחַ . . .	475
		עָנִי, עָנִי . . .	699 sq.
		עָנִי רַבָּה . . .	695
		צ	
		צִמְחַת יְהוָה . . .	654
		ר	
		רַחֵץ . . .	340 sq.
		רַקֵּם . . .	282
		רַחֵם . . .	415
		ש	
		שָׁלוֹ . . .	411
		ש	
		שְׁגִיּוֹן . . .	476
		שְׂדֵי . . .	745
		שׁוֹשְׁבִים, שׁוֹשֵׁן . . .	476
		שֹׁטֵף . . .	340
		שִׁיר . . .	476
		שְׂכִינָה . . .	474 sq.
		שְׂמִינִית . . .	478
		ת	
		תְּהִלָּה . . .	478
		תִּימָן . . .	254
		תִּשְׁבָּה . . .	478

II. Greek.

	Α		
Ἀδῶμα . . .	252	ἀμφισβητεῖν . . .	49
ἀμφί . . .	49	ἀναπαύομαι . . .	59
ἀμφιβαῖνω . . .	49	ἀναπληροῦν . . .	56
ἀμφιβάλλω . . .	49	ἀνασταυροῦν . . .	63
ἀμφινοῖω . . .	49	ἀναστενάζω . . .	56, 62
		ἀνέρχθαι . . .	60
		ἀνερωτάω . . .	48
		ἀναναπληροῦν . . .	58
		ἀναποδίδωμι . . .	58
		ἀνταποκρίνομαι . . .	59
		ἀντιπαρέρχομαι . . .	59
		ἀπεκδέχομαι . . .	59

ἀπεκδύομαι . . .	59	ἐκτείνω . . .	60	Π	
ἀπέχειν, ἀπέχεσθαι,	53	ἐπαναπαύομαι	59	παραδιατριβαί	61
ἀπό . . .	49	ἐπανερχεσθαι	60	παραδίδομι . . .	753
ἀποθλήθω . . .	65	ἐπεκτείνεσθαι	60	παρατιέω . . .	47
ἀπολείχω . . .	65	ἔργα ἀγαθὰ ν. κα-		παρακλιέω . . .	52
ἀπόφημι . . .	50	λά . . .	203 sq. 225	παρακύπτειν . . .	52
ἀποψηφίζεῖν . . .	50	— πονηρά etc.		πενθεῖν . . .	698
ἄφεις ἁμαρτιῶν	193		205 sq. 225	περὶ . . .	49
B		Θ		πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ	192
βαπτίζω, βάπτω,		θηρησκία . . .	212	πληροῦν . . .	56
etc. . .	288 sq.	I		πραῦς, πραεῖς,	609
A		Ἰδουμαία . . .	252	προγινώσκω . . .	55
διά . . .	50	K		προκαταγγέλλω	60
διακωλύω . . .	50	καταψηφίζω . . .	50	προορίζειν . . .	55
διαπαρατριβαί	61	κεράτια . . .	402, 403	πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύμα-	
διασώζω . . .	50	A		τι . . .	691 sq.
διαφέρω . . .	51	λυπεῖσθαι . . .	698	Σ	
διέρχεσθαι . . .	50	λίπη κατὰ θεόν	698	στενάζω . . .	56
δικαιοῦν, δίκαιος,	196	N		T	
δικαιοσύνη . . .	196	νόμος τῶν ἔργων,		τέλειος . . .	225
E		τῆς πίστεως,	199	τραυλοδύται . . .	250
εἰς . . .	314 sq. 325			T	
ἐκ, ἐξ, . . .	51			ὔδατα πολλά . . .	321

INDEX II.

TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.

<p>Genesis. 19: 24 . . . 656 29: 18 sq. . . 399</p> <p>Exodus. 3: 14 . . . 739 6: 2, 3 . . . 730 sq. 14: 19 sq. . . 335 19: 10 sq. . . 352 23: 19 . . . 629</p> <p>Numbers. 20: 17, 18 . 635, 636</p> <p>Joshua. 10: 12—15 . 721 sq.</p> <p>Judges. 6: 12 sq. . . 660 10: 12 sq. . . 277</p> <p>Ruth. 2: 14 . . . 643</p> <p>1 Samuel. 30: 1 sq. . . 646</p> <p>1 Kings. 19: 4, 5 . . . 415</p> <p>2 Kings. 16: 6 . . . 257</p> <p>Psalms. 37: 11 . . . 704, 705 37: 29 . . . 705</p> <p>Amos. 6: 1—6 . . . 583</p> <p>Habakkuk. 3: 3 . . . 254</p>	<p>Malachi. 1: 2, 3 . . . 258</p> <p>Matthew. 3: 11 . . . 311 3: 16 . . . 156, 319 4: 1 sq. . . . 155 5: 3 691 5: 4 697 5: 5 699 8: 28 sq. . . 157</p> <p>Mark. 1: 9 314 1: 10 319 1: 12, 13 . . . 155 3: 8 261 5: 1 sq. . . . 157</p> <p>Luke. 4: 1 sq. . . . 155 8: 26 sq. . . . 157 15: 16 402 16: 21 65 18: 9, 14 . . . 209</p> <p>John. 1: 19 sq. . . . 352 3: 22 sq. . . . 321</p> <p>Acts. 2: 1 sq. . . . 332 7: 53 680 8: 36 sq. . . . 324 sq. 10: 7 334 16: 33 334 19: 5 386 22: 16 335</p>	<p>Romans. 4: 13 704 5: 3—5 578 6: 3, 4 327 10: 4 690</p> <p>1 Corinthians. 15: 24—28 . 751 sq. 10: 2 335</p> <p>2 Corinthians. 11: 16—30 . . 579 11: 32 266</p> <p>Galatians. 2: 12 sq. . . . 217</p> <p>Ephesians. 5: 26 336</p> <p>Colossians. 2: 12 . . . 327, 331</p> <p>1 Timothy. 6: 5 61</p> <p>Titus. 3: 5 337</p> <p>Hebrews. 2: 2 681 6: 9, 10 . . . 209 10: 22 337</p> <p>James. 1: 26 . . . 212, 225 2: 20 206</p> <p>1 John. 5: 7 388</p>
--	---	---

INDEX III.

SUBJECTS, ETC.

- Aaron*, tomb of, 284, 422, 432, 433, 640.
- Aben-Ezra*, his Rabb. commentary, 14.
- Abulwalid*, his Heb. lexicon, 13.
- Accents*, Heb. power of, 511.
- Alphabetic Psalms*, 504.
- Amharic dialect*, 33, 34.
- Anthropology*, what, and history of, 74, 75.
- Ar*, *Ar Moab*, 285.
- Araba*, Wady el, 248, 462.
- Arabia Petraea*, 437. See *Idumea*.
— *Tertia*, 269.
- Arabic Language and Literature*, 27—Korish and Hamyaric dialects, 27—lexicons, 29—grammars, 32—Vulgar Arabic, 32, 758.
— Versions, 8—Arabs Erpenii, 8.
- Arabs*, see *Bedouins*.
- Aramaean dialects*, 16.
- Arindela*, 275.
- Aristotle* described by Goethe, 687.
- Arnon* or Modjeb, 647.
- Atlas* of the Bible, 756.
- Augustine*, development of his moral and religious character and system, 81 sq.—his system formed before he came in contact with that of Pelagius, 90—Result of the external controversy, 91 sq.—its importance, 92—cannot be wholly referred to one main point of difference, 94—freedom of the will, 95—grace and dependence on God, 98, 99—relation of the world to God, 100—condition of the first man, the first sin, 102 sq.—propagation of sinful nature, 104 sq.—*gratia*, 110 sq.—redemption and the character of Christ, 114 sq.—ethical views, 118 sq.—grace and works, 122—last years of Augustine's life, 128. See *Pelagius*.
— on Preaching, 569 sq.—importance of the rhetorical art, 572—best mode of learning, 574—*are* the sacred writers eloquent? 576—examples, 577 sq.—perspicuity, importance of it, 586—suavity, 591—prayerful spirit, 593—three characteristics of eloquence from Cicero, 595 sq.—example of the plain style, 598—of the intermediate, 600—grand or lofty style, 602—these sometimes all to be mingled, 604—example of Augustine at Cesarea in Mauritania, 605—excellence of each in its place, 608—rules for those who preach discourses written by others, 611.
- B.**
- Baldwin*, king of Jerusalem, makes an excursion to the Red sea, 269.
- Balout tree*, 413.
- Baptism*, is the mode prescribed in the New Testament? 288 sq.—Form and classic usage of *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*, 288 sq.—verbs in *ίζω* not necessarily frequentative, 294—significations, 298 sq.—use of these

- verbs in Septuagint and Apocrypha, 306—meaning of them in New Testament, 309—do they necessarily imply immersion? 312—General *usus loquendi* of βαπτίζω, 312—circumstances attending baptism, 319—baptism of John, 319—baptism by the disciples of Christ, 321—meaning of ἵδαρα πολλά John 3: 22 sq. 321—other passages, 324 sq.—circumstances against immersion, 332 sq.—Jewish proselyte baptism, 338—did such a custom exist before the time of Christ? 342 sq.—this not probable, 352 sq.—Mode of Baptism in primitive churches, 355—testimonies, 355 sq.—practice of the eastern and western churches, 360 sq.—Syriac rendering of βαπτίζω, 363.—Is the *mode* essential? 363—a mere external rite, 364—the mode not prescribed in the New Testament 365—parallel case of the Lord's supper, 365—sprinkling significant, 367, 369 sq.—immersion not always practised, 373—this illustrated by ancient sculptures, 374 sq.—early examples of sprinkling, 378—immersion was practised *in puris naturalibus*, 381—notice of Carson's work on baptism, 384—infant baptism, 385.—Letters on baptism to Prof. Stuart, 288, 299—answers to do. 386, 388.
- Baptist Missionaries**, Letters from to Prof. Stuart, 288—his reply, 386.
- Bedouins**, treachery of the Sheikh of Kerek, 404—his singular oath, 404—their cupidity, 405,
- 439, 623, 634—court of justice, 409, 646—Howeytat tribe 416—manner of pitching tents, 417, 421, 634—manner of entering a camp, 630—their tents, 634—manners and customs, 644—dress, 645—religious duties, 645.
- Bible**, the best guide for an oriental traveller, 636.—Atlas of, 756.
- Biblical Antiquities**, Geography, etc. works on, 43, 44.
- Butler**, Arab mode of using it, 629.
- Burnouf**, Eugene, Discourse on the Sanscrit Language and Literature, 707 sq.—his work on the Pali, 759.—Commentary on the *Yaçni*, 759.
- C.
- Callirhoë**, hot springs, visit to, 648.
- Calvin**, as a commentator, 147—his views of baptism, 364.
- Camoos**, see *Kamoos*,
- Carob-tree**, which yields the *husks* of the New Testament, 402.
- Carson** on Baptism, notice of, 384.
- Castell's** Heptaglotton, 20, 30, 33.
- Ceratonia siliqua**, 402.
- Chaldee** Language, 21—Grammars and Lexicons, 21—Targums, 7, 8, 10, 21.
- Champollion's** Works on the language and monuments of ancient Egypt, 34, 755.
- Chézy**, M. Eulogy on, 707 sq.
- Christianity** in reference to the perfectability of our moral being, 229 sq.—Principle of regeneration, 237.
- Commentaries**, etc. on the Psalms, 516.
- Commentary** on the Scriptures, 130 sq.—What is a *proper* commentary, 134 sq.—logical com-

mentary, 146—Calvin, 147—philological commentators, 149—Olshausen, 151, 161—Rosenmueller, 151—Kuinoel, 153—Flatt, 160—Tholuck, 160—Why is commentary needed? 162—simple translation not sufficient, 164—different kinds of commentary, 173—popular and learned, 174—how far alike, 175—in what different, 176 sq.—Owen on Hebrews, 177—popular commentary, 180—Henry, Scott, and Doddridge, 181—means of supplying the public wants, 184 sq.

Concursus, what, 100.

Critique on Matt. 5: 3—5 by Tholuck, 684 sq.

Crusades, Wilken's History of, 755.

D.

Dead Sea, properties of its water, 617—chemical analysis, 618—excursion to by Mr Legh 617,—views of the southern extremity, 624, 647—country around etc. 624 sq.

Degrees, Psalms of, 507.

De Wette's Introduction to the Psalms, 445 sq.

Dhourra or *Durra*, what, 402.

Divinity of the Messiah, see *Messiah*.

Djauhari, his Arabic Lexicon, 29.

Duration of Christ's kingdom, 748.

E.

Edom, see *Idumea*.

Egyptian language and monuments, 34, 35, 755.

Elath, 275.

Eldjy, an Arabic village, 423.

Ethiopic language and literature, 33.

Eyes, Hints to students on the use of the eyes, by Dr Reynolds, 519—diseases of the eyes prevalent, 522—studious course of life not necessarily hurtful to the eyes, 522—not the use, but the abuse of them hurtful, 524.—I. Proper adjustment of the light, 525—the eyes should not be exposed to sudden alternations, 525—cases in point, 527—precautions against sudden changes from weak to strong light, 528—the study should be well lighted, 529, 530—light in the room should be equally distributed, 531—proper quantity of light at evening, 533—common lamps and candles bad, 533—argand reading lamp best, but without shade, 530, 534—the wearing of shades not recommended, 534—reading by twilight fatal to the eyes, as also looking at the bright moon or at lightning, 535—so too reading by a side light, 536—other bad habits, 537, 538.—II. The eyes may be best used in the morning, 538—but not after a full meal, 539—nor must they be strained by artificial lights, etc. 540.—III. Sympathy of the eye with other organs and parts of the body, 541—hence free air and exercise necessary to a healthy state of the eyes, 542—so too a free circulation of the blood and a free state of the bowels, 543—also strict temperance, 544—and a due proportion of sleep, 545.—IV. The eyes must have a proper degree of use or action, 546—too much use to be avoided, 547—Signs of undue use, 549—means of

- restoring eyes already affected, 550—cold water the best remedy, 551—black eyes supposed to be more exposed to disease than others, 552—V. Bad habits to be avoided, as rubbing or pressing the eyes, 553—exposure to wind, or reading in a recumbent posture, 554—to early use after sickness, 554—examining very minute objects, 555—use of green glasses bad, 555—use of tobacco, 556—use of eye-waters, 557—these almost always prejudicial, 557—famous *Paris collyrium*, 558.—VI. Conformation of the eye to the distance of objects, 559—long and short sightedness, 559—use of spectacles to be recommended, 560—signs of long sightedness, 561—great care to be used in selecting spectacles, 562—signs of short sightedness, 562 sq.—Great, but unfounded complaint of Greek and Hebrew type, 564 sq.—suggestions in respect to these studies, 564, 566.
- Ezion-Geber*, 275.
- F.
- Faith and Works*, Paul and James reconciled, 189 sq.—the alleged discrepancy affects also Christ, 193—his mode of teaching adapted to different classes of hearers, 194 sq.—Paul's view of faith and works, 196—*good works*, how used and regarded, 203—works of law, 207—only one point of difference between Paul and James, 208—each taught his view considerably, 209—*which wrote first?* 212.—Former views as to their discrepancy, 217—James wrote for
- Judaizing Christians, 224—Paul and James co-operated to one end, 225—examples of the like spirit, Peter Waldo, 227—John Huss, 227—Luther, 227.
- Firuzabadi*, his Arabic Lexicon, or *Kamoos*, 29.
- Flatt's Commentaries*, 160.
- Freytag's Arabic Lexicon*, 31, 759.
- G.
- Gabalene*, 271, 406.
- Gez language, 33.
- Gemara*, the, 26.
- Gerasa*, see *Jerrash*.
- Gesenius* on Heb. Lexicography, 1 sq.—his Lexicon, 391.
- Gharendel*, Wady, 441.
- Ghor*, El, 248, 441, 443.
- Giggeius*, his Arabic Lexicon, 30.
- Gilboa*, mountains of, 248.
- Godhead* of the Messiah in the Old Testament, see *Messiah*.
- Goethe*, extract from, on Plato and Aristotle, 687.
- Golius*, his Arabic Lexicon, etc. 30.
- Graeca Veneta*, 9.
- Grammars* of the Syriac, 21—Chaldee, 21—Samaritan, 22—Arabic, 32—Vulgar Arabic, 759—Ethiopic, 33—Persian, 35—Turkish 759—Egyptian, 35.
- H.
- Hamasa*, the, 28.
- Hamyaric* dialect, see *Arabic Language*.
- Haouran*, see *Aaron*.
- Hebrew Philology and Lexicography*, sources of, 1 sq.—threefold, 2—*Usus Loquendi* of Old Testament, 3—*aids* for this, 4—*Traditional* knowledge of the Hebrew, 5—in Versions, 7—*use and value* of these, 9 sq.—

in Lexicons, 12—in Commentaries, 14—*Kindred Languages*, 15—Aramaean dialects, 16—Syriac, 17—Chaldee, 21—Samaritan, 22—Zabian, 23—Palmyrene, 24—Phœnician, 24—Talmudic, 25—Rabbinic, 27—Arabic, 27—Ethiopic, 33—Egyptian, 34—Persian, 35.—Remarks on the proper use of these dialects, 36—by whom best used, 39.—Plan of lexicographical labours of Gesenius, 39.

Hebron, account of, 620.

Hengstenberg, on the Godhead of the Messiah, 652 sq.—on the standing still of the Sun and Moon, 721 sq.—his Christology, Vol. II, 758.

Hesbon, visit to, 650.

Hieroglyphics, see *Champollion*.

Hindostan, conquest of, from the north, 718.—Language, 759.

Hor, Mount, 283, 640.

Hot Springs at Callirhoé, visit to, 648.

Husks, 402.

Huss, John, his example, 227.

I.

Idumea, historical sketches of, 247 sq.—general situation and extent, 248—names, settlement, and early history, 250—subsequent history, 256 sq.—name Idumea used in a wider sense, 260—successors of the Idumeans, 262—Nabatheans, 262—Kedarenes, 263—country called Arabia Petraea, 264—kings of Arabia, mostly called Aretas, 264 sq.—subdued under Trajan, 267—called Palæstina Tertia, 268—afterwards Arabia Tertia and

Syria Sobal, 269—cities and towns, 271 sq.—Petra, 278—Burekhardt's journey, 394—Legh's do. 614.

Indian literature, etc. see *Sanscrit Interpretation* of Matt. 5: 3—5, see *Interpreters* and *Sermon on the Mount*.

— of Josh. 10: 12—15, see *Sun and Moon*.

— of Ex. 6: 2, 3, see *Jehovah*.

Interpreters of the N. T. want of agreement among, 684 sq.—a great cause of disquiet, 684—the discrepancy not always real and *contradictory*, so that one does not exclude the others, 685—two tendencies in exegesis, one rich and spirited, the other cold and abstract, 686 sq.—extract from Goethe on Plato and Aristotle, 687—examples of the latter tendency, 689—of the former, 689, 690.—Critique on Matt. 5: 3—5, as an example of the above positions, 691 sq.

J.

James reconciled with Paul, see *Faith*.

Jarchi, his Commentary, etc. 14.

Jauhari, see *Djauhari*.

Jehovah, import of the name, Ex. 6: 2, 3, page 730 sq.—different views, 731—vowels uncertain, 732—sources of evidence for the signification, 783—expresses the *real existence* of God, in opposition to false gods, 733—this view supported by the etymology, 733, 734—and by constant reference in the Bible, 734—by the theocracy, and the Mosaic dispensation, 735 sq.—by

- God's dealings with the Israelites, etc. 737—this meaning illustrated from Ex. 3: 14, p. 739—meaning of Ex. 6: 3, p. 740—use of *Jehovah*, 741—used alone in Genesis only once, 742—use in Job, 742—a sense in which God was not known to the patriarchs as *Jehovah*, 742—bearing of all this on the characters of the different dispensations, 744.—Meaning of יהוה, 745—peculiar importance of the name *Jehovah* has ceased, so far as it regarded the Mosaic dispensation, 747—but remains in so far as it is applied to Christ, 748.
- Jerrasch*, ruins of, the ancient Gerasa, 651.
- Jordan*, excursion of the pilgrims to, 616.
- K.
- Kamoos*, an Arabic lexicon, 29.
- Karrak*, see *Kerek*.
- Kedarenes*, 263.
- Kerek*, as a fortress, 270—its ancient name and character, 285—described by Seetzen, 286—by Burckhardt, 394 sq.—by Legh, 627.
- Khanzyre*, 403, 643.
- Kimchi*, D. his lexicon and commentary, 14.
- Kindred Languages of the Hebrew*, see *Hebrew*.
- Kingdom of Christ*, its duration, 748.
- Kir*, *Kir Moab*, 285.
- Kopitar*, M. Letter on the Slavic Versions, 186.
- Kuinoel's Commentary*, its character, 153 sq. 689, 690.
- L.
- Leben* or *Lebbin*, an Arab dish, 420, 620, 629.
- Legh*, Mr. and his companions, fruitless attempt to reach Wady Mousa, 615—excursion to the Jordan, 616—account of the subsequent journey, 618 sq.
- Lexicons*, of the Hebrew, 12 sq.—Syriac, 19, 20—Chaldee, 22—Samaritan, 22—Talmudic, 26—Arabic, 29 sq.—Ethiopic, 33—Persian, 35—Egyptian, 35.—Plan of Gesenius's Lexicons, 39—his Manual Heb. Lat. Lexicon, 391.
- Ludolf's Ethiopic Grammar*, Lexicon, etc. 33.
- Luther*, as a reformer, 227.
- M.
- Maan* and *Maon*, 277, 438.
- Mahābhārata*, 712.
- Maltese dialect and literature*, 32.
- Manu*, or *Menu*, his institutes, 712.
- Meninsky*, his Arabic, Turkish, and Persian Lexicon, 30.
- Messiah*, his Godhead as taught in the O. T. 652 sq.—views of interpreters, 653—union of divine and human nature, passages cited, 653 sq.—how compatible with the unity of God? 655—the Angel of *Jehovah* is *Jehovah* and yet distinct from him, 656 sq.—different hypotheses to explain the facts, 662, 669, 670—arguments against them all, 671—reference to the Persian views, 672—to Jewish tradition, the *Metatron*, 672—origin and meaning of this name, 672—*Shechinah*, 674—identity of the *Metatron* and angel of *Jehovah*, 678, 679—Angel of *Jehovah* the Mediator of the N. T. 681—advantage of the N. T. doctrine above the Old, 682—duration of the Messiah's kingdom, 748.

Metatron, 672. See *Messiah*.
Mishna, the, 25, 187.
Moallakat, Arabic poems, editions of, 28.
Modjeb, the Arnon, 647.
Mons Regalis, 269, 283, 419.
Music of the Hebrews, 512 sq. See *Psalms*.

N.

Nabatheans, 262—their history, 263 sq.
Nilus, an episode in Sanscrit, 712.
Names of Jews often double, 13.
Ncander, biographical sketch of, 66 sq.—parallel between Augustine and Pelagius, 74 sq.—conciliation of James and Paul, 220 sq.—his Hist. of the Church during the Apostolic Age, 70, 757.
Nebo, mount 648.
Neumann, Asiatische Studien, on China etc. 188.

O.

Olshausen's Commentary, 151, 161, 757.
Owen on Hebrews, 177.

P.

Pagninus, his Heb. lexicon, 14.
Palaestina Tertia, etc. 268, 408.
Palmyrene dialect, 24.
Parched corn or grain, 643.
Paul reconciled with James, see *Faith*.
Pelagius, sketch of his life and character, 74—formation and development of his system, 78 sq.—characteristics of it, 83—his views *de libero arbitrio*, 95—on the origin of evil, 97—relation of the world to God, con-

cursus, 100—the first sin, 102—progressive deterioration of mankind, 108—grace, 112—redemption, 114—Christ a teacher, 115.—Death of Pelagius, 129. See *Augustine*.

Persian language and literature, 35—grammars and lexicons, 35—dialects, 35—mythology, 672.
Petra, the capital of Idumea, notices of, 278 sq. 639. See *Wady Mousa*.
Phenician dialect and literature, 24.
Philology a science of observation, 721.
Philosophy of religion, what, 230 sq. 240.
Plato described by Goethe, 687.
Poetry, Hebrew, see *Psalms*.
Prepositions with Greek verbs in New Testament, 45—connected with verbs in a threefold manner, 48—their force twofold, 54—relation of time and place, 55—verbs compounded with two or more prepositions, 60—modes of apprehension, 63.
Psalms, Introduction to, 445—poetical character and contents essentially *lyric*, 446—classification, 448—origin and cultivation of Hebrew poetry, 450—schools of the prophets, 453—David and his cotemporaries, 455—authors of the Psalms, 456 sq.—original and imitative, earlier and later character, 460—collection and arrangement, 463—five books 465.—Titles of the Psalms, 467—arguments for and against their authenticity, 467 sq.—inscriptions, 470 sq.—Rhythm and music of the Psalms, 478—historical view, 479 sq.—probably no metre, 489, 491—exposition of Hebrew rhythm, 492 sq.—

- Parallelism, 494 sq.—alphabetic Psalms, 504—Psalms of degrees, 407.—Power of the accents, 511—Hebrew music, 512—the Psalms sung by choirs, 513.—Historical interpretation, 514—exegetical helps, 516 sq. *Puranas*, 712.
- Q.
- Quails* of the Israelites, found at present, 411.
- R.
- Rabbinic* dialect, 27.
Rāmāyana, 712.
Regeneration, principle of, 237—a fact, 244.
Rosenmueller's Commentary on the New Testament, 151.
—Scholia in V. T. et in Compend. red. 187.
- S.
- Saadiass Gaon*, his Arabic version, 8—his lexicon, 12.
Samaritan language and literature, 22—Version, 8, 10.
Sanskrit language and literature, 707 sq.—the study of it first introduced into Europe by M. Chézy, 708—its affinity with the languages of Europe, 709—how to be accounted for? 709—inducements for prosecuting it, 710.—Literature of India, the Vedas, 711—epic poems, 712—the *Puranas*, 712—system of law, institutes of Manu, 712—philosophy, its character, 713—poetry, 714—absence of history, 714—may yet in part be recovered, 716—different epochs known, 716—traces in the ancient dialects, 717—hypothesis of the conquest of Hindostan from the north, 718—labours still to be achieved in prosecuting the Sanscrit, 719—the study of mere words useless, 721—the study of language a science of observation, 721.
Saracens, origin of the name, 268.
Seetzen, sketch of his travels, 444.
Seir, Mount, 250, 415.
Sela, see *Petra*, 278.
Septuagint Version, 6, 9.
Sermon on the Mount, critique on v. 3, p. 691—v. 4, p. 697—v. 5, p. 699—meaning of “to inherit the earth,” 705 sq.
Shechinah, 674. See *Messiah*.
Shemitish languages, see *Hebrew*.
Shobak, 269, 283, 419, 632.
Slavic Bibles, 186.
Spectacles, proper use of recommended, 560 sq. See *Eyes*.—Green spectacles to be avoided, 555.
Sun and Moon, the standing still of, Josh. 10: 12 sq. 721 sq.—different views taken, 723 sq.—objections to some of these, 725—the passage is a quotation from an ancient poet, 726—general view of it, 728.
Syria Sobal, 269.
Syriac language, 17—its literature, 17—whether now spoken? 17—printed books, 18—native and other Lexicons, 19, 20—Grammars, 21—Version, 7, 10.
- T.
- Tafyle*, 408.
Talmud and *Talmudic* dialect, 25—literature, 25, 26—lexicons, 26.
Tanchum, his Rabb. commentary, 15—his lexicon, 26.

Targums, 7, 8, 10.

Teman, 253, 275.

Tholuck on Romans etc. 160, 188
—Critique on Matt. 5: 3—5, p.
684 sq.

Titles of the Psalms, see *Psalms*.

Tittman J. A. H. on the force of
Greek prepositions in composi-
tion, 45—his death, 45.

Troglodytes, 250.

Tromm's Concordance, 9.

V.

Vedas, 711.

W.

Wady Mousa, i. q. *Petra*, 283, 433
—description of its ruins by
Burckhardt, 423 sq.—by *Irby*

and *Mangles*, 426 sq.—by *Mr*
Legh, 638 sq.

Waldo, Peter, his example, 227.

Wilken's History of the Crusades
completed, 755.

Willmett's Arabic Lexicon, 31.

Welstein's Nov. Test. Græcum,
new edition of, 756.

Words, the study of them alone
useless, 721.

Works, see *Faith*.

Z.

Zabian language and literature,
23—printed books, 23.

Zend dialect, resembles the San-
scrit, 717.

Zend-Avesta, publication of, 35.

Zoar, site and present state, 272.

