

most rigidly scientific methods in the examination of testimony. But it is not scientific to try and make it square with preconceived views; to misquote or to misrepresent authorities; and to suppress passages which modify, elucidate, or explain excerpts, which, in an English translation, appear *prima facie* to give some sort of colour to Agnostic perversions of truth.

WILLIAM KERR-SMITH.

ART. IV.—THE LANGUAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART II.

BEFORE discussing the languages *written* by the Apostles and the Evangelists, which will form Part III. of this series, it will help the reader, desirous to obtain a full grasp of the subject, if we cast a glance back on the annals of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, and mark the contact which Abraham and his descendants had with individuals and nations speaking other languages. It is one of the most remarkable evidences of the *absolute* truthfulness and genuineness of the Old Testament Record, that no modern philological or palæographical discovery shakes the credibility of the record, if erroneous conceptions, based upon imperfect knowledge of linguistic phenomena, are removed, and the subject is regarded in the same spirit, and from the same point of view, that other records of antiquity are examined. The reader must bear in mind that I write, not as a theologian (for which I have no capacity), but as a linguist. I accept, as an undoubted fact, the inspiration of the contents of the books of the Old Testament. My remarks apply solely to the linguistic vehicle of words and sentences, and forms of written character.

A Syrian (Abraham), 1921 B.C., crossed from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan. He spoke Aramaic; he came into contact with kindred Semitic tribes, who inhabited the land. He was aged seventy, and not likely to change his language; he was accompanied by his wife Sara and his brother's son, and the large number of upwards of 300 purchased, or home-bred slaves. He went down into Egypt, at that time ruled over by a powerful dynasty, and the documents of stone and papyrus certify that the language was totally different from Hebrew or Aramaic, being Hamitic. Pharaoh is described as conversing with Abraham, presumably through interpreters; the words of the conversation are given in Hebrew. Canaan was invaded by Chederlaomer, who spoke a totally different and Altaic language; but no conversations are recorded. In Melchisedek we have a Semite beyond doubt, as, if anyone wished to

express the idea of a King of Righteousness, he would use those very words to this day in Arabia, Persia, and India. The King of Sodom conversed with Abraham; we may presume that he also was a Semite. Hagar was an Egyptian girl, who had probably accompanied Sara from Egypt, and adopted the language of her mistress, but her son Ishmael married an Egyptian, and adopted some early form of the Arabic language, which his descendants speak to this day. Rebecca came to Isaac from Aram, speaking the language of her country. Their son Jacob, at the age of seventy-seven, went across the Euphrates, and married four Aramean wives, and his father-in-law is described as "the Syrian." The language had even then differentiated, for when Jacob and Laban raised a heap of stones, Laban called it *Jegar-sahadutha*, and Jacob "Galid." The word used by Laban for "witness" is still used in a kindred form in Persia, and India, and Arabia, "shahid," as a "witness and a martyr to the faith." The whole of Jacob's large family must have spoken the language of their respective mothers, when they returned to Canaan, and with the exception of Joseph they found wives among the people of the land. The Hebrew language thus began to form itself. The Ishmaelites from Gilead, to whom the sons of Jacob sold Joseph, were, if descendants of Ishmael, their own first cousins. They are called also Midianites, but if descendants of Ketura, they stood in the same relationship, and probably spoke mutually intelligible languages. But Joseph, when he arrived in Egypt, had to learn an entirely new language, and he did so, for it is particularly mentioned, that he spoke to his brethren through an interpreter. He had married an Egyptian wife, and his children were certainly bilingual. The descendants of Jacob dwelt a long time in Egypt, and during that period, free from all Aramaic influences, and singularly free from Egyptian taint, the Hebrew language acquired the form, which is known to us. Still, they must have acquired some knowledge of Egyptian, as at any rate they could understand the orders of their taskmasters, and they were able to borrow gold and silver and raiment from their Egyptian neighbours.

Moses was brought up in Pharaoh's daughter's house, as her son, and an Egyptian. He was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; if he had picked up Hebrew from his nurse, it was his second, or alternative, language. At the age of forty he fled to Arabia, and was introduced to Jethro, as an Egyptian, probably from the style of his dress, or his language. He spent forty years in the desert, speaking the language of the Midianites, whatever that was. At the age of eighty he led the Hebrews out of Egypt, 1491 B.C., and, for the first time in his life, lived in familiar intercourse with his relations, using the Hebrew language. Forty years more he spent in the desert in

their midst, having his wife and her relatives with him: his children must have been bilingual, while he himself was trilingual. In his old age he married a Cushite (Ethiopian) woman, who must have spoken a Hamitu language, akin to Egyptian. A few words, and some proper names, in Exodus record his knowledge of the Egyptian language. But he was chosen to be the historian of his people, and must have collected the traditions, and teledoth, of his ancestors from the graybeards and recorded them in the language then used by the Hebrew people. The grave question now arises, What written character did he use? The Hieroglyphic, and Hieratic, characters were both in existence, and must have been known to Moses, who was a learned man; on the other hand, no allusion to the art of writing occurs in the Book of Genesis. We find the letters K T B applied to writing then, and they have the same meaning in Arabia, Persia, and India to this day. The oldest record of the Phœnician alphabet, which was the one used by the Hebrews, dates 900 B.C., or 600 after the Exodus. There is little doubt, that the Phœnicians derived their famous alphabet, the mother of all the alphabets in the world, from the Hieratic ideographs of Egypt; but with our present limited information we cannot explain, how Moses, with his antecedents of forty years in Egypt, and forty years in the desert, became acquainted with it. No document of stone or papyri, so abundant in Egypt, has survived as evidence. It is most unfortunate, that, while the surrounding nations, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, the Moabites, the Phœnicians, and the Hittites, have all left stone inscriptions, the Hebrews were at no period of their history a monumental people. It need scarcely be said that all manuscripts have perished: the oldest Hebrew MS. in existence is not earlier than 800 A.D. Still, in this age of wonderful discoveries, we may anticipate the production of earlier stone monuments, and must hesitate before we arrive at final opinions.

It has often been wondered, how the Hebrew language, from 1451 B.C., the date of the death of Moses, to 500 B.C., the time of Ezra, exhibits no material change, such as would be expected in the lapse of one thousand years. How different is the language of the age of King Alfred from that of Queen Victoria! It is supposed that, as time went on, the Hebrew language, as known to us, stiffened into a written language (an instance of which process we have to this day in Latin), while the vernacular underwent gradual changes from century to century; at any rate, Ezra and Daniel commenced their books in Hebrew, and ended them in Aramaic. Such books as the Kings and Chronicles were compiled from contemporary documents.

Returning to the time of Moses, to consider the vernacular spoken, it is clear, that Balaam and Balak could not have been

acquainted with the Hebrew language, and yet the gleaming words of the former reach us in that vesture. From a linguistic point of view the Book of Job has no interest, as, admittedly, it is a beautiful dramatic poem, such as Milton's "Paradise Lost." When the spies entered Jericho, they were kindly treated, though in secret, by Rahab: there could have been no interpreter there. Women in the East are not often bilingual. The spies had been forty years in the desert, and their ancestors centuries in Egypt; yet somehow or other they held communications with a Canaanitish woman. Soon after the occupation of Canaan, we find a divergence of pronunciation betwixt the dwellers on east side of Jordan, betraying the residence of the speaker, in the Shibboleth story. Ruth the Moabitess could hardly have acquired Hebrew, living among her own people; it is more probable, that Naomi acquired the Moabite language. In that case, the beautiful expression of love to her mother-in-law is only a translation from Moabite; but the words are as musical in English, the second translation, as they are in Hebrew, the first. It is a matter of uncertainty, who the Philistines were, but they could scarcely have been Semites: they were probably from Egypt. It is obvious that Delilah did not speak to Samson in Hebrew; and when the giant Goliath taunted David, a mere shepherd lad, he could hardly have used Hebrew, as he treated the whole nation with scorn, and swore by his own gods; and no interpreter was possible on such an occasion, but David understood the drift of his boasting threats, and answered him. Among David's servants was Uriah the Hittite; this language is still an unrevealed secret, but it was not Hebrew. It is probable that, as a mercenary soldier, he knew Hebrew, and he married a Hebrew woman. With Hiram, King of Tyre, David contracted a friendship, and the Phœnician language, being closely allied to the Hebrew, was no doubt mutually intelligible. With Solomon we find an Egyptian wife, followed by Egyptian-speaking attendants, settled at Jerusalem. And to Solomon came the Queen of Sheba from the uttermost parts of the earth, as One, who cannot err, tells us; and, if the map of the known world of that period is examined, it is literally true; but we have no hint as to the language she spoke, and by what means she conversed with King Solomon. And the memorable words, uttered by her, could not have been spoken by her in Hebrew. Jeroboam, the first King of Israel, had been a sojourner in Egypt, and Shiskak, king of that country, came and plundered Jerusalem in the time of Rehoboam. If we are to believe the Egyptian Chronicles, these invasions were frequent; and the Egyptian language must have been known to individuals. Ahab, King of Israel, married Jezebel, daughter of the King of Tyre, speaking the Phœnician language: she was

accompanied by the priests of Baal. The cries of these priests to their gods on Mount Carmel must have been in Phœnician; and the language of Elijah, "the Tishbi," from Gilead, east of the Jordan, must have been something different from Hebrew, probably Aramaic. According to the universal practice of all Oriental chroniclers all the sayings, both of Elijah and the priests, are recorded in the conventional Hebrew of the Book of Kings. When we come to reflect upon the language spoken by Jezebel, we have to face new phenomena. She was the daughter of Ethbaal, King of Tyre, and priest of Astarte: of the same family, in the next generation, came Belus and Dido, also called Elissa, who founded Carthage. We have to thank these two women for the names of Isabel and Elisa. We know what the Phœnician language was from inscriptions, such as that on the sarcophagus of Esmunazar in the Gallery of the Louvre. If anyone were to doubt, that Carthage was a Phœnician colony, the stones with Punic inscriptions would cry out to correct him. Some such language was spoken by Jezebel and her followers; and it was not Hebrew. Athaliah, her daughter, probably took it with her to Jerusalem. The discovery of the Moabite Stone has revealed to us the language of Moab; it is the oldest specimen of alphabet-writing in the world, 900 B.C.: and it records the defeat of King Ahab by the King of Moab. In the time of Elisha we find the conversations of the King of Syria at Damascus, and Naaman the Syrian, and a letter to the King of Israel, all in Hebrew, as if textually quoted; but we feel instinctively, that the language of the Hebrews could not have been used by these speakers, whose vernacular was Aramaic.

The prophet Isaiah wrote about 750 B.C. In chapter xix., verse 18, he writes: "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan," or, in other words, the Jewish settlers in Egypt shall speak the language once spoken by the Canaanites, but "which" (to quote the Speaker's Commentary) "had been sanctified by being employed as the vehicle for the commemoration of God's purposes to mankind, and was called Hebrew."

The power of Assyria, with its capital Nineveh, on the Tigris, began now to be known; and in the reign of Hezekiah Jerusalem was besieged, about 725 B.C. We find the servants of Hezekiah upon the walls of the beleaguered town, beseeching Rabshakeh not to speak in the Jews' language, or Hebrew, but in Aramaic, the language of Damascus, in order that the common people might not understand his words. The language of Assyria itself has now been revealed by inscriptions as Semitic, but distinct from both the above. Then came the captivity at Babylon, 588 B.C., and the Jews had to listen to another

Semitic language, the Babylonian, of which we have ample information from cuneiform inscriptions; and the Hebrew language, which had been formed during the captivity in Egypt, received its death-stroke during the captivity at Babylon. Here, however, they were destined to come into contact with a new people, speaking an Aryan language, the Persian. One word of that language had crept into the Song of Solomon, "pardes," which has become one of the notable words of the Eastern and Western worlds as "fardus," or "Paradise." The Persian is one of the most illustrious of the Aryan languages, as it passed from Zend into Pahlavi, and from Pahlavi into Persian. If on the one hand it was strengthened by contact with, and absorption of, Semitic elements from the Arabic, on the other hand it has, from its own resources, lent strength to the Aryan Hindustani, and the Altaic Turki. It stands by the side of the English as one of the two Aryan languages, which have had the strength in themselves to free themselves from the tyranny of inflections and grammatical gender. We know the language, in which Cyrus and Darius spoke to Daniel from the inscriptions upon Cyrus's tomb at Persepolis, and the stately tablets of Darius's inscriptions at Behistun.

The remnant of the Jews returned, under Zerubbabel, to Jerusalem in 536 B.C. The prophets Haggai, Malachi, and Zachariah still wrote the conventional Hebrew. Artaxerxes, 467 B.C., sent Ezra to Jerusalem: his book commences in Hebrew and ends in Aramaic. In 445 B.C., Nehemiah arrived at Jerusalem. His book lets side-lights in upon the language spoken by the people he saw. "Jews apparently at Jerusalem, who had married wives of Ashdod (Philistines), of Ammon and Moab, and their children spoke half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the language of the Jews, but according to the language of each people." Daniel had commenced his book in the Hebrew, and finished it in the Aramaic language. The teaching of the prophets had ceased: the Hebrew language was no longer spoken. Like Sanscrit and Latin, it had done its great work, and died away. In the Book of Esther, of the same period, we read of the one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, to the inhabitants of each of which the great King wrote *according to their writing and their language*, from India in Further Asia to Ethiopia in Africa. All have passed away, language and written character, save Hebrew and Greek, for to them were committed the oracles of God. As time went on, the Jewish nation had to receive its orders in Greek, and then in Latin, and under the fiat of the latter ceased itself to exist, A.D. 70; for the nation, also, had completed the task which was given it to do, when Abraham was called two thousand years before.

In Part I. I stated that it was not the *same* Aramaic which was spoken by Abraham, and by our Lord, but it was *similar*. This cannot be brought home more strongly than by considering in a reverential spirit what is told us with regard to the Transfiguration. St. Luke tells us, on the authority of Peter and John and James, who were eye-witnesses, that Moses and Elijah talked with our Lord, and spake of His decease, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. Now the epoch, at which Moses lived, is distant from that of Elijah by the interval of five centuries, and that of Elijah from that of our Lord by an interval of nine centuries. The Apostles heard with their ears and comprehended with their understanding the solemn purport of the words uttered by each speaker, all of whom used the Aramaic language. But we cannot shut our eyes to the great fact that, judging human phenomena in the ordinary way, the form of Aramaic words and sentences used by Moses must have differed materially from that of Elijah, and that of Elijah from that of our Lord, and the Apostles, who understood them. It is difficult to suggest a solution.

One word on the subject of "bilingual" individuals and populations. In the new Oxford English Dictionary it is interpreted as speaking, reading or writing, in two languages, but in linguistic works it has a narrower sense. Every young girl who learns French in the schoolroom, and boy, who learns Latin at school, is, according to the Dictionary, "bilingual." Every inscription with the text translated into a second language is bilingual. But, when a traveller reports that the uneducated inhabitants of an island, or region, are bilingual, or in a linguistic work we read that a belt of country is occupied by a *bilingual* population, something very different is intended to be implied. It means that the men, women and children, without receiving instruction, but under the influence of the circumstances which surround them, unconsciously get into the habit of speaking (not necessarily writing or reading) two languages. In Switzerland, overlapped by their great French, Italian, and German neighbours, nearly every one is bilingual. On the borders of England and Wales we find the same phenomenon. In large belts of country in British India, which lie betwixt great linguistic regions, such as Tamil-land and Telugu-land in the one case, and Bengal and Behar in the other, the populations speak indifferently both languages. This is Provincial, or National, bilingualism. But there may be also "Family or Tribal" bilingualism, the result of intermarriages betwixt persons speaking naturally different languages. Purchased slaves learn to speak the languages of their masters, without forgetting their own. The same thing is happening with

regard to immigrants into a strange country; the first generation in such cases is bilingual; the second adopts exclusively the new language. There is no rule absolute. Many Persian immigrants into India centuries ago still speak Persian in their families, and elsewhere the languages of India. The Jews, wherever settled, have an alternative language in reserve. On the other hand, the French Huguenots, who went out to the Cape Settlement, became blended with the Dutch Boers, and have lost their French, as the Huguenot families have in England.

It is maintained in this series of essays, that our Lord and His twelve Apostles *were not* "bilingual," either on account of their Province or Family. It will hardly be asserted, without actual proof, that there were schools for teaching Greek in Nazareth or Capernaum, and that our Lord, and the twelve attended them. No doubt they used Latin and Greek loan-words, the names of particular places, such as Dekapolis, or of particular things, such as *χῆρος*, *δηνάριον*, just as to this day the English-speaking populations use French and Latin words, but nothing more.

ROBERT CUST.



ART. V.—THE REMUNERATION OF THE CLERGY.

"I WOULD have stuck to the curacy," said an experienced clergyman, commenting upon the news that his younger friend had accepted a certain living. The criticism was no doubt a contradiction to some current modes of thinking and wishing, but it was not altogether unjustified. As a curate, he meant, his friend would at least get that which it was agreed he should get; he would get it, too, in all probability paid with tolerable punctuality, and to a certainty he would get it without any considerable drawback. Nothing, as the phrase is, was expected of him. On the contrary, many generous persons would feel themselves at liberty, and some, perhaps, would even feel themselves bound, to help him. But directly he passed from the class of the "poor curate" into the class of the so-called "fat rector," all this would be changed. He would not, perhaps, even nominally be the recipient of a much larger sum than he had before; but the calls and drawbacks would be cruelly multiplied. The income he would really receive would be found to be far below its reputed value; whatever it might be, it would in most cases be paid, not with the old punctuality, but with delay, with irregularity, often with