

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE IV.

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPAEDIA AND METHODOLOGY.

Translated from the unpublished Manuscripts of Prof. Tholuck of Halle, by Edwards A. Park.
(Continued from No. I. p. 317.)

§ 15. *The Science of writing History.*

This teaches the mode in which historical narratives should be composed, and enables us also to test the merit of works, which detail the history of the church. An excellent volume, rich in religious and moral instruction, is that of George Müller (brother of the historian and Prof. in Schaffhausen), entitled, *Letters on the Study of History* (*Briefe über das Studium der Geschichte*). Ulrici's work on the Characteristics of the ancient historical Writings (*Char. der antik. Hist.*), Berlin, 1833, is very instructive. This work gives a critical view of all the distinguished historians of Greece and Rome, and scrutinizes the religious character of their productions. Louis Woltmann published at Berlin, in 1810, an acute and malevolent criticism upon Müller, entitled, *John Müller as an Historian* (*als ein Historiker*); and in this review are given some very instructive hints on the mode of writing history.

SCIENCES AUXILIARY TO PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

§ 16. *Anthropology and Psychology.*

The material on which the clergyman is called to operate, is the human mind. The mind is, in this life, dependent on the body; and, in its intimate union with the body, is called the soul. The divine must therefore give attention to Anthropology, which describes the physical phenomena of man, the phenomena of divers ages, temperaments, races, etc. He must also give attention to Psychology, which takes cognizance of those spiritual functions and states that are essentially connected with our physical being and relations. Psychology is often considered in conjunction with Anthropology. Among the treatises on Anthropology, that of Heinroth deserves especial commendation; among the treatises on Psychology, that of Heinroth, and also the *History of the Soul* (*Geschichte der Seele*), by Schubert, are the most worthy of

perusal. The numerous writings of Schubert on Natural History, are composed in an excellent religious spirit, as is also his Psychology, and by this means have his works obtained a general circulation. They are, Views of the night-side of Nature, (*Ansichten der Natur von ihrer Nachtseite*, that is, Explanations of the dark subjects in natural science, as magnetism, for example), The Intent and Signification of Dreams (*Symbolik des Traumes*), The Primitive World and the Fixed Stars (*die Urwelt und die Fixsterne*), Two treatises on Natural History, (*Natur Geschichte*), a larger and a smaller, Text-book of Astronomy (*Lehrbuch der Astronomie*).¹

One department of Anthropology and Psychology, which has excited much interest among theologians in recent times, is Magnetism and Somnambulism. Animal magnetism is that mysterious connection of all living existences, by means of which, the life of one being may sympathize immediately with the life of another, and even exert an influence upon it. It is called magnetism, not because it has any connection with the magnet, but because the connection of the living principle in one person with that in another, is just as mysterious as the connection of the magnet with the north pole. The wonderful workings of this principle were known to the ancient Greeks even; see the short essays of Wolf on this subject. These phenomena were brought, in a connected form, before the philosophers of modern times, by Mesmer, in the year 1780 or thereabout. The name of Mesmerism is therefore applied to magnetism. The magnetic influence is used in the cure of diseases. The healthy magnetizer causes his own living principle to operate upon that of the sick patient. He does this by waving motions of the palms of his hands, or the ends of his fingers, and thus he excites or soothes the nervous system of the invalid. Under the influence of this operation, sometimes also without any such influence, the somnambulism or the *clairvoyance* discovers itself. This is a state of sleep accompanied with peculiar powers. The man lies down as if dead. He exhibits a kind of dreaming, very different from that ordinarily experienced, and attended with unusual capabilities. It is unlike the common state of a dreamer, in the following particulars: there is such a difference between the situation of the magnetized per-

¹ Schubert is also the author of the Life of Oberlin, and numerous religious tracts. He was the instructor of Otho, king of Greece, and in his visit to Palestine, was entertained a long time, and very hospitably, by that king. He still resides at Munich and remains one of the most useful of Christians.

son, when he is asleep and when he is awake, that in his waking hours he can retain no remembrance of what he had experienced during his sleep. Again, while he is in the magnetic state he has a sympathy with external nature; not however with all natural objects, but with the nearest circle of living beings, with his relatives, more particularly with the magnetizer. He has such a communication with others, that he can perceive their mental operations, determine what they know and how they feel. Sometimes the subject of this *clairvoyance* will speak languages which he has not previously understood; he will make use of medical terms which he has not previously known. All this knowledge is communicated by means of the sympathetic union existing between the magnetized and the magnetizing individual. Nor is there merely a *consensus* with the nearest living circles; there is also a *praesensio*, a power of predicting such events as are soon to transpire. That the reports of such magnetical phenomena are founded on fact, may appear the more credible from the circumstance of their being admitted by Strauss. He has devoted much attention to the subject, and despite of his skepticism, not only believes in the powers more commonly ascribed to magnetism, but even in the ability of the magnetized person to operate upon distant objects. See the third volume of Strauss's *Controversial Writings* (*Streitschriften*).

This whole subject of animal magnetism has been the theme of much discussion within the last few years, chiefly as it relates to the question of miracles. Believers in the scriptural testimony for the occurrence of wonders appeal to the phenomena of Mesmerism, with the intent of proving that the ordinary experience of man is not the sole criterion of the truth; with the design of illustrating the sentiment of Shakspeare: "there are more things in heaven and earth than have been dreamed of in your philosophy." The skeptic is therefore driven to the necessity of admitting, that Christ may have performed such wonders as are analogous to the magnetical developments. Strauss is at present of the opinion, that even the restoration of the man born blind, (see John 9:1—12,) is not an incredible event, because it is so congruous with the phenomena of Mesmerism. See his *Controversial Writings*, III. 154. And yet in the first edition of his *Life of Jesus*, he declared the scriptural narrative of this restoration to be entirely unworthy of belief, because it was so contrary to experience. Weisse also, in his *Criticism on the Evangelical History* (*Kritik der evang. Gesch.*), admits the credibility of all the wonders recorded

in the Bible, which have an analogy with the Mesmeric phenomena. Still, if we admit that there is a similarity, in respect of form, between the wonders of magnetism and those of the New Testament, we must also admit that there is a marked difference between them, in respect of their intrinsic nature. The subject of magnetism in its relations to the question of miracles recorded in the Bible, is discussed in Tholuck's *Miscellaneous Writings* (*Vermischte Schriften*), Vol. I. S. 58 seq.

The work of Passavant on *Animal Magnetism* (*Lebens Magnetismus*), 2d ed. 1837, is very instructive, as is likewise that of Wirth on the *Theory of Magnetism* (*Theorie des Mag.*), 1836. The account of "the Prophetess of Prevorst" (*die Seherinn von Prevorst*), produced a great sensation at the time of its first appearance. Prevorst is a small village in Württemberg. The author of the narrative is Kerner. It was published in two parts, in 1820. Those portions of the history which were written from Kerner's own observation, are to be relied on as true, but he has recorded much that he did not himself observe, and this does not gain our credence, but is disbelieved rather.¹

¹ The American and English divine will not be prepared to coincide with Prof. Tholuck on the subject of animal magnetism, as well as some other topics introduced into his *Encyclopaedia*. Still, before we condemn his faith in this principle as a weakness, we should remember that it is sanctioned by the most eminent philosophers of Germany, and that Tholuck evinces no more deficiency of scientific discrimination, in this article of his belief, than was manifested by Hegel, nor in any degree so much as is evinced by Schelling. He adopts in part the Hegelian theory with regard to Mesmerism, and it is interesting for those who do not acquiesce in that theory, to see the mode of its application, or misapplication to theological questions. It is a great mistake to suppose, that the reported phenomena of animal magnetism are unworthy of scientific investigation, and that he who applies them to theology should be ridiculed rather than reasoned with. Even the Baron Cuvier, says of the mesmeric developments, they "scarcely permit us to doubt, that the proximity of two living bodies, in certain positions and with certain movements, is capable of producing a real effect, independent of the imagination of one of the two parties. It also clearly appears, that these effects are owing to some kind of communication established between their two nervous systems." Laplace, who cannot be reproached with any such degree of credulity as amounts to a weakness, says, "The singular effects, which result from the extreme sensibility of the nerves in certain individuals, have given birth to different opinions on the existence of a new agent which has received the name of Animal Magnetism. It is natural to think, that the action of these causes is very feeble, and may easily be disturbed by a great variety of accidental circumstances; so that, from the fact, that in many cases, this agent has failed to manifest itself, we ought not to conclude that it never exists. We are so far from being acquainted with all the agents in nature, and their different modes of action, that it would be unphilosophical, to deny

§ 17. *Rhetoric.*

There is a natural oratory, which exists independently of all art. It is produced by an enthusiasm in the subject, and is thus the proper source of the eloquence of faith and love, spoken of in 2 Cor. 4: 13. All natural gifts, however, are improved by art. The art of rhetoric, as it is applied to the subjects with which a preacher is conversant, is called Homiletics. The distinction between Homiletics and other species of rhetoric is chiefly this: the object of sacred eloquence is, the good of the whole man; and the means it employs for attaining this object are only such as conscience approves; but the design of secular eloquence is, often, to produce some special and immediate effect, as to secure a contribution for the needy, a reconciliation between enemies, etc.; and as it does not aim at securing the holiness of man, so it does not shun an appeal to unsanctified motives.

It is, however, by no means unimportant for the preacher, that he acquaint himself with the lever by which the orators of the old world have moved so powerfully the minds of men. Reinhard says in his Confessions, that he is much indebted for his pulpit success to the orations of Demosthenes.

the existence of the phenomena, merely because, in the present state of our knowledge, they are inexplicable." The medical section of the French Royal Academy of Sciences, composed of the most eminent French physicians, have also thus expressed themselves; "We do not demand of you a blind belief of all that we have reported. We conceive that a great proportion of these facts are of a nature so extraordinary, that you cannot accord them such credence. Perhaps we, ourselves, might have ventured to manifest a similar incredulity, if, changing characters, you had come to announce them to us; and we, like you, had neither seen, nor observed, nor studied, nor followed anything of the kind." See Oliver's *Physiology*, chap. 31.—These authorities are not quoted for the purpose of teaching or implying that animal magnetism is a well founded science, but simply for the purpose of showing that it is as unphilosophical to disbelieve in the magnetic phenomena, without a previous examination of them, as it is to credit the reports of such phenomena without subjecting them to the most rigid and scrutinizing tests. In the present state of the inquiry, the proper position of the mind seems to be that of suspense; for while we are not authorized to adopt the conclusions of the scientific men who have reported the magnetic phenomena, we are also not authorized to condemn their reports as visionary, and to denounce the theologian who believes them as an over-credulous fanatic. Before Prof. Tholuck is censured, as he has often been, for his essays on this theme, we must consider well the tendency of a rapid, inquisitive mind like his, to sympathize with the dominant philosophy of his age, and adopt many, too many of its freshest theories.—Tr.

PART II.

THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

A. The Science of Exegesis.

§ 18. *On the Importance of Exegetical Study, and on the distinctive character of the Sacred Scriptures.*

The christian faith and the christian life are founded on the Bible. The first and most important study for the theologian is, therefore, that of the Scriptures. Thus Luther says: *Theologus sit scriptuarius*. The theologian is sometimes prejudiced against the study of exegesis, by the multitude of different interpretations that have been adopted. The words, for example, recorded in Gal. 3: 20, have received about two hundred and fifty diverse explanations. It must be conceded, that there is by no means so great a variety in the modes of interpreting the classical authors, as in those of interpreting the writers of the Bible. For this fact there are various reasons; some of them resulting from the character of the interpreter; some, from the importance of the Bible in its relation to the Christian scheme; and some from the distinctive characteristics of the book itself.

First, as to the interpreters of the sacred records. They have not availed themselves, in their work, of all the helps which they should have employed. They have often neglected the study of language, still more frequently have they failed to possess the true christian spirit. By means of this spirit they could have understood those passages of the Bible, which express sentiments of kindred character with those of every pious man.

Secondly, as to the importance of the Scriptures. The words of Inspiration claim to be the law of Christianity; law for the belief and for the whole life. If, now, a man be not willing to adopt a particular article of faith, or a particular course of duty, he will seek to explain away such an article or such a command, so that it may seem to be not in the Bible. Where the selfish interests are involved, there will ever be a multitude of differing and forced interpretations. This is found to be the fact in the interpreting of wills.

Thirdly, as to the distinctive characteristics of the Bible itself. These occasion a discrepancy in the modes of explaining it. It must be remembered, that our heavenly Father has given us a Revelation for the purpose of educating the spiritual nature of

man, of all races, all ages, all varieties of talent and training. It is therefore a matter of fact, that the Scriptures are so wonderfully composed as to interest all classes; the child feels himself to be spoken to in them, and the philosopher finds materials there for subsequent meditation. The Bible must, accordingly, embrace within itself a great multitude of characteristics, which are adapted to the diverse states of its readers. The same expression that is well fitted for one mind is not so well adapted to a different mind, and thus what is clear to the former is obscure to the latter. The differing statements of Scripture are never contradictory to one another, but are often nothing more than diversified colorings (*nuances*) of the same thought. They may be all reconciled into one general and complete view. The second number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, published in 1832, contains an essay which shows this to be the case in reference to the first verses of the Saviour's Sermon on the mount.¹ Herder has said: Only that book is truly rich in its contents which a man can re-peruse once in every five years. But it is ever the case, that many passages of such a volume will remain obscure to the reader, while he is perusing it for the first time. A book which a man may completely understand, during his first perusal, has certainly not much solid merit. Accordingly, Luther says of the Bible, I have never shaken this tree, without its letting a new golden apple fall down. The sacred Scripture is an odoriferous plant; the more it is rubbed, so much the sweeter fragrance does it emit. Augustine says of the Bible, It is small with the small, and great with the great. On this account must it be demanded of a theologian, that he enter on the study of the inspired volume with a degree of modesty equal, at least, to that which he feels when he examines any great author. If he find offensive expressions, he must search for the ground of offence not in the author but in himself.

The science of exegesis is divided into the following departments; first, the Biblical Hermeneutics; secondly, the Biblical Linguistics; thirdly, the Biblical History and Antiquities; fourthly, the Criticism and the Introduction.

§ 19. *The Biblical Hermeneutics.*

This department instructs us, how we may attain to an understanding of the sacred records. In what method, we ask, do we

¹ Translated by Prof. Robinson for the Biblical Repository, Vol. III. No. 12.

arrive at the meaning of any human discourse? By the term, "discourse," we mean the thoughts and feelings of the individual transferred into speech; and by the phrase, "understand a discourse," we mean the process of inverting this transfer, of reducing the speech back to thoughts and feelings. From these definitions results the principle, that, in order to understand a discourse, we must be acquainted with the laws of thinking and of speaking. But is this sufficient for the comprehending of a train of remark? It is not. If a person say, "I love," then I can understand his words, so far as their logical and philological import is concerned; but in order to have a full comprehension of their meaning, I must have experienced the emotion of love, I must also know the circumstances of the person who utters these words, whether he be an old man, or a child, a religious man, or a sensualist. This information with regard to the personal relations of the author of a discourse, is called the historical knowledge of the discourse. The question then arises, whether it be sufficient for the interpretation of the Bible to have this historical knowledge, in connection with the logical and philological. The affirmative answer to this query was given by Ernesti, Semler, Keil. They demanded for the understanding of the Bible, the grammatico-historical interpretation. Staüdlin of Göttingen, on the contrary, demanded that the religious interpretation be superadded to the above. See his *Dissertatio de Novi Testamenti Interpretatione historica non unice vera*, 1807. Keil defended his own views in the *Analects of Keil and Tzschirner*, Vol. I. Staüdlin was entirely correct in his meaning, but not in his definitions; for the historical interpretation, when rightly understood, includes within itself the religious interpretation also. When a pious man speaks, I cannot give the proper historical interpretation of his words, unless I know from my own experience what that is of which he speaks, and unless I interpret his expressions accordingly. It is a very beautiful remark which Origen made concerning John the Evangelist, that "the beloved disciple could best interpret the words of the Saviour, because lying on the breast of his Lord he became another Jesus." The greater the resemblance between a man and the authors whom he explains, so much the better will be his explanations.

The term "historical interpretation," however, has been used by Semler, Eichhorn, and the rationalistic interpreters, in a different sense from that which has just been elucidated. They have explained the phrase thus: the discourses of Jesus and of the

apostles are to be interpreted in conformity to the conceptions and the opinions of their Jewish contemporaries; the teachings of the prophets are to be understood in conformity to the prevalent notions of their respective times; and these notions again are to be illustrated by the views which prevailed among other ancient tribes besides the Jewish. Accordingly, the interpretations of these critics are commonly introduced with these words: *Opinabantur enim Judaei*. If, however, we adopt this mode of exclusive historical interpretation, we must proceed on the ground that Christ and his apostles have taught nothing new, nothing higher than was taught by their contemporaries. We must not recognize in the Saviour a religious genius; for such a genius will ever advance beyond the standard of its own age. Pursuing this method of exegesis we are led into error by the multitude of proverbs, figures of speech, and forms of phraseology, which were indeed in ordinary use among the Jews of our Saviour's time, but which were used in a new and exalted sense by Christ and his apostles. The lofty religious views of these men are not recognized in the rationalistic mode of interpretation. If we adopt this mode, we must either ascribe to Christ and his apostles the crude errors of Judaism, as is done by Meyer, Rückert, Fritzsche; or we must accommodate their language in its essential meaning, and suppose that they knew the falseness of their assertions, but conformed to the errors of their times. This latter style of comment is adopted by Reiche and earlier expositors.

Those who interpret the Scriptures according to such false views of historical exegesis, must adopt the plan of accommodation. Language may be accommodated in various ways. There is a negative mode, as when I conceal a truth with regard to which I have not been interrogated. There is a positive mode, as when I make a false assertion instead of a true one, for the sake of avoiding collision with my hearers. We may accommodate our speech, in its substantial meaning (*materiell*), as when we say what is false with regard to the subject under consideration; or in its style and fashion (*formell*), as when we use an inappropriate phraseology for the purpose of making the subject intelligible. This *formal* accommodation is unobjectionable, and is often adopted in the teaching of youth. The negative accommodation is also entirely irreprehensible, but the positive and *material* belongs to the category of the lie. Many advocates of the false historical interpretation, which has just been considered, explained such passages as Mat. 8: 11, 25: 31, 32, 1 Cor. 6: 3, 10: 4, in

accordance with the rabbinical notions that prevailed in the first ages of Christianity. Thus were very crude meanings attached to those verses; and it was accordingly supposed, that Christ and his apostles designed to accommodate their speech to the Jewish errors. This theory of accommodation, however, is sanctioned at present by very few; by no interpreter of the Scriptures except Reiche.

The different kinds of interpretation are described by Hahn in an essay published in the second number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830. Concerning the citations of the Old Testament in the New, see the Supplement to Tholuck's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews; Art. The Old Testament in the New, 1836.—The general principles of Hermeneutics are developed by Ast in his *Grund-plan of the Grammatical, Hermeneutical and Critical Sciences (Grundriss der Gram., Hermeneut. und Krit.)*, 1808. The most extended system of theological Hermeneutics is that of Morus, ed. Eichstadt, Jena, 1795, in two parts. This work is rich in materials, but it is deficient in its philosophical ground-work. The same remark is applicable to the celebrated treatise of Ernesti: *Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti*, fifth edition, from Ammon, 1809.¹ This small book has been very highly prized, because it was the first which applied the principles of classical interpretation to the New Testament. The *Manual of Hermeneutics* published by Keil in 1810 is also valuable, contains much historical matter, but is written neither in the true philosophical nor in the true Christian spirit. Lücke has also published an *Essay on the Hermeneutics of the New Testament (Versuch N. T. Hermeneut.)*, 1817. The most instructive work in this department is, *die Hermeneutik von Schleiermacher*, ed. Lücke.

§ 20. *Biblical Philology of the Old and New Testaments.*

A. *Lexicography of the Old and New Testaments.*

In order to form a judgment of the biblical lexicography, we must attend, in the first place, to the faults which are found, in a greater or less degree, in lexicography in general. First, lexicographers omit to trace the word back to its primitive signification. This original meaning always expresses something which is, as it were, palpable to the senses. Secondly, the derived significations

¹ Translated, and accompanied with original notes, and extracts from Morus, Beck, Keil and Henderson, by Prof. Stuart.—Tr.

are not arranged, by our lexicographers, in the order according to which they are deduced from the original import of the word. Thirdly, they are not so presented that the learner can ascertain the manner in which they are derived from the fundamental signification of the term. Fourthly, the sense of a word is often confounded with its signification. The signification of a term is the meaning which it has in itself, originally; the sense of it is the meaning which it acquires in a certain connection. Fifthly, our lexicons often omit the definite authorities which are needed for the meaning assigned to particular words.

The lexicographer must have an insight into the nature and origin of the languages which he explains. This knowledge is important in its relation to theology. The following remarks are worthy of notice on this subject.

First, every word has some meaning. There are no terms introduced into the language without a reason. Even the primitive words signify something. Thus *οὐρανός* is derived from *ὄρω, ὀρνυμι*, to raise one's self; whence also *ὄρνις* a bird, which raises itself in the air; *οὐρανός*, therefore, is that which is lifted up. *Cœlum* is derived from *κοῖλον*, the concave, the vaulted. *Terra* comes from *terere*, to rub, grind; the earth is, therefore, that which is triturated. The word *ἄνθρωπος* is ordinarily derived from *ἄνω* and *τρέπω*, and is thus made to denote one who turns his countenance upward. It is more correct, however, to derive the word from *ἀνήρ* and *ὄψις*, the aspect of a man. So likewise *homo* comes from *humus*, and denotes, 'born of the earth;' *γενή* comes from *γεννάω*, etc.¹

A second remark of importance on this theme is, that all objects which belong to a sphere above the senses have received their names from men, who formed merely sensible images of those objects. The examples already adduced will show that, in giving names to things of which the senses take cognizance, men have seized hold of the chief quality in those things, have brought it into the foreground, and have applied such names to the objects as would indicate that chief quality. They have followed the same law in attaching names to things of which the senses do not take cognizance. If their method of designating sensible objects, as it was described in the preceding paragraph, was looked upon as wonderful, still more must we consider their method of

¹ On the evils that may arise from an excessive reference to etymology in defining the signification of words, see Campbell's *Dissertations*, Part III. *Diss.* IV. § 15—26.—Tr.

designating objects which lie above the sphere of the senses. Thus the German word, *Wahrheit* (truth), is deduced from *Werden*, and denotes that which ever endures, that which is eternal. So the Hebrew word קָנָן is derived from קָנָן , to be firm, and hence denotes that which is stable, unchangeable, sure, true. The German term, *vernunft* (reason), is derived from *vernehmen*, to perceive, and denotes the power of perceiving, the higher decision of our intellectual being. The Greek word *συνειδησις* denotes the knowledge which one has with himself, that is, with the inmost I.

When the chief quality of the object denoted by the word had been made prominent in the word itself, it was then represented by the sound of the component letters. Thus there is a resemblance between the sound of the following terms and their signification: *stark*, strong; *schwach*, weak; *hell*, bright; *dunkel*, dark; *starr*, numb, fixed; *weich*, soft, etc. It is generally admitted that the vowels have this power of representing, of painting the idea; but the same power exists in the consonants also; and Plato has essayed, in his *Cratylus*, to find their signification.

When we reflect on what has been now advanced, it appears plain that the primitive state of man cannot have been that of a mere animal, but was rather that of mental excitement and elevation; of profound thought also. It is only by these qualities that he was able to give such an appropriate distinction to the most prominent qualities of the objects, especially the supersensuous objects, that received names from him, and to express those qualities with such significant sounds. This consideration has led some to appeal to Genesis 2:19, and to explain the passage thus: The first man, guided by a divine impulse, gave such names to the objects around him, as were entirely appropriate to their nature. Now the object of language in general is to give these appropriate names to things. Plato says, in his *Cratylus*, "the designations of things are agreeable to their qualities." The preceding exposition of the verse in Genesis is not sufficient to prove, that all languages were formed under a divine influence; for all languages are not modeled after the Hebrew, but as they have originated in more recent times, so they adopt their own peculiar modes of designating the objects of thought. Compare Tholuck on the Primitive World, in the 2d part of his *Miscellanies* (*Vermischte Schriften*).

There is another interesting thought, which may also be deduced from the study of the first principles of language. It appears that original roots of words, in different tongues, are similar

to each other. If a man had ventured the assertion, in the middle of the eighteenth century, that the Lithuanian and the Indian languages have a mutual affinity with one another, he would have been deemed lunatic. But it is at present a settled truth, that the Indian, Greek, German, and Slavonic languages are derived from the same original source. The rules for Comparative Grammar have been laid down by Bopp.

Let us now apply what has been advanced, to the lexicons of the Bible. The third and the fourth faults of lexicography, which have been mentioned, are sometimes found in these works. The word *מָנָה* has eight different significations, as it is defined in the first edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon; these eight are reduced to four, in the edition of 1833. The lexicons of Schleusner and of Bretschneider exhibit many instances, in which the sense of a word is given instead of the signification. This fault is especially conspicuous in Schleusner, so that it becomes even ridiculous. Hence is it that he gives so great a number of definitions to a single word; to the term *σάρεξ*, for example, he assigns eighteen different meanings; to the term *πνεῦμα*, twenty three, (whereas the same word has only nine in Wahl's Lexicon, and only three in Bretschneider's,) to the participle *ἐν* he gives thirty one, and to *ἐπί* fifty two. Wahl's lexicon is free from this fault to a considerable extent. It is marked, however, by another blemish. It does not substantiate its definitions of words by any fundamental exegesis of the texts in the New Testament, where these words occur. It also determines the meaning of a word too often on the authority of classical writers only, and does not make its chief appeal to the use of the Jewish authors, and the most ancient fathers. In this respect Bretschneider's Lexicon is superior to Wahl's.

Gesenius's Thesaurus is the most extensive and copious of all the Hebrew lexicons. It is at the same time a depository of historical, geographical, and antiquarian researches. The Latin edition of his lexicon, published in 1833, exhibits in respect of many words a great improvement upon his previous labors in this department.¹ Besides the lexicon of Gesenius, the student should use Winer's edition of Simonis's lexicon, published in 1828. This contains much that is peculiar to itself. It is especially funda-

¹ This edition of Gesenius's Lexicon, accompanied with the author's later corrections and emendations, has been recently translated into English, and published by Prof. Robinson.

mental in its treatment of the prepositions. See also Hupfeld, *De emendanda ratione Lexicographiæ Semitiæ*, 1820. He designates three gradations of excellence in the Hebrew Lexicography, and places the Lexicon of Gesenius in the second class.

The concordances have an intimate connection with the lexicons. It is absolutely indispensable, that a (German) preacher have in his library a German Concordance of the Bible. That of Büchner is in the highest degree serviceable and copious. It was published in 1776, but has been issued in a new and much improved edition by Heubner.—For a Hebrew concordance we have that of Buxtorf, published in 1632, and a new edition of the same by Fürst.—For the Septuagint we have the concordance of Trommius, in two vols. folio. For the Greek Testament, we have that of Er. Schmidt, 1638 folio. (A later and the best edition of Schmidt is by Bruder, 1842.) Schleusner's Lexicon for the Septuagint is a total failure. It was published in five volumes in 1821. It may however be of use as a concordance, though not as a lexicon.

Wahl's smaller *Clavis* of the New Testament accomplishes very well the object for which it was intended. His larger *Clavis* is faulty in respect of its definitions, which are altogether too minutely subdivided.¹ Wilke has published a small *Clavis* which is very convenient for common use, but not sufficiently fundamental for a student who wishes to make a thorough examination of a word. The new edition of Bretschneider's Dictionary, published in 1839, is superior to Wahl's in one particular, it makes more extensive use of the Hellenistic literature. It is inferior, however, in all other respects. Its explanations of words are often very unnatural. The various meanings which it gives to words are not arranged with precision, as they are by Wahl. His definitions, too, are more deficient than Wahl's, in the statement of the true religious import of words. Schleusner's Lexicon, 4th ed. 1819, is still worthy of reference, as a depository of philological citations and of antiquarian notices. Winer is at present engaged in preparing a new German Lexicon of the New Testament.

A great advance has been made since the close of the preceding century in the science of Grammar. This improvement has

¹ This *Clavis Philologica* of Wahl was translated and revised by Prof. Robinson and published in this country about eighteen years since, but is superseded for the English student by Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament.—Tr.

been shared by the grammar of the Hebrew language, and also by that of the New Testament. The improvement consists chiefly in the introduction of more rational principles into the study of language, the search for the philosophical ground of the various phenomena of speech, and the attempt to explain these phenomena in a rational way. The comparison of different languages with one another has, in various ways, accelerated the progress of grammatical science. The study of the original structure of languages has had a similar influence. The introduction of this philosophical spirit into Grammar may be traced to the exertions of Fr. A. Wolf. Next to him are to be mentioned some recent authors, as Gottfried Hermann, who has done much for the Greek Grammar; Jacob Grimm, who has vastly improved the German Grammar; Bopp, who has contributed much to the Indian; Ewald, to the Hebrew; and William Von Humboldt, to the study of the general principles of language.

Previously to the labors of Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar was treated either according to an arbitrary system of rules, as by Danz, or without any definite plan and with some false views, as by Vater. The Grammar of Gesenius was the first, which introduced a clear and simple method into the treatment of the Hebrew language, made the language easy of comprehension, and easy of survey as a whole. Ewald's method differs from that of Gesenius, is less simple and facile, but goes further, even to the simplest elements, in analyzing the structure of the language, and thereby renders the language more comprehensible as an organized whole. The treatises of Hupfeld on Hebrew Grammar, which are published in the *Studien und Kritiken*, third volume, second and fourth numbers, shed much light upon the subject. They are designed to prepare the way for a new Hebrew Grammar, which must surpass that of Ewald in the fundamental character of its researches.

In reference to the Greek language the work of Hermann, *De emendanda ratione Gramm. linguae Graecae*, affords much valuable information. The same may be said of his additions to Viger, *De praecipuis Graecae dictionis idiotismis*, fourth edition, 1834. The grammar of Matthiae is pervaded by a spirit of raw empiricism; that of Thiersch discovers an animated pursuit after the philosophical principles of the language; so likewise does the larger Grammar of Buttman, which however is deficient in its syntax. But the larger grammar of Kühner is superior to that of Thiersch or of Buttman in this particular. It unites clearness

of style, with philosophical research, and also with a considerable degree of completeness. It was published at Hanover in 1835, in two parts. The same author published also a Grammar for schools in 1836. The Greek Syntax of Bernhardt, which was published in 1829, is also worthy of commendation for its rational views, and completeness. It has opened the way for a history of the Greek language. It is liable to criticism, however, for the obscurity of its representations.

Until the year 1820, the language of the New Testament has stood in need of nothing so much as of improved grammatical treatises. There were some excellent philologists among the commentators, who flourished at the time of the Reformation. One of them was Beza, whose expositions are truly admirable; another was Camerarius. The commentators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, lost in a remarkable degree this philological skill. We discover the want of it in the supernaturalists, those of Storr's school, and also in the rationalists, as in Dr. Paulus, for example. His interpretation of the passages, which record the miracles of Christ and the apostles, is so forced and unnatural, that Hermann says, "Paulus has turned the miracles of Christianity into miracles of philology." We find the most astonishing blunders in his commentaries. Thus he derives the word *καθεξῆς* (*in a connected form*) in Luke 1: 3, from *κατά* and *ἦκω*; so that the passage must mean, It has seemed good to write in an order in which one event comes after another. He likewise derives the word *τετράρχης* from *ἄρχω*, *I rule*, and *τέταμαι*, *I am stretched out*; so that the meaning is, a ruler stretched out, that is, a great ruler. Winer is the first who broke up the arbitrary methods of preceding critics. Among the excellences of this grammarian, is especially to be noticed and extolled his sound judgment and discretion. He has made the following remarkable confession in reference to the new method, as compared with the old, of interpreting the Scriptures: The controversies among interpreters have ordinarily led back to the admission, that the old protestant views of the meaning of the sacred text are the correct views; see Leips. Litteratur Zeitung, 1833, No. 44. The severe application of grammatical principles to the interpretation of the Bible is, in this respect, like the rigid observance of exegetical rules. Both have an influence upon the development of the religious spirit of the Bible. Bengel's Gnomon shows, in an especial manner, how much may be gained in favor of religion by strict accuracy in the interpretation of the sacred text. For

example; let the student search, in conformity with the rational principles of Grammar, for the reasons which induced the Greek to say πιστεύειν εἰς, to believe, with a direction of the mind toward or upon a person; πιστεύειν ἐν, to believe, resting on the merits of a person; πιστεύειν ἐπί τινα, to believe with a direction of the mind towards a person and a supporting of one's self by him; and let the student contrast these phrases with the simple πιστεύειν τίνι, to believe the word of a man, and he will at once see that the first of these forms always include, what the last form does not, an heartfelt confidence and trust in the individual believed.

§ 21. *Biblical History and Antiquities.*

A. Biblical History of the Old Testament.

There is need at the present time of a learned history of the Jewish people. In this history the providence of God toward Israel, with reference to the introduction of Christianity, should be the leading idea. There is also need of a popular history of the same people, which shall illustrate the same pervading idea; for the history of the Old Testament is one of the chief studies in the system of popular education. The older histories of the Jews are not exactly adapted to the wants of the learned at the present day. They are written in accordance with that narrow theory of Inspiration, which teaches that not only the law and the prophecies, but likewise all the historical elements of the Bible are communicated immediately by the Holy Spirit. We are indebted to Buddeus and Rambach for the most important of the older works on the history of the church, as recorded in the Old Testament. These writers were not skilled in criticism, and their history is simply an amplification of the more ancient works in this department. The thoroughly critical mode of treating the subject was not introduced until 1780 or thereabout; but with this improvement in one respect came a deterioration in another. The sensibility for the religious excellences of the Old Testament history was lost, and in a short time the criticism was merged into the extreme of skepticism. De Wette seemed at one period, to have gone furthest in this direction in his critical *View of the Israelitish History* (*Kritik der Israel. Gesch.*), 1807. But De Wette's skepticism has been surpassed in more recent times by Von Bohlen and Vatke. The *Commentary of Von Bohlen on Genesis*, published in 1835, is generally acknowledged to have been very hastily and

superficially composed. He goes even so far as to dispute the very existence of Abraham, although we have proof of his existence from sources independent of the Scriptures, from the traditions of the gentile Arabs. His skepticism in reference to the biblical description of certain scenes in antiquity is shown, by the old Egyptian monuments, and by other means, to be destitute of foundation. Vatke is another of the recent critics, who has surpassed the skepticism of De Wette. This appears in his *Theology of the Old Testament*, published in 1835. He goes so far as to affirm on the ground of a misinterpretation of Amos 5: 25, that the Israelites, at the time of Moses, did not worship Jehovah but the planet Saturn, and that the temple of Solomon was not built after the pattern of the tabernacle, but that the account of the tabernacle is a fiction, and was suggested by the structure and uses of the temple.

Leo's *Jewish History* was written in the spirit of the modern skepticism, more particularly in accordance with Vater and De Wette. After it was published, the author himself condemned it, and recalled it from circulation. He has given us a narrative of the Jews in the first volume of his *Universal History*, and has here adopted the correct principles of criticism and judgment.

Although we are in need of an extended critical work on the state and character of the ancient Jews, we have a very commendable history of this people, adapted to popular use, and written in the spirit of child-like piety, by Hess of Zürich, author of the *History of the Patriarchs, of Moses, of Joshua, of the Kings of Judah and Israel after the Revolt, of David and Solomon, of Christ, of the Apostles, etc.*

B. Biblical History of the New Testament.

The highest literary effort which is demanded of a theologian, is to form a clear conception of the life of the Redeemer on the earth. This presupposes a fundamental acquaintance with all the departments of theology, and can properly be the result of nothing less than a theological life. Particularly does it demand a comprehensive knowledge of the truths pertaining to miraculous agency, and also of those affecting the person of the Redeemer.

The first attempt that was made in Germany to accomplish this task, and give a vivid representation of the Saviour's earthly residence, was by the venerable Hess, in his *Life of Jesus (Leben Jesu)*, 1st ed. 1768; 8th ed. 1828. This work is composed with care, and with earnest piety, but evinces not much critical ac-

men, and bears the impress of the degenerate age in which he was educated. In more recent times has appeared, first, Hase's Compendium, *The Life of Jesus* (*Leben Jesu*), 3d ed. 1840. Christ is represented in this work as the second Adam, who was appointed to represent our race as it existed in its original purity, without sin, without any error in regard to religious truth, with the same power over nature which was possessed by man in his state of innocency. But the author rejects the weighty arguments, which prove the historical authority of the first three Gospels, and therefore abandons, as untrustworthy, a great part of the evangelical narrative. Hase is not a rationalist, however, but acknowledges a distinction in kind as well as degree between the Saviour and other men. (Rationalism admits a difference of degree only, none in nature: *einen graduellen nicht einen spezifischen Unterschied*).—Strauss published his *Life of Jesus*, in two parts, soon after the publication of the work of Hase. The fundamental error of Strauss's treatise is the presupposition on which he proceeds, that miracles are impossible. On the ground of this *a priori* judgment, he declares the genuineness of the four evangelists to be in the highest degree suspicious, and scarcely gives himself the trouble to examine, in any proper way, the historical reasons for their authenticity. (These external arguments are of but little force with him, against the internal character of the history.) How little of thorough investigation he had given to the dogmas he has advanced, is evident from the sudden change of his views, which was announced in the third volume of his *Controversial Writings*. Here he acknowledges, all at once, that the majority of the miracles recorded in the New Testament may have a resemblance to the phenomena of Magnetism, and may therefore be historically true. In the third edition of his *Life of Jesus*, he seems inclined to admit the genuineness of the Gospel of John. He has, however, himself declared, that if the genuineness of only one Gospel can be proved, then the theory of their mystical character must lose its chief supports. In the Preface to his *Characteristics*, published in 1839, and in the fourth edition of his *Life of Jesus*, he has once more changed his views, and announced that he has gone back to his original position.—After Strauss, Weisse appeared in his *Criticism on the Evangelical History* (*Kritik der evang. Gesch.*), 1837, in two parts. He deals with the narratives of the Gospel still more arbitrarily than Strauss does, but has a worthier view of the Saviour's character, and contends for his miraculous powers.—Neander's *Life of Jesus* followed that

of Weisse. In this work, Neander exhibits a warm spirit of piety, a judicious criticism, but a want of established doctrinal views in relation to the person of Christ. He is likewise deficient in energy, also in freshness of portraiture. He does not bring the scenes which he describes into the reader's ideal presence. He expresses himself too often with indecision, where a decided opinion may be safely formed.—Kuhn, a Catholic Professor in Freiburg, published a *Life of Jesus* in 1838. This work is philosophical and critical. It is, at the same time, written with the spirit of an animated Christian. — Krabbe published his *Lectures on the Life of Jesus* (*Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu*), in 1839. It is a thorough-going refutation of Strauss's skepticism, and adheres very strictly to the standards of the church.—On the historical character of the records concerning Christ, see Tholuck's *Credibility of the Evangelical History*, (*Glaubwürdigkeit*, etc.) 2d ed. 1838.

Next to the necessity of obtaining a vivid conception of the life of Jesus, is the importance of clear views in reference to the life of Paul. Hensen published, in 1830, a history of this apostle (*Leben Pauli*). It is written with a good spirit, and betrays industrious research, but is destitute of originality. The work of Neander on the *Planting of the first Christian Church*,¹ satisfies, in a high degree, the demands of the student. It contains the history of the most prominent men among the apostles, an introduction to their writings and their doctrinal views. Its want of precision, however, is palpable, as likewise its deficiency in acuteness of apprehension. It may well be used as an introduction to the history of the church, to systematical and exegetical theology. — It were desirable to have a good description of the characters of the most important personages mentioned in the Bible. Niemeyer gave us such a description in his *Biblical Characteristics* (*Charak. der Bibel*), in five parts; but this work is not adapted to our times, and can no longer be used with profit.

C. Biblical Geography.

The Old and New Testaments are occupied chiefly with scenes that occurred in Palestine. It is therefore necessary to learn the geography of that land. The most extended work which we yet have on this subject is Reland's *Palestiné*, published in 1714, in two parts, quarto. The best of the recent geographical descriptions of Palestine is the *Manual of Geography* (*Handbuch der*

¹ Translated into English by Jonathan Edwards Ryland, of Northampton, England.—Tr.

Geog.) by Charles von Raumer, 1838. In some particulars this work is excellent. It is, however, too aphoristic, and does not leave on the mind a complete impression of the scenes described. It is especially desirable to obtain faithful and impressive pictures of the Holy Land, such as are taken from nature and from life. There is a beautiful collection of plates, representing scenes in Judea, by Bernatz. It is accompanied with notes by Schubert. Its title is, *Bildersammlung aus dem heiligen Lande*. We should connect with such ocular representations the journals of travellers, the picturesque narratives of such men as Chateaubriand and Lamartine, and especially the very instructive *Researches of Robinson*, etc. — The student should also possess maps of the countries described in the sacred volume. The small Bible Atlas of Ackermann, published in 1822, is very serviceable. It contains a chart of Jerusalem. The best map of that city is Berghaus's. Neander's *Planting of the Apostolical Church* contains a chart for the countries mentioned in the New Testament.

D. Biblical Antiquities.

That part of the sacred antiquities which is most important for us, is the account of the religious life of the Israelites. It were delightful to possess a work like the *Journey of Anacharsis to Greece*; we have something like it in the work of Strauss, the court-preacher at Berlin. It is entitled *Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem* (*Helon's Wallfahrt nach Jerus.*), and consists of four parts. The most accurate Jewish Archaeology is that of Faber, which appeared in 1773. Only one volume, however, has been published, and that describes the family scenes of Judea. The most extensive Archaeology is that of Jahn, published in 1796 and 1818.¹ The two volumes of the first part describe the domestic habits and the usages of society among the ancient Jews; the second volume describes the Jewish political institutions; and the third, the sacred antiquities. Unfortunately only the first two volumes of the first part have appeared in a new edition. The second and third volumes are left, therefore, in a very imperfect state.—De Wette published a *Compendium of the Hebrew Antiquities*, in 1830; but this must be accompanied with lectures on the subject; else it is insufficient for the scholar.—A knowledge of the Jewish religious antiquities is absolutely indis-

¹ This work was subsequently abridged by the author himself; the abridgement was published in Latin, in one volume, and the second edition of it was translated into English by Prof. Upham, now of Bowdoin college. Tholuck speaks of the original German works, not of the Latin Abridgement.—T

pensable to the biblical student. The most learned treatises in this department are, Reland's *Antiquitates Sacrae*, as it was edited by Simonis, and Carpzov's *Antiq. Sac.*, published in 1748.

§ 22. *Biblical Introduction and Criticism.*

One important element of an introduction to the Old and New Testaments is wanting, in the treatises which we now have. The authors of these treatises have confined their attention too much to the externals of the Bible, and on this account the whole department of biblical introduction seems dry and dull. The nature of this department requires, first, that it delineate the characteristics of the Bible as the primitive depository of a divine revelation, as a strictly religious volume; secondly, that the distinguishing religious characteristics of each several book in the volume be stated; thirdly, that the student be shown what was the design of the Deity in making precisely these communications to our race, in giving to the Bible its present contents rather than any other. More topics of this kind should be considered in the Introduction.

The department of criticism is divided into the higher and the lower. The lower criticism has respect to the text of the Bible, its various readings, etc. Very little of this species of criticism is now demanded in the study of the Old Testament. The scrupulous care of the ancient Jewish transcribers has precluded the occurrence of any important errors. In the study of the New Testament, however, there is still much to be done in this department. We have, as yet, no critical edition of the Greek Testament, which meets the demands of the scientific theologian. Our *lectio recepta* is from the edition of the Elzevirs, published in 1624.¹ It is conformed, chiefly, to the edition of Beza, but in part to the peculiar views of the editors. It is not known, however, by any one on what principles exactly the Elzevirian text was framed. Meanwhile, the number of the various readings, which are discovered in the progress of the New Testament study, increases. Mill had collected 30,000 in the year 1760, and about 15,000 may have been added since that time. This great number of discrepancies disturbed the religious sensibilities of Bengel, so that he prepared a critical edition of the New Testament. He was the first who reduced the various readings of the codices to distinct classes. His undertaking was further prosecuted by Griesbach,

¹ See Hug's Introduction to the N. T. Chap. VII. § 58.—Tr.

who took the received text for the basis of his edition, and altered this text in cases of importance only. Unimportant errors, however, may perhaps be found in the *lectio recepta*. This consideration induced Lachmann to resolve on commencing the whole work *de novo*, and on constructing a text which should be accommodated exclusively to the united authority of the oldest manuscripts. Those readings were therefore to be received as the basis of his text, which were sanctioned by the most ancient oriental and occidental copies of the Scriptures. He did not connect with this investigation of the oldest records a comparison of the different versions, conjectures, etc. His text was only a reproduction of the readings, found in the most ancient manuscripts. It is therefore not at all suited to the use of students. It cannot be called a critical edition of the New Testament, but only a preparation for such an edition. That it is not adapted to ordinary use, is evident from the following considerations. First, since there are so few codices, which are written in uncial characters, and are preserved entire, Lachmann has been obliged, sometimes, to adopt the readings which are authorized by only a single codex. Thus he has given the whole text, from the fourth to the twelfth chapter of 2d Corinthians, according to no other authority than that of Codex B, and the whole text, from Hebrews 9 : 14 to the end of the epistle, on the basis of Codex A merely. In the second place, all the most ancient codices contain, sometimes, the same errors of the copyist, and these errors are therefore adopted by Lachmann. Thus in Ephesians 1 : 15, the words *τιν ἀγάπην* are omitted. In Hebrews 6 : 14, instead of ἡ μίση, these manuscripts insert εἰ μίση. Thirdly, it is a disadvantage under which Lachmann's edition labors, that it does not present to the eye the division of the text into verses.

For manual use, the best editions of the New Testament which have yet appeared are those of Knapp and Hahn. That of Titmann, stereotyped in 1828, is the most convenient, but is disfigured by many errors of the press. The best critical apparatus is contained in Griesbach's large edition of the New Testament, and in his *Symbolae Criticae*.—The most correct editions of the Old Testament are, that published at Basle in 1827, and the second edition of Hahn's text, published in 1832.

That which is called the higher criticism is more important than the lower. It examines the authenticity and the integrity of the sacred books. The Protestant church permits a free critical investigation of this subject, on the ground of the external testi-

monies and the internal data for or against the authority of the records. It may indeed appear hazardous to institute a scientific examination of the authenticity of the Scriptures, because such important interests depend upon the results of the inquiry. The Catholic church pronounces a decision, concerning the authentic character of the books, by means of her councils which claim to be inspired. We, however, put confidence in the power of Christian truth, and believe that a critical examination of the reasons, on which our religious faith is built, will not invalidate the faith itself. Besides, it is not in all cases a particularly injurious concession, to give up the genuineness of a scriptural book, if we be obliged to do so on critical grounds. The concession, for example, that the latter part of Isaiah was not written by that prophet, may be made without important loss, provided that the evidence in the case requires the abandonment of the common belief. So, too, might we believe, without serious evil, that not Luke but Timothy is the author of the Acts of the Apostles, if there were good reason to adopt this opinion of some recent critics. It is only of importance to retain our belief, that the books of the Bible were written by the men to whom they have been usually ascribed, when we must otherwise lose our confidence in the credibility and authority of the writings themselves. In the first place, when it is said that one of the historical books of the Bible was not written by a man who lived at the time of the occurrences which he relates, by a man who lived among the scenes which he describes; when it is said, for example, that the Pentateuch was composed in the time of David, and without the aid of older records which served as a basis for the new, there is something advanced on which important practical consequences depend. In the second place, when it is said that prophetic books were written after the predicted events had transpired; when, for example, modern critics assert that the book of Daniel was not composed until after the occurrence of the scenes foretold, then also will serious evils result from conceding what these philologists claim. In the third place, similar baneful consequences will follow, if we admit that the didactic portions of the New Testament were not written by the apostles; if we adopt, for instance, the opinion of Bruno Bauer, that the Pastoral Epistles were composed in the second century, and of course by some writer or writers who had no apostolical authority.

Until the year 1770 or thereabout, until the time of Semler and Eichhorn, the historical criticism had remained in nearly the same

state in which it was left by the Reformers. The progress of free inquiry was checked by a close adhesion to a certain dogmatic system, and a fear of injuring the cause of orthodoxy by untrammelled investigations. From the time of Semler and Eichhorn, however, great advances have been made in this department. Many erroneous views have been corrected, but criticism veered from the side of an undue dependence upon the orthodox system to the side of an undue dependence upon the Rationalistic system. The critics proceeded on the assumption, that miracles and prophecies are impossible, and they accordingly rejected the authenticity of the sacred books. So Bertholdt, De Wette, Eichhorn. The commentators of this school manifested a vacillation of mind with regard to the occurrence of miracles, and thus betrayed the fact that they had no solid ground on which to rest, in their disbelief of such occurrences; but still, notwithstanding this indecision, they conducted their arguments on the basis of the doctrine that miracles are impossible. Such wavering is seen in De Wette. In the first three editions of his Introduction to the Old Testament, he says, § 145, "Since it appears a *decided* fact to an educated mind, that such miracles have not actually taken place," etc. But in his fourth edition he says, "Since it appears to an educated mind, *doubtful*, at least, whether such miracles have occurred," etc. Vatke in his Biblical Theology, page 9, says, "Very many of the reasons, and sometimes the principal reasons, why we must assign a more recent date to a pretendedly ancient book, are of a dogmatical character." Strauss in the preface to his Characteristics says, that he can see the insufficiency of all objections against the genuineness of John's Gospel, except the single objection which results from the miracles which it records. This he cannot answer; and on the sole ground of its record of miracles, he feels obliged to give up the Gospel.¹ The question will now be asked, is not this a very objectionable slavery to a dogmatical system? Must not the critical examination of the text be free from all influence from one's theological opinions? To this question, we reply, that we have no right to demand such a separation between criticism and dogmatic theology. All the convictions of a man's mind must be connected together. Therefore will my philosophical opinions exert an influence upon my histor-

¹ These are some of the numerous concessions which are made by the most learned of the German rationalists and infidels, and it is partly on account of such concessions that their works are so serviceable to the establishment of orthodox principles.—Tr.

ical, and my observations in history will produce an effect, in their turn, upon my notions in philosophy. But although we cannot demand, that a critic exclude from his mind all the influences of philosophical or theological speculation, we can demand as much as this, that those interpreters, who adhere to the christian faith, be as much exempted from the charge of having formed their critical opinions under the influence of a doctrinal creed, as their opposers are exempt from it; that the christian interpreters be acknowledged to have as much freedom from the prejudice of system, as the infidel interpreters have; that, in fine, both parties admit themselves to be under the influence of dogmatic opinions.

The books of the New Testament whose genuineness is most severely contested, are the Gospel of Matthew in its present form, the Pastoral Epistles, and the second Book of Peter. The controversy with regard to the Old Testament is chiefly confined to the genuineness of the Pentateuch, the Book of Daniel, and the last part of Isaiah. It is necessary for the student to read the books which are written on both sides of this controversy. The contest is not yet decided by our scientific theologians, and the arguments, therefore, which both parties adduce, should be allowed to make their legitimate impression upon the scholar's mind. The oldest works in the department of higher criticism, are chiefly in opposition to the genuineness of the above-named parts of Scripture. In defence of their genuineness the following works are the most important for consultation: Hengstenberg's Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament, (*Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. T.*), including, 1st, the Defence of the Book of Daniel, 2d, the Authenticity of the Pentateuch; König, on the Genuineness of the Book of Joshua (*Echtheit des Buchs Josua*), 1836; Kleinert, on the Genuineness of the disputed portions of Isaiah (*die Echtheit der angefochtenen Theile des Jesaia*), 1st Part, 1829.

The following are the principal Introductions to the Old Testament, which have been written in the spirit of the Christian faith; Jahn's Introduction to the Old Testament, in two parts, 1802 (*Einl. ins A. T.*; this work is not fitted to the wants of the present age); Hävernick's Introduction to the Old Testament (*Einleitung ins A. T.*), 3 Parts, 1837. The results of the negative criticism, (that which opposes the genuineness of the disputed books in the received canon,) are given most extendedly in the Introductions to the Old and the New Testaments by Ber-

tholdt, in 6 Parts (Einl. ins A. und N. T.), 1812—19, and in the Introduction to the Old Testament by De Wette.

When the student has no leisure to examine the works which have appeared for and against both parts of the Bible, then is it especially recommended to him to select two authors of solid merit, who shall best represent the two conflicting parties, and to examine their respective arguments in favor of, and in opposition to, some one scriptural book. He should adopt this course, in order to obtain a general impression of the comparative force of argument on the two opposing sides.

We have several extended Introductions to the New Testament. That of Hug, Prof. of Theol. in Freiburg, a Catholic, is learned and is written in an interesting style. The third edition of it appeared in 1829.¹ He has attempted to vindicate and sustain the genuineness of all the books, which are commonly regarded as canonical. Schott published an Introduction to the books of the New Testament (*Isagoge in Lib. N. T.*) in 1829. In this work he sets forth the results of the higher criticism with sobriety, learning and candor. Credner published an Introduction in 1836, in which the investigations are erudite, and are exhibited with perspicuity, but in some cases they indicate an arbitrariness, capriciousness of judgment. Other works in this department are Olshausen's Proof of the Genuineness of the New Testament Writings (*Nachweisung der Echtheit sämmtlicher Schriften des N. T.*), 1832, and De Wette's Introduction to the New Testament. The last named is the most skeptical of all the New Testament Introductions.²

† 23. *Literature of the Exegesis.*

The requisites for a biblical interpreter are to be set forth as follows. First, all good interpretation of the Scriptures depends upon this, that the commentator himself possess the spirit of his author, or that he be able to transfer himself into that spirit. Many commentators of the latter half of the preceding century were greatly deficient in this sympathetic quality. This is seen in the work of Vogel, entitled, *John and his Commentators before the Judgment-seat (Johannes und seine Ausleger vor dem jüng-*

¹ Two translations of this work into the English language have appeared, one in England by Daniel G. Wait, LL. D., and a much more accurate one in America by David Fosdick, Jr.—Tr.

² Translated by Rev. Theodore Parker, of Roxbury, Mass.—Tr.

sten Gericht). In Vol. I. p. 26 of this work the author says of the Evangelist John, that he "was adapted to the weakness of those men upon whom the philosophical spirit of our century, (alluding to the philosophical speculations of Kant,) has not been poured out." The same is seen in the commentary of Lange upon the first epistle of John, where the author calls on the reader to sympathize with the evangelist, "who was, at the time of his writing that epistle, a weak old man, and had no longer the power of thinking in any connected manner." The unfitness of such a commentator to give the spirit of a biblical writer is especially shown by Dr. Paulus, who gives the following explanation of John 9: 4, "I must heal the diseased eyes before the evening twilight comes on, because when it is dark we can no longer see to work." It may be offered as a general remark, that this deep sympathy, this identity of spirit, between interpreters of the Bible and the writers of it, is wanting in those commentators who adopt the principles of the falsely-called historical interpretation. The commentaries of Meyer are in this respect very deficient; those of Rückert are less so.

Secondly, the biblical writer must be explained psychologically; that is, a man must transfer himself into the identical situation of the individual whose writings he interprets. Chrysostom is remarkable for this excellence in his comments on the Epistles of Paul, as also is Calvin in his Exposition of Paul's Epistles and of the Psalms.

Thirdly, a commentator must explain the meaning of a biblical writer in the true spirit of the ancient history; that is, he must bring before the eyes of the modern a picture of the whole mode of life, which was adopted in the days of inspiration, the whole character and the accidental peculiarities of the Jews and early Christians. Dr. Paulus has a remarkable talent for this vividness of representation. Neander's *Life of Jesus* is entirely destitute of such picturesque exhibitions. Gesenius gives them in his *Commentary on Isaiah*.

Fourthly, an interpreter must explain the sacred text with philological exactness. The *Exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians* by Harless is, in this respect, excellent and may be called a master-piece.

We need three kinds of Commentary on every book of the sacred Scripture. The first is such a commentary as shall serve the purposes of a *repertorium*, and shall contain, in reference to every passage, all the information which the student shall wish to pro-

cure. It must exhibit the entire history of the expositions that have been given, and answers to the critical, grammatical, and archaeological questions that have been proposed on every part of the text. An old work of this description is the commentary of Chemnitz, entitled *Harmonia quatuor Evangeliorum*, continued by Leyser and Gerhard, in three volumes. Among the more modern works of this description are Gesenius's *Commentary on Isaiah*, Tholuck on the *Sermon on the Mount*,¹ and Bleek's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Secondly, we need that species of Exposition, the chief design of which is to exhibit the spirit of the sacred books in a connected manner, and also to develop their doctrinal contents. The commentaries of Olshausen are excellent in this respect. Thirdly, we need commentaries for cursory reading. These are especially important for students, and should contain the most important parts of the verbal and historical exposition. Of this kind are the commentaries of Matthies, Meyer, De Wette, Tholuck on John.² The commentary of Meyer has explained the antique phraseology of the sacred books with exactness and appropriate brevity; but has failed in its exhibition of the doctrinal system, and of the spirit and ideas found in these books. If a commentator aim to unfold the rational import of the figurative expressions in the Bible, he is said by Meyer to pursue a falsely *rationalistic* method. Such a style of exposition as Meyer's will keep the mind always outside of the sacred writer's meaning. The commentaries of Matthies, on the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians, give a spirited theological exposition of these books with a proper degree of conciseness. This expositor, should have given more attention, however, to the helps which learned men have provided for the interpretation of the scriptural text. The merits of De Wette's Commentaries are stated in Tholuck's *Vermischte Schriften*, in an article entitled, *The Characteristics of De Wette as an Interpreter*.

The exegetical works on the Old Testament which have been prepared with reference to the wants of students are, the *Abridgement of Rosenmüller's Commentary*, and the *Commentary of Maurer*. Neither of these works gives a good theological and religious exposition, but that of the last named author far surpasses that of the first named, in acute apprehension of the thought, and in exact explanation of the words of the text.

¹ A part of this commentary was translated by Prof. Torrey, in the *Bib. Rep.* Vol. V.—Tr.

² Translated into English

There are exegetical works of a more comprehensive character than those already mentioned. The first of these is the *Critici Sacri*, in nine folio volumes. This is a collection of the most celebrated expositions, which appeared in the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth. In respect of philology and exegesis, it is indeed meagre; still it goes over the whole ground of the Hebrew Scriptures, and comments on the New Testament also. The second of these comprehensive works is more modern, the *Scholia* of Rosenmüller. The chief deficiency in this work is, its want of spirit in its treatment of the inspired authors. Neither their thoughts nor their language are examined by Rosenmüller in a very penetrating manner, and there is but very little life or animation in his whole work. It is praiseworthy, however, for the industry which it exhibits in its author, for the simplicity and naturalness of its expositions. Rosenmüller was in a great degree dependent on other philologists, especially on Clericus (*Le Clerc*), and *Heinr. Joh. Michaelis*. In many places he has barely transcribed the words of these commentators.

The greatest desideratum of the Old Testament Literature for our times is, that of a *Theologia Prophetica*; by which is meant a treatise on the distinctive marks of a prophet's office, or the nature of the prophetic gift, and on the predictions themselves. We possess three works of this character. The first is Hengstenberg's *Christology*.¹ This contains an explanation of those passages in the Old Testament which refer to Christ, and also an introductory explanation of the author's theory of prophecy. This discussion on the distinctive character of the prophetic gift is, however, peculiarly deficient and imperfect. True, the writer uniformly exhibits acuteness in his reasonings, but is mechanical in his style of thought, and often constrained, forced. The last part of his *Christology* is written in a freer spirit than the first. The second work in reference to this subject is, *Knobel on the Prophetic character (über den Prophetismus)*, in two parts, 1837. This book is composed on the principles of Rationalism, and is useful as a collection of theories, but is deficient in spirit and originality. The third work in this department is, the *Prophetic Character of the Old and New Testaments (der Prophetismus des A. und V. T.)*, by Köster, published in 1838. This treatise is written in the spirit of accommodation between the opposing

¹ Translated into English by Dr. Reuel Keith of Alexandria, D. C. Prof. Hengstenberg intends to make a thorough revision of this work, and issue an improved edition of it.—Tr.

theories. It is in great measure destitute of severe discrimination, and of lucid proof, but contains much excellent matter in reference to some relations of the subject, and may be especially recommended to students.—Compare also Tholuck's Treatise previously referred to, entitled, *The Old Testament in the New*.

At the present day it is demanded of the prophetic theology, that it be able, altogether independently of the Messianic predictions, to show the absolute impossibility of denying a supernatural influence upon the mind of the Jewish prophet. Such unquestionable proof must be deduced from that prophetic writer, the authenticity of whose book is entirely undisputed, and who even himself asserts that he wrote down the predictions with his own hand, or caused them to be written according to his dictation. That prophet is Jeremiah, see 30 : 1, 2. 36 : 4. 51 : 60. We may derive from Jeremiah an admirable picture of the self-denial, the fear of God, the sufferings for the cause of God which distinguished the old prophets. There are, moreover, some passages of his writing which must be recognized without a scruple as predictions; see ch. 25 : 12, ch. xxviii, ch. 31 : 16, et seq., ch. 50 : 41, etc. Before all others, then, the prophet Jeremiah claims to be accurately studied. Next to him, the prophets Hosea and Amos will give a lively view of the spirit of their office, and the reality of their predictions.

After we have proved, beyond all rational doubt, that the men who are called prophets did actually possess the power of foretelling future events, then we may pass to the consideration of the Messianic Psalms. When we examine these Psalms, we must proceed on the basis of a remark, which Peter makes concerning the state of the ancient seers in uttering their predictions; see 1 Peter 1 : 11, 12. From this passage it is evident, that the same spirit which was in Christ, was also manifested in those prophets, and that by means of this identity of spirit they obtained presentiments of the future christian scheme, that they had no clear insight into the scheme, and especially that they were ignorant of the time when it should be introduced. The remark, that the spirit of Christ which was in the prophets waked up within them a power to foretell future events, gives us a clearer idea than we should otherwise have of the prophetic gift. The spirit of Christianity had already begun to reign, in its first principles, among the better portion of the Jewish people. This spirit raised them in certain important particulars, far above the religious standard of their countrymen and of their age. Thus we find in the Old Tes-

tament such ideas and expressions, as are not at all homogeneous with the spirit and character of the Mosaic economy. It is said of Abraham, that nothing but his faith commended him to the favor of God, and that his faith was counted to him for righteousness, see Gen. 15: 6. In like manner also, David expresses the idea of free grace and of the forgiveness of sins procured without a ceremonial offering. He says, that the worshipper should sacrifice his own will rather than a dumb animal to God, see Psalms 51: 16, 17. 40: 6, 7, 8. comp. Heb. 10: 8, 9. But especially deserving of notice, yea more remarkable than any other production in the Old Testament, is Jeremiah 31: 31—34. In this passage, a prophet of the ancient dispensation himself predicts, that the first covenant will ultimately be dissolved, and that the new covenant will be distinct from the old in several important particulars. One particular is, that the law shall be applied, under the new dispensation, not to outward works but to the exercises of the will, to the inward motives. Another particular is, that the prophet's office and the priest's office shall be discontinued, and that all men shall possess a like amount of religious knowledge; comp. Heb. 8: 8—13. In the same spirit also Isaiah recognizes the truth, that the servant of God must be brought into a state of humiliation in order to atone for the sins of the people, and that he will be exalted after he has been thus humbled, see Is. ch. lii.

The idea of the scenes that were to occur in futurity, was sometimes clearly unfolded in the Old Testament, and at other times was so darkly shadowed forth, in the peculiar style of that book, as to compel us to separate the idea from the form, in order to ascertain the precise scope of the Revelation. Thus the Messiah is represented, in some passages, as king and priest; Jerusalem, as the central point in the new kingdom of God; the conversion of the Heathen, simply as a conversion to pure Judaism. See the second and eleventh chapters of Isaiah, the fourth of Micah, etc. In other passages, the distinguishing idea of the New Covenant is brought forward with such clearness, that the institutions of the Old Covenant seem to be entirely abolished by means of the New. Thus Isaiah 66: 21 teaches, that priests will be chosen from the Gentiles even, and this is a thought which opposes the whole spirit of the Mosaic economy. When Peter says, that the prophets have ministered to us more than to themselves by their predictions, he means that they had certain presentiments concerning the future scheme of Christianity, but that they could not comprehend the mode in which their predictions would be fulfilled, and

that we, having actually witnessed the fulfilment of these prophecies, are the first who can reap the full benefit of them.

The orthodoxy of former days has failed in its explication of prophecy. It has aimed to prove, that even the minutest particulars of the christian scheme are accurately foretold in the prophetic writings. Umbreit has published several treatises, which serve to harmonize the older with the newer orthodoxy in reference to this subject. His essay on the "Servant of God," in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 4th No. 1836, is a valuable contribution of this kind. Compare Tholuck on Isaiah lii, in the second supplement to the *Commentary on the Hebrews*. See also Umbreit on the Prophets as popular orators, in the fourth No. of the *Stud. und Krit.* 1833.

There is scarcely a commentator, from whom so much may be learned in regard to the religious import of the Old Testament, as Calvin. His commentary on the Psalms is especially serviceable for this end. A new edition of it was published, in two volumes, in 1836. In more recent times the religious character of the Psalms has been developed by Umbreit in his work entitled, *Erbauung aus dem Psalter*, in which he has given an exposition of a small number of the Psalms. Ewald's *Commentary* on this part of the Old Testament has the merit of presenting the poetical character of the Psalms in a clear and proper light. De Wette's *Commentary* exhibits much prejudice in regard to the critical and dogmatical questions which he discusses. The commentary of Maurer meets the wants of the student, who is searching particularly for philological information.¹

It is not right to regard the interpretation of the Messianic Psalms (so called), as the principal object to be attended to in the study of the Psalter. The student should rather devote his chief attention to the unfolding of the elements of the christian religion, which are suggested in those sacred lyrics. We are to give especial heed to such remarkable disclosures of our need of redemption, and of the pious man's consciousness of peace with God, as are made in Psalms xxiii, and ciii, and 73 : 25. Passages of this character may in fact be termed *prophetic*; for they contain other principles than those of the Mosaic religion, and they cannot be fully understood if we examine them in the light of

¹ When these lectures on Encyclopaedia were last delivered, the author's own commentary on the Psalms had not appeared; and only the first volume of Hengstenberg's. Hengstenberg's commentary is now in process of translation into English.—Tr.

mere Judaism. It must be confessed, however, that many Psalms are called Messianic, which are not so in reality. There are some, for example, in which the Messiah has been supposed to speak directly, and in the first person. But we are not authorized to consider any Psalms as strictly Messianic, except the second, and the hundred and tenth, and in these the Messiah does not himself speak, but is spoken of in the third person. Those Psalms, in which the poet introduces himself in the first person, must be regarded as the songs of David, or of some other composer. Still, it is none the less true that in these songs we find certain elements, which we may denominate Messianic; for the authors of them express such hopes as rise above the standard of their times and of their people. How, for example, was it possible that David, under the influence of no extraordinary illumination, could regard his own deliverance from suffering, as a prelude to the conversion of the whole heathen world; see Psalm 22: 28. The last song of David, as it is authentically preserved to us in the 23d chapter of 2 Samuel, authorizes us to look for some references to the Messiah in this collection of sacred songs.

The best of the older commentaries on the minor prophets, Hosea, Joel, Micah, Malachi, is that by Pococke, published in 1625. In its theological as also in its philological character, this exposition is one of the most thorough and profound. The modern commentaries, which are most worthy of notice, on this part of the Bible, are Gesenius, Hitzig, and Umbreit on Isaiah, Umbreit on Jeremiah, Hävernick on Daniel, Ewald on all the Prophets.

Since the end of the preceding century, the falsely-styled historical interpretation has prevailed in the exegesis of the New Testament. The commentators of the age now passing away, have treated this book as an ancient depository of the old Jewish opinions, such opinions as can be of but little service at the present time. It is on this account that Hegel¹ said of these interpreters, "they treat the New Testament, (as if they had no personal interest in it,) as if they were writing-clerks, taking an inventory of goods for a merchant who has hired them." But the new interest in practical religion, which has been awakened since the year 1817, has imparted life to the interpretation of the New Testament. It was this experimental religion, that first gave the impulse to exegesis. Men came back to the New Testament as

¹ The influence of Hegel was adverse to the spirit and the form of Rationalism in Germany. He often spoke of the Rationalistic system as "superficial," "shallow," "hollow," "low," "flat."—Tr.

the basis of theology, and strove, chiefly by means of exegesis, to give a luminous view of the ideas contained in the Gospels and Epistles. The commentaries which were first published with this intent, are, Lücke on John, and Tholuck on the Romans. The same exposition was afterwards adopted by others, among whom the most prominent is Olshausen. His commentaries have some peculiar merits. First, he treats the New Testament as a whole, and therefore always explains insulated passages with reference to the entire doctrinal system of the evangelists and apostles. Secondly, he makes it an especial object, to give a complete development of the ideas suggested by the sacred writers, and particularly of those ideas which are expressed in the manner most liable to elicit complaint or objection. Thirdly, he endeavors to show the harmony between the contents of Scripture and the demands of human reason. The same tendency is obvious in the commentaries of Harless on Ephesians, Steiger on the first Epistle of Peter, Pelt on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Matthies on the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians and Philippians. The commentaries of Rückert, also, on the Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Galatians, and Corinthians, are composed with this design, to develop the ideas, to unfold the spirit, of the apostle. He very frequently, however, passes a hasty and rash criticism upon his author, and rejects the assertions of the inspired penmen, before he has penetrated into their real meaning.

In connection with the above named commentators, Fritzsche is deserving of honorable mention, as one who has advanced the philology and the criticism of the sacred writings. He has performed many valuable services to the critical as well as to the distinctively exegetical department of the New Testament literature. He has frequently, however, mistaken the meaning of the sacred text, and given insipid and trivial expositions of it. His errors have been occasioned, sometimes, by his want of theological knowledge, and often by his excessive philological nicety. He has published commentaries on Matthew, Mark, and the Epistle to the Romans.¹

We will now give a few hints in reference to the method of studying the New Testament. In the first place, it is necessary, for the understanding of any work, to take a preliminary survey of the whole; and accordingly, when we wish to study a particu-

¹ This author, Ch. Fred. Augustus Fritzsche, Prof. of Theol. at Rostock, is the same who made the celebrated (notorious) attacks upon Prof. Tholuck in 1831 and 1832.—Tr.

lar book of the New Testament, it is desirable that we first read the entire book in a cursory manner. During this preparatory perusal, we should not delay very long on any single passage. Still, as some expressions may be so difficult of comprehension, as to suggest no distinct idea when they are examined for the first time, we may profitably read a short Commentary in connection with them. Otto von Gerlach's (popular) Commentary on the New Testament, in three parts, is appropriate to this end. After this cursory perusal, we should commence the close and fundamental study of the book, and should make use of such a philological treatise upon it, as will explain not only the language and the historical references of the text, but also its ideas and its spirit. When the student has thus examined an entire chapter, let him embrace the results of his study in a paraphrase of that chapter. In this paraphrase, he should have especial regard to the transitions from one verse to another, and should designate the force of the particles by which those transitions are indicated. Secondly, as every organized whole is the more thoroughly understood, by means of an insight into the single individual parts of which it is composed, so it is desirable that some one prominent book of the New Testament be made the especial object of the student's investigations; that it be studied slowly and thoroughly, and that all the most distinguished commentators upon it be also examined. Thirdly, the interpretation of the Bible must be prosecuted from first to last with an unremitting reference to the especial duties of the pastoral office. These duties constitute the ultimate object of the ordinary theologian in his biblical investigations. It is therefore highly conducive to the end for which he studies, that he have an interleaved Bible, in which he may write everything which serves in any manner to the elucidation of the sacred text. This copy of the Scriptures should be his Repertorium for sentences, thoughts, illustrations, which may reflect any light upon scriptural passages. It is especially important, that the theologian be mindful of the great advantages which result from a collection of parallel texts from the Bible. Such a collection is useful both to the learned commentator, and also to the ordinary reader of the Scriptures.

[To be concluded.]