BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

Contents of No. 2;

[Vol. II.]

ANALYTICAL COMPARISON

OF THE

SANSKRIT, GREEK, LATIN, AND TEUTONIC LANGUAGES;

FROM THE

ANNALS OF ORIENTAL LITERATURE.

ANALYTICAL COMPARISON

OF THE

SANSKRIT, GREEK, LATIN, AND TEUTONIC LANGUAGES,

SHEWING THE ORIGINAL IDENTITY OF THEIR GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE.—BY F. BOPP.

It is now very generally admitted, that there exists a similarity between the Sanskrit and several of the languages, which by conquest or other causes, have obtained the most extensive adoption over both ancient and modern Europe. No person however, not practically acquainted with the language of the Brahmans, could be aware that there exists a coincidence so exact and so universal throughout all portions of grammar as is really the case. Many resemblances are evident at first sight, others are discovered by more careful investigation, and the more closely we analyse the recondite structure of the kindred tongues, the more we are surprised to find them constantly developed by the same principle.

A careful inquiry into the analogy of the Sanskrit with the above mentioned European languages must, on many accounts, be considered as truly valuable. It shews the higher or lower degree of affinity by which nations, who in the remotest antiquity wandered from the land of their ancestors into Europe, are connected with the present inhabitants of India. It shews, secondly, that those refinements of grammatical construction by which the Sanskrit is so advantageously distinguished from all the spoken

dialects of the Indian world, already existed in that remote antiquity, when colonies, leaving their Asiatic seats transplanted into Europe their native tongue; because by the same refined grammar which distinguishes the Sanskrit from the Bengali, Tamul, Hindustani, and the Mahratta languages, &c., it is connected with the Greek, Latin, and the ancient Teutonic dialects, among the latter, particularly with the Gothic. Hence we may conclude that the beauties of the Sanskrit language are not the work of the learned or the priesthood, as some might be inclined to suppose; but that they really were in daily use in the mouth of the people, and were so strongly impressed upon their minds, that they did not forget them in their transmigration beyond distant mountains and seas. We might further conclude, that a nation, possessing a language so polished in so early a period, where we are altogether abandoned by the light of history, must be able to boast of a very ancient literature, and it is credible that those who remained in their native country, or more in its vicinity; (for it is probable that what we call Sanskrit was spoken also in its primeval form by the ancient Persians and Medes;) would think upon means to preserve in their purity the tenets of their religious and civil institutions; that they might deliver to their successors the venerated traditions of their ancestors, they would probably invent means, of writing them down before their brethren who wandered abroad, could recover sufficient leisure for that purpose. Therefore, what the Brahmans tell us, concerning the antiquity of their Vedas, and other religious writings stands upon a more solid ground than they perhaps themselves are aware, and before the contrary has been more effectually proved than has yet been done, we may with due precaution and necessary restrictions, listen to the reports of the Hindus, who are certainly not merely guided by vanity when they so unanimously speak of the high antiquity of part of their literature.

Another and not less important reason, which makes a critical comparison of the Sanskrit with its European sisters, worthy to be undertaken, is the light thrown thereby upon each of the languages compared, and the clearer view we thence obtain of the most ancient forms of each respectively, and probably some conception of the original and primitive signification of a great part of the grammatical inflexions common to all. It is chiefly by comparison that we determine as far as our sensible and intellectual faculties reach, the nature of things. Frederick Schlegel justly expects, that comparative grammar will give us quite new explications of the genealogy of languages, in a similar way as comparative anatomy has thrown light on natural philosophy.

I do not believe that the Greek, Latin, and other European languages are to be considered as derived from the Sanskrit in the state in which we find it in Indian books; I feel rather inclined to consider them altogether as subsequent variations of one original tongue, which, however, the Sanskrit has preserved more perfect than its kindred dialects. But whilst therefore the language of the Brahmans more frequently enables us to conjecture the primitive form of the Greek and Latin languages than what we discover in the oldest authors and monuments, the latter on their side also may not unfrequently elucidate the Sanskrit grammar. That is to say, whilst the Sanskrit has preserved many grammatical forms, which can be supposed to have formerly existed in Greek, Latin, Gothic, &c., there are instances where the reverse is the case, where grammatical forms, lost in the Sanskrit, have been preserved in Greek or Latin. To explain this fact it will be necessary to offer a few remarks, which shall be more fully investigated in their proper place. The first person of the Sanskrit verb is generally indicated by an *m*, this *m* in the present tense is followed by an *i*, *b'avami*, signifies I am, the second and third persons are *b'avasi*, thou art, *b'avati*,

he is, plur. *b'avanti*, they are. From these persons the middle form* is derived by the slight change of the terminating vowel *i* into *e; b'avati, b'avanti, b'avasi*, become *b'avate, b'avante, b'avase;* corresponding with the Greek δίδοται, δίδονται, δίδοσαι. We should expect that analagous to this, *b'avami* would make in the middle form *b'avame*, but here the *m*, which is the characteristic of the first person, is lost, together with its preceding vowel, and only the terminating *e* remains, so that we find *b'ave* instead of *b'avame*. If the analogy of the Sanskrit language alone was insufficient to produce a conviction that this must have originally been the middle form of *b'avami*, the Greek forms δίδομαι, τύπτομαι, &c., would inform us that *me* (μαι) characterized the first person of the present tense, middle form, in that ancient Asiatic tongue, before it was transplanted into Europe. The Latin also has preserved the original shape of some inflections, at present lost in Greek and Sanskrit, and, whilst there is a pronoun extant in the two latter of which the former has no vestige, a few adverbs and derivatives, as *tam, tum, tot, totus, tantus*, excepted; there is one pronoun in Latin, complete in declension, which has, with the exception of a few cases, some adverbs and derivative pronouns, become obsolete in Sanskrit, and has left scarcely any traces in Greek. This subject, I hope, will be found of sufficient importance to require some further explanation, which shall be given in its proper place.

But before we enter upon our comparison, it will be necessary to explain the manner in which the Sanskrit words occurring in this essay will be written in the Roman character. The Sanskrit alphabet contains 50 single letters, and the Roman only 25, if we comprize the y and z. But as it is inconvenient in matters of grammar to represent one single letter by two or three, as is too frequently the case,

* Called by Dr. Wilkins, in his Grammar, the proper form.

I shall endeavour to propose a method by which this can be almost entirely avoided. With respect to the vowels, it will be sufficient to state, that after the example of Sir William Jones and Dr. Wilkins, I here make use of the Italian orthography as the basis, distinguishing the long from the short vowel, in Sanskrit represented by particular letters. by means of a grave accent. In a few instances, however, where grammatical differences are expressed only by the length or shortness of a vowel, I have made use of the prosodial signs, in order to attract more effectually the attention of the reader. Those who are unacquainted with the Italian, will do well to follow the French pronunciation, with the exception of the vowel *u*, which is to be pronounced as in the English word *bull*, where it has no accent, and like the word *rule*, where it is marked with a grave accent. Besides the vowels known in European languages, the Sanskrit has an *r*, considered as a vowel, with a sound much the same as that of the syllable *ri* in the English word *merrily* where the *i* is scarcely heard. In fact the *r* is the only consonant which can be pronounced without the help of any vowel, and it is therefore not at all to be wondered at that the Hindus consider it as a vowel, where it is neither preceded nor followed by another vowel, and that they have invented a particular letter for it, which it will be thought well to represent by our common *r*, with a point under it, (*ṛ*). Sanskrit grammars speak also of an *l* vowel, but this letter scarcely ever occurs, and it is therefore not necessary to embarrass ourselves with the invention of a mode of representing it.

It is proper to be acknowledged, that the Italian language has preserved most faithfully the Latin pronunciation, and we may be assured, that the single vowels, at least, were pronounced in Latin as they still are pronounced in Italian. It will be desirable therefore that, in order the better to comprehend the following comparisons, the English reader would follow the Italian pronunciation in

Latin words also, laying aside for a little while his peculiar manner of pronouncing them, by which he distinguishes himself, not much in favour of truth, from all the continental nations. With respect to the Greek pronunciation, I believe, that for the single vowels at least, that of Erasmus is to be preferred, conformably to which η corresponds to the Sanskrit *e*, and is to be pronounced like a French ê with a circumflex accent, as in the word tête ; its corresponding short vowel ε is rather to be pronounced like the French è in the word bontè. ι has always the sound of *i* in French, either short or long, and υ that of a French, if not rather of an Italian *u*. Following this pronunciation, the similarity of the Greek with the Sanskrit will appear more striking than by that generally adopted in England.

With regard to the consonants we have to observe, that in Sanskrit each has its corresponding aspirate, to express which the Indian alphabet is furnished with particular letters. It will be convenient to indicate these by the Greek sign of aspiration, in order to avoid representing one letter by two ; conformably to this I write *b'avati*, he is, and not *bhavati*. There is a letter in the Sanskrit alphabet having exactly the sound of an English *ch*, which we may use, as the only instance of two letters expressing a single sound.* Its corresponding aspirate will regularly be accompanied by the Greek sign of aspiration (*ch'*). Another Sanskrit letter has the sound of an English *j*, or of an Italian *g* before *e* or *i* ; I represent it by *j*. Where words, in which this letter occurs, are used in Latin or Greek, we generally find a *g* or γ in its place ; as for instance, *jana*, (nom. *janas*) race, family, people, (*les gens*) *genus*, γένος; *janitri*, mother, *genitrix*, γενέτειρα: *raja*, king, *rex*, *regis*, (*il rege*), *rajati*, he *reigns*, *regit*; *janu*, *knee*, (a neu-

* It might be given also by a Z, to which we could conventionally adjoin the sound of the English ch. I generally use a Z when I write Sanskrit with Roman characters for my own use, to gain time.

ter noun), *genu*, γόνυ; *rajatam*, silver, *argentum*; *jara*, decrepitude, old age, γῆρας, &c.

There are three kinds of sibilants in the Sanskrit alphabet. One corresponds to the common English *s*, as in the word *sama*, similar (*similis*, ὁμός, the *same*); another has a slight aspiration, and might be accompanied by the Greek *spiritus lenis* (*s'*). This *s'* very frequently is changed into *k*, but only after established rules of euphony, and we find that where words are in Sanskrit written with this *s'*, in Greek and in Latin a *k* or *c* are its usual substitutes; for instance, *das'a*, ten, *das'amas* the tenth, correspond to the Greek and Latin, δέκα and *decimus*; and the root *drs*, to see, which forms *drak s'yami*, I shall see, answers to the Greek verb δέρκ-ω, &c. The third sibilant has a strong aspiration, and is therefore to be marked with the *spiritus asper* (*s'*). It seldom occurs at the commencement of a word, unless it be confounded with one of the two preceding sibilants, most frequently it is a change of the first *s*, produced by the rules of euphony. The Sanskrit alphabet contains four different *n*'s, which are respectively used as the following letter may chance to be a gutteral, palatial, cerebral, or dental consonant, but as the first three scarcely ever occur at the commencement of a word, and as we have no occasion to use them in this essay, we have no need to fix upon any sign for distinguishing them from the common *n*. It will be more necessary to mark with a point, after the example given by Dr. Wilkins, a peculiar kind of *t* and *d*, called cerebral, together with their aspirates, that they may not be confounded with the common dental *t* or *d*, as *ṭ*, *ḍ*, *'ṭ*, *'ḍ*. The letter *y* wherever it occurs in this essay, in Sanskrit or Gothic words, is always to be considered as a semi-consonant, and to be pronounced as in the English word year; it answers to an Italian and German *j*.

Before we quit this tedious but unavoidable subject, we

may be allowed to pay a tribute of deserved praise to the admirable system by which the alphabet is arranged by the Sanskrit grammarians; in the original grammars the letters are classified with the most scientific skill, in an order founded upon the nature of the organs of speech by which they are respectively articulated. Many sounds, which other languages are obliged to express by several letters, can be represented by single ones in the Sanskrit alphabet, which also has particular characters for short or long vowels, and even for the dipthongs *ai* and *au;* but those connected with one another in sound bear also a similarity in the shape by which they are expressed. There is only one defect of which we may accuse the Sanskrit alphabet, namely, that the short *a*, the short Italian *e* and *o* are not distinguished from one another. For I cannot believe, that in the language of the Brahmans, when it was a vernacular tongue, the *akara* had always the power of a short *a*, and that the sounds of *e* and *o* never occurred in it; I rather think that the sign used for the short *a*, was put also to express a short *e* and *o*. If this was the case, it can be accounted for why in words common to the Sanskrit and Greek, the Indian *akara* so often answers to ε and ο, as for instance, *asti*, he is, ἐστί, *patis*, husband, πόσις; *ambaras*, sky, ὄμβρος, rain, &c.

The languages, which we shall now endeavour to shew, as being intimately connected with the Sanskrit, are the Greek, Latin, and the ancient Teutonic dialects. Among the latter we prefer the Gothic, as the oldest, and, therefore probably, bearing the greatest similitude to its Asiatic sister. Ulphila's Gothic translation of the Gospels, which has happily escaped the destruction of time, was made in the fourth century. We dare boldly affirm, that the language of Ulphila has a closer resemblance to the Sanskrit than to the English, although in the latter, as belonging to the Teutonic stock, there is not extant any gram-

matical inflection, which might not with facility be deduced from the Gothic. The reader himself can apply our remarks on the Gothic to its kindred dialects, ancient and modern, and he will find that among the modern, the German chiefly abounds in grammatical coincidences with the Sanskrit. Similar coincidences preserved in the Slavonian dialects are too striking to be entirely overlooked, and among Oriental languages, the Persian, Armenian and, we may add, the Georgian, can be proved to have had one origin with the Sanskrit, the sacred language of the Hindus. We shall perhaps have an opportunity of speaking of these in one of the following numbers, confining ourselves at present to those of a more general interest.

OF THE ROOTS.

Were we inclined to follow the example of the first grammarians, and to form a grammar by an analysis of speech, we should at the end of our labour only be led to discover those simplest elements which we call roots, and from which the Indian grammarians derive all words, from which also the larger portion, with the exception of pronouns, numerals, and particles, really do proceed. It will be well to avail ourselves of the labours of the first grammarians, and beginning with the simplest elements, contemplate the roots developing themselves under our own sight, as we may say, into various ramifications. The character of Sanskrit roots is not to be determined by the number of letters, but by that of syllables, of which they contain only one ;* they are all monosyllables, a few excepted, which may justly be suspected of not being primitives. A Sanskrit root may contain as few letters as are

* The vowels *a* and *i*, terminating verbs of the fifth and tenth conjugations, remain only in certain tenses, and therefore cannot be considered as belonging to the root.

requisite to constitute a monosyllable, that is to say, a single vowel is sufficient, and it may also accumulate as many letters as can possibly be united into one syllable. I shall give examples of the two extremities ; ì is a root, common to three languages, signifying to go. In Sanskrit we may form from it ìmas, we go, in Latin, *imus*, Greek ἴμεν, or after the Doric dialect, ἴμες. *Svask* is a root, which likewise signifies going in Sanskrit ; in this we find collected four radical consonants with one vowel. The reader will observe, that in its first elements the Sanskrit shews a strong contrast to the Arabic and its sister languages. The nature of an Arabic root is not to be determined by the number of syllables, but by that of radical letters. Three of these (quadriliteral verbs being not to be considered as primitives) neither less, nor more, characterize an Arabic root, among which letters, the short vowels, which are necessarily used to articulate the radical consonants, are not to be counted. An Arabic root may be a monosyllable, if the second radical is an *elif*, *waw*, or *ya*, as sàl, kàl, being pronounced in grammar sàla, kàla, the last short vowel does not really exist in the spoken language, which agrees more with the Hebrew. But the greatest proportion of Arabic roots contains two syllables, as Katab, barà, àtar, &c. Roots like the above mentioned ì cannot possibly occur in Arabic.

Wherever we are enabled to reduce, with any certainty, Latin, Greek and Teutonic verbs or nouns to their roots, we find them always to be monosyllables, as for instance, *da*, *sta*, *mon*, *min*, *(moneo memini)*, *frag*, *(frango, fregi)*, *vid*, *voc*, &c., corresponding to the Sanskrit roots, *da*, to give, *st a*, to stand, *man*, to mind, *b'anj*, to break, *vid*, to know, *vach*, to speak. Examples of Greek roots are φά (φάω) Sansk. *b'a*, to shine, ἐδ (ἔδω), Sansk. *ad*, to eat; δεικ (δείκνυμι, δείξω). Sansk. *dis'*, to shew; future tense, dèk-s'yàmi, I shall shew. There

are, however, roots in Greek, which bear evidently the character of having two syllables, as for instance, ὀρέγ forms the verb ὀρέγω. But if we consider, that frequently, words, which the Greek has in common with other languages, are distinguished in the former by a prefixed ο, as ὄνομα, name, *nomen;* Sansk. *naman* (nom. *nama;*) ὀδούς, ὀδόντ-ος, *dens, dent-is,* Sansk. *danta;** ὀφρύς, eye-brow, Sansk. b'rù, likewise a feminine, whose nom. is b'rùs, &c. ; if we pay due regard to these and many similar cases, we shall be inclined to take ρεγ as the primitive root of ὀρέγω, which would agree with the German root *reck (recken)*, of the same signification.

As examples of Gothic roots may be cited, *slep* (*slepan*) to sleep, Sansk. *svap; var (varyan)* to prevent, Sansk. *vr*, which forms vàrayati, he prevents, Goth *vareith; vas (vasyan)* to clothe, Sansk. likewise *vas; vai (vaian)* Sansk. và, expressing in both languages the motion of the air, *vaivoun vindos*, which occurs in Matt. vii. 25, signifies, "the winds blew;" in Sanskrit I often met with vavau vàyuh, the wind blew, *vavau* being formed by the reduplication, like the Gothic *vaivoun*, whose singular is *vaiva.*

If we can draw any conclusion from the fact that roots are monosyllables in Sanskrit and its kindred languages, it is this, that such languages cannot display any great facility of expressing grammatical modifications by the change of their original materials without the help of foreign additions. We must expect that in this family of languages the principle of compounding words will extend to the first rudiments of speech, as to the persons, tenses of verbs, and cases of nouns, &c. That this really is the

* The Greek adverb ὀδάξ will be better derived from the verbal root ΔΑΚ, to bite, connected with the Sanskrit root *das'*, (forming the future *dak-s'yami*); of the same signification.

case, I hope I shall be enabled to prove in this essay, in opposition to the opinion of a celebrated German author, who believes that the grammatical forms of the Sanskrit, and its kindred languages, consist merely of inflections, or intermodifications of words. Mr. Frederic Schlegel, in his excellent work on the language and philosophy of the Hindus, very judiciously observes, that language is constructed by the operation of two methods; by inflection, or the internal modification of words, in order to indicate a variation of sense, and secondly, by the addition of suffixes, having themselves a proper meaning. But I cannot agree with his opinion, when he divides languages, according as he supposes them to use exclusively the first or second method, into two classes, reckoning the Sanskrit language, and those of the same family, in the first, under the supposition that the second method never is used by them. I rather think that both methods are adopted in the formation of all languages, the Chinese perhaps alone excepted, and that the second, by the use of significant suffixes, is the method which predominates in all. Reduplication, for instance, is found in languages, which scarcely use any other mode of modifying words. The Arabic, and its sister languages, are considered by Mr. F. Schlegel as having a remarkable tendency to use the second method, and he very ingeniously observes: "Where the first and most essential forms, as those of persons in verbs, are marked by incorporated particles, having an independent meaning themselves, in their separate state, and where a propensity to adopt similar suffixes shews itself in the ground work of the language, there we may safely believe that the same circumstance has taken place in other instances, where the addition of foreign particles cannot now be so certainly recognized; we may be convinced that the language generally belongs to this class (which uses suffixes) notwithstanding it has already assum-

ed a higher character by means of mixture and artificial refinement." The indication of the persons of verbs in the Sanskrit language, and those of the same origin, Mr. F. Schlegel considers as being produced by inflection; but Scheidius shows very satisfactorily, with respect to the plural at least, that even the Greek verbs make use of pronouns, in compound structure with the root, to indicate the various persons. With respect to the singular, he would have succeeded much better if he had not limited himself to the corrupt form in ω, terminating the third person of the present tense, in ει, where I cannot perceive any pronoun incorporated;—but had extended his view to the form in μι, terminating the third person in the Doric dialect with τι. Scheidius commits another fault, namely, that in speaking of the pronouns he stops at the nominative, whilst the crude form of nouns may be better extracted from the oblique cases. In this way it is easy to discover that το is the radical form of the Greek article, which is originally nothing more than a pronoun of the third person, and is used as such in Homer. This το, bereft of the final vowel, becomes an essential element of verbs in their third person, singular, dual and plural, as, διδοτι*, διδοτον, διδοντι. I have no doubt but it can be proved, with as much certainty at least as in the case of the Arabic, that Sanskrit verbs also, form their persons, by compounding the root with the pronouns, upon which subject I shall offer a few remarks in its proper place. Mr. F. Schlegel does not enter into any inquiry of the origin of what is generally called grammatical inflection, this subject belonging not to the plan of his highly instructive work, if he had been induced to undertake it, it would certainly not have escaped his usual sagacity and profoundness of thought, that the greatest part of those inflections are merely additional par-

* Used in the Doric dialect, in which the original form of words is the most faithfully preserved.

ticles, whose proper signification, where it can be discovered, is more or less connected with the modification of sense induced by them upon the verb or noun. The only real inflections which I consider possible in a language, whose elements are monosyllables, are the change of their vowels and the repetition of their radical consonants, otherwise called reduplication. These two modes of inflection are used in the Sanskrit and its kindred dialects to their full extent, and often even, particularly in the former, to a useless redundancy, I mean without indicating a modification of the sense. The Arabic, together with its sister languages, having mostly roots of two syllables, is naturally capable of a greater number of internal inflections, this faculty it particularly displays in its formation of nouns, deriving from the roots a great number of them, without the help of foreign additions, whilst the Sanskrit forms almost all its nouns by means of a great number of suffixes, of which many are easily reduced to their own roots. In other parts of grammar the Arabic almost entirely neglects its capability for inflection, the verbs, for instance, have properly two tenses, only (besides an imperative mood ;) a present, which also is used as a future tense, and a preterit ; and these two tenses are chiefly distinguished by their mode of joining the pronouns, the former affixing them before, the latter suffixing them after the verb, as for instance, TA*ktub*, NA*ktub*, thou writest, we write ; *katab*TA, *katab*NA, thou wrotest, we wrote.* The Sanskrit grammar contains a great variety of tenses

* I have here in view the spoken Arabic, which agrees more than the literary with the Hebrew. The latter has a few tenses more, formed by terminations following the final radical. So the aorist YA*ktub*, which alone occurs in the spoken dialect, gives origen to YA*ktubu*, YA*ktuba*, and YA*ktubanna*. It would lead us too far beyond our immediate object to enter into any discussion, whether these tenses existed originally in the language, or whether they are an invention of gammarians after the time of Mohammed.

and moods, partly formed by composition, partly by means of inflection, as we shall endeavour to shew in the following chapter.

OF THE VERBS.

A verb, in the most restricted meaning of the term, is that part of speech, by which a subject is connected with its attribute. According to this definition it would appear, that there can exist only one verb, namely, the substantive verb, in Latin *esse;* in English, *to be.* But even these are sometimes used as attributive verbs, as in the phrase, *Deus est*, There is a God ; here the attribute ascribed to the subject, *Deus*, is expressed by the verb *est*, he is. This verb is more generally used as a mere grammatical *copula*, without conveying the idea of existence. In the phrase, *homo est mortalis*, the verb *est* merely ascribes the attribute *mortalis* to the subject *homo ;* we do not think at all of its expressing existence. In fact, existence is sufficiently expressed by the word homo, which conveys a complex idea, comprising that of existence. The only quality, supposed as unknown or not expressed by the word *homo*, is mortality, which the verb *est* attributes to the subject. One who does not exist, cannot die, and it would be superfluous to say, first, that man exists, and then state that he is subject to death. Again, if we do not renounce the idea of existence, which *est*, used as an attributive verb, expresses, then the phrase, *homo est mortalis*, instead of a simple logical proposition, offers a complex one. If after having said " *This man is . . .*" one stops suddenly, the hearer remains in expectation of what this man is, the word *is* appearing to him only a connecting particle, which does not inform him of any thing, but is only the mean of informing. The Spanish language makes use of *estar*, derived from the Latin *stare*,* as a

* The French imperfect j'étois, originally written j'éstois, comes from the same verb.

substantive verb, but here certainly we abstract from the original meaning of standing, as it may be applied to subjects sitting or lying.

It appears to me, that it is from the want of a mere grammatical *copula*, that languages make use for this purpose of a verb already attributive; but among attributive verbs, *to be* is certainly the most convenient, because every subject, to which an attribute is ascribed, exists, or is at least supposed to exist. An attribute which may be expressed by an adjective can be included in the verb itself, and such attributive verbs incline more towards the nature of adjectives than that of verbs in their grammatical functions. Languages of a structure similar to that of the Greek, Latin, &c. can express by one verb of this kind a whole logical proposition, in which, however, that part of speech which expresses the connexion of the subject with its attribute, which is the characteristic function of the verb, is generally entirely omitted or understood. The Latin verb, *dat*, expresses the proposition, he gives, or he is giving: the letter *t*, indicating the third person, is the subject, *da* expresses the attribute of giving, and the grammatical *copula* is understood. In the verb *potest*, the latter is expressed, and *potest* unites in itself the three essential parts of speech, *t*, being the subject, *es* the *copula*, and *pot* the attribute.

After these observations the reader will not be surprised, if in the languages, which we are now comparing, he should meet with other verbs, constructed in the same way as *potest*, or if he should discover that some tenses contain the substantive verb, whilst others have rejected it or perhaps never used it. He will rather feel inclined to ask, why do not all verbs in all tenses exhibit this compound structure? and the absence of the substantive verb he perhaps will consider as a kind of ellipsis. That he may be better enabled to form his opinion, it will be well to begin our comparison with the substantive verb, explaining its

entire conjugation, from which it will be easy to make due application to that of other verbs. There are two roots in Sanskrit expressing to be, *As* and *Bʻu*, answering to the Latin roots *Es* and *Fu ;* the former is almost solely employed to express the grammatical junction between subject and attribute, it is defective in its conjugation, and, in some measure, irregular ; the latter has a complete conjugation, it supplies the deficiencies of the former, like the Latin *Fu ;* and almost all words connected with the idea of existence are derived from it. In several Teutonic dialects, ancient and modern, the verb substantive is formed from two different roots, corresponding with those in Sanskrit. The English root *Be* has a striking similarity with the Indian Bʻù ; and *As* assumes in English the form of *Ar* (forming thou *art*, we *are*, &c.) the change of *S* into *R* being extremely frequent in Sanskrit as well as in several of its kindred languages. In German the first and second person, singular, of the present tense, *ich bin*, *du bist*, correspond with the Sanskrit root Bʻù and all the remaining persons with *As*. The present tense, which expresses the real conjunction of a subject with its attribute, without any restriction, is formed in Sanskrit by the mere addition to the root of the characteristics of the person. These are throughout all the tenses, with a few exceptions, *M* for the first person, singular and plural, *V* for that of the dual ; *T* for the third person of the three numbers, and, the present tense excepted, for the second, plural ; *S* for the second of the singular, and *Tʻ* for that of the dual, and the plural of the present tense, and indeed of many tenses, particularly of the middle form, also of the singular number.

In exact conformity with the Sanskrit, *M* is also the characteristic of the first person, singular and plural, in the Greek, Latin, and Teutonic languages, but in the Gothic only of the plural. In Greek μ is always changed

into ν, at the end of a word, a situation in which μ never appears, and therefore in Greek ν is the characteristic of the accusative case, which is denoted by an *m* in Sanskrit and Latin. This rule extends to the first person of verbs, where ν takes the place of μ, if it is not followed by any termination. In the language of the Franks also, *n* distinguishes the first person, singular, of the present tense, and in the plural, where this characteristic is followed by the termination *es*, it assumes its original form *m*, as *machon*, I make, *machomes*, we make. In Latin the *m* of the first person singular has been more carefully preserved in the conjunctive than in the indicative mood, where it remains in the imperfect and pluperfect only, and in the future tense of the third and fourth conjugations ; the present tense of the verbs *sum* and *inquam* excepted.

The characteristics of the other persons in Greek, Latin, and the Teutonic languages will likewise be found to agree, more or less, with those of the Sanskrit. That these characteristics are real pronouns, or the radical consonants of them, will appear perfectly evident when we come to treat of the declension of pronouns.

In the present tense the pronominal consonants *M, S, T* of the singular number and of the third person plural, are articulated with a short *i*. *Mi* joined to the root *As*, forms *asmi*, I am. ΕΣ, which is to be considered as the root of the substantive verb in Greek, connected with the syllable μι, should form ἐσμί, but the radical Σ, followed by the characteristic M, was changed in the Doric dialect into M, (ἐμμί) for sake of euphony, in the same way as the Sanskrit dative *tasmai*, to him, has assumed in Gothic the form of *thamma*. More generally ἐσμί was contracted into εἰμί, whilst in the plural, ἐσμέν is more common than its contract from εἰμέν. The Latin derived from the root *Es* the obsolete form *esum*, which was changed into *sum ;* in Gothic the radical *S* is rejected in the first person of the present

tense, but *im*, I am, is perhaps the only instance of the Gothic preserving the characteristic *m* in the singular. By the addition of the pronominal syllable *si*, to the root *As*, should be formed *assi* in Sanskrit, but one *s* has been rejected, and *asi*, thou art, agrees with the Latin *es* and the Gothic *is*. The ancient ἐσσί in Greek, derived from the root 'ΕΣ by the addition of the pronominal syllable σι, has certainly preserved the original form in its greatest purity. Ἐσσι was in later times contracted into εἶς, like ἐσμι into εἰμι. The Sanskrit third person *asti*, he is, is almost entirely identified with the Greek ἐστι, from which also the Latin *est*, and the Gothc *ist* are little different. In the plural, as well as in the dual, the Indian root *As* loses, in an irregular way, its radical vowel, but the characteristic *M* in the first person plural of the present tense, receiving the termination *as*, we find *smas*,* we are, instead of *asmas*, in which we recognize the Doric εσμές, which again claims, with greater appearance of right, to be considered as the original form. In Latin we have *sumas* and the ancient *esumas*, in Gothic *siyam*. The second person in Sanskrit is *st'a*, you are, instead of *ast'a*, which we find preserved in the Greek εσσί; the Latin *estis* corresponds more with the Indian dual *st'as*, which is used instead of *ast'as*. In the Gothic *siyuth*, we find the second person indicated by an aspirated *t*, as in the Sanskrit. The third person in the ancient language of India is *santi*, they are, which will be found exactly to resemble the Latin, *sunt* and the Gothic *sind*. The Doric ενσι, which was changed into εἰσί by the influence of the same principle that transformed τυπτουσι into τυπτωσι, is certainly mutilated, and as in all the persons hitherto considered, we found the radical Σ inherent, we might fairly conclude that the ori-

* S at the end of a word is subjected in Sanskrit to several changes, depending upon the rules of euphony, but it will be well in this comparison to preserve it always in its original form.

ginal shape of εντι was σεντι or εσεντι, which would be analogous to εσμεν and εστε.

The following table offers a coherent view of the present tense of the Sanskrit verb substantive :

SING.	DUAL.	PLUR.
1 As mi	S vas	S mas
2 A si	S t'as	S t'a
3 As ti	S tas	Sa nti.

In order to shew the conjugation of the present tense in a more regular verb, we choose the root Pà, to reign, which may be compared with the Doric-Greek, Latin, and Gothic roots, ΦΑ, *Da*, and *Hab :*

SING.

Sans.	Greek	Latin	Goth.
1 Pà mi	φα μι	Do	Haba
2 Pà si	φή ς	Da s	Habai s
3 Pà ti	φα τι	Da t	Habai th

PLUR.

1 Pà mas	φα μές	Da mus	Haba m
2 Pà t'a	φα τέ	Da tis	Habai th
3 Pà nti	φα ντι	Da nt	Haba nd

DUAL.

Sansk.	Greek.	Goth.
1 Pà vas	———	Hab os
2 Pà t'as	φα τόν	Hab ats
3 Pà tas	φα τόν	———

Note. The Dual was extensively used in the language of the Goths, it occurs very frequently in the gospels translated by Ulphila. The first person alway terminates in *os*, perhaps but little differing from the Sanskrit termination *vas*. The second person has *ts* for its characteristic, which is joined to the verb by one of the vowels, *a*, *i*, *u*, *ai* or *ei*. In the gospel of John, c. xiv. 23, Christ, speaking of himself and his divine Father, says : Και πρός

αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα, καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν; this Ulphila has translated word for word, employing the present tense with a future signification, in the following manner : *yah du imma galeithos, ya salithvos* at imma gatauyos.* Mark xiv. 13, Christ says to two of his disciples: ὑπαγετε, this is translated by *gaggats;* in Sanskrit it would be *gach'atam.* In the first person plural, the Frankish dialect offers a more striking similarity than the Gothic to the sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, having the termination *mes*, answering to the Sanskrit *mas*, the Doric μες, and the Latin *mus.* The whole of the present tense of the Frankish language will perhaps be found to coincide more than the Gothic with the above languages. The root *Mach* is thus conjugated :

	SING.	PLUR.
1	Macho n	Macho mes
2	Macho s	Macho t
3	Macho t	Macho nt

The first person sing. agrees with the Greek termination ον in the imperfect and second aorist; for the Frankish dialect seems in conformity with the Greek, to change a final *m* into *n*.

The middle voice expresses the reflection of the action upon the actor himself, but is often used in Sanskrit with an active signification. In order to effect its derivation from the active voice, those persons terminating with an *i*, change this vowel into è; so b'avati , he is, b'avanti, b'avantè, b'avasè. they are, and b'avasi, thou art, are changed into b'avatè. If the Greek αι had the sound of a French, *ai*, which is that of an Indian è, then the Greek derivation of δίδοται, δίδονται from the Doric and original forms of the active voice δίδωτι, δίδοντι, would agree exactly with the method employed in Sanskrit; the second person δίδοσαι supposes

* This is the accusative. plural, of *salithva.*

the active to have been διδωσι, but σι, which characterises in Sanskrit the second person of the present tense, active voice, has in Greek only been preserved in εσ-σι, thou art. From the first person διδωμι is derived the middle form διδομαι, after the same principle. In Sanskrit the characteristic of the first person is lost in the singular, throughout all tenses of the middle voice; b'avàmi, does not form b'avàmè, as might have been expected, but, b'avè, which certainly cannot claim such high antiquity as the Greek διδομαι. As τυπτομαι, τυπτεσαι (which has been changed into τυπτεαι and τυπτη) and τυπτεται are in complete analogy with διδομαι, &c. we may thence conclude that the present tense of all active verbs terminated originally in μι, σι, τι. The change of τυπτομι, τυπτετι into τυπτω τυπτει has not affected their derivatives of the middle voice, which, having preserved the original form, point out the primitive state of their corresponding persons of the active.

All the persons of the Sanskrit middle voice are not in such intimate connexion with their corresponding persons of the active voice, but one principle chiefly predominates in the formation of the middle voice, in Sanskrit as well as in Greek, namely, the increase or lengthening of the termination. I consider therefore the origin of the middle form as the mere result of inflection, in its restricted use, without the help of foreign addition. The following table exhibits the conjugation of the present tense, middle voice, in comparison with that tense of the active.

SING.		DUAL.	
B'avà mi	B'av è	B'avà vas	B'avà vahè
B'ava si	B'ava sé	B'ava t'as	B'avè t'è
B'ava ti	B'ava tè	B'ava tas	B'avè tè

PLUR.

1 B'avà mus	B'avà mahè
2 B'ava t'a	B'ava d'vè
3 B'ava nti	B'ava ntè.

Potential mood.— After the present tense the potential mood is treated of in the Sanskrit grammers. Its characteristic is a long *î* inserted between the root and the pronominal characteristics, to which is prefixed in most of the conjugations a long *a* in this tense, so that the above î is to be changed into the semi-consonant *y*, according to the rules of euphony.*

Whatever may have been the original pronunciation of τύπτοιμι, τυφαιμι, and διδοιην, τιθειην &c. it is certain that the vowel ι, inserted just in the same way as î is in Sanskrit, between the root and the personal termination, characterizes the Greek optative. Also in Gothic, this way of forming the potential mood prevails from *Sokyam*, we seek, is derived *Sokyaima*, we may seek. Although it becomes pretty evident, by the proper names occurring in Ulphila's translation of the Gospels, that *ai* was pronounced in Gothic as in French, namely, like a long ê, this contracting of two vowels into one sound does not prevent each of them from retaining its proper signification. In Sanskrit *î* is always contracted into è with a preceding *a*, without affecting its meaning, thus jayaît becomes jayèt, he may be victorious, the two words *nama idam* are contracted into one, namèdam, according to the rules of euphony. Even in Greek τυφαιμι was probably pronounced tupsêmi; in this word ι still remains the only characteristic of the optative, as well as in τιθείην, διδοίην, &c.

The Indian root *As*, to be, rejects, in an irregular way,

* That I am authorized to consider ì as the essential characteristic of the potential mood appears from the middle voice, where à is not placed before the pronominal terminations, and therefore the y resumes its primitive form, as adyat, adita. It appears also from the first and fourth conjugations, where à is not placed before the personal characteristics, but because of the *a* preceding in these conjugations, the ì is contracted with it into è, as b'avèt, instead of b'avaît.

its radical vowel throughout the whole potential mood, making Syàm, I may be, instead of Asyàm. The conjugation of Syàm may be compared with that of *Siem*, occurring in Plautus, and with the Gothic *Siyau:*

	SING.	
Sansk.	Lat.	Goth.
1 Syà m	Sie m	Siyau
2 Syà s	Sie s	Siyai
3 Syà t	Sie t	Siyai
	PLUR.	
1 Syà ma	Sie mus	Siyai ma
2 Syà ta	Sie tis	Siyai th
3 Syus	Sie nt	Siyai na.

Note. Syàm, syàs, &c. is properly instead of siàm, siàs, &c. which agrees perfectly with the Latin *siem, sies.* In Latin and the Doric dialect, we might add also the language of the ancient Franks, the *M* of the first person is in the plural always followed by the termination *us*, ες, *es*, but in Sanskrit *mas* appears in the present and future tense only, in the others *s* is rejected, and syàma therefore agrees more with the Gothic *siyaima* than with the Latin *siemus.* It may be proper to observe, that it seems not improbable that in Sanskrit also, *mas* originally stood in all the tenses, and that in *admas*, we eat, (ἔδομες), pàmas, we reign, &c., the termination *as* properly denotes plurality whilst *m* which belongs also to the singular, indicates the first person. It may perhaps not be out of place here to observe, that Sanskrit nouns also indicate plurality, in the nominative and accusative, by the termination *as*, corresponding with the Greek terminations ες and ας, and with the Latin *es* of the third declension.

The Gothic language loses the characteristic of the third person, in the singular and plural of the potential mood. With respect to the Indian *syus*, they may be, I have to

observe, that here also the third person seems to me to be unexpressed, and the termination *us* only to indicate plurality. In the second preterit also, which is formed by reduplication, the third person terminates with *us* in the plural and dual, the only difference, I perceive, between the two numbers is this, that the dual expresses the third person by its usual *t*, which the plural leaves out. Thus in b'ab'ùvatus, both are, I find plurality expressed together with the third person; in b'ab'ùvus, they are, I consider the idea of plurality alone is indicated, the usage of the language supplying the want of the pronominal characteristic. From the conjugation of the present tense of the substantive verb, in Greek, we could easily draw the conclusion that 'ΕΣ is the root of it. If this be the case, we cannot but consider the optative ἐην as a corrupt form, the radical Σ being rejected. 'Εην stands probably instead of σειην or ἐσειην. It is very well known how addicted the Greek language is to reject σ, particularly where it stands between two vowels—ἐτυπτεσο is changed into ἐτυπτεο, which by contraction becomes ἐτυπτου; according to the same principle of rejecting σ τυπτοιο is formed from τυπτοισο.

The striking analogy between the Greek optative, particularly of that of verbs in μι, and the Sanskrit potential mood will appear in the clearest light by comparing pàyàm (instead of pàiàm) *I may reign*, with φαιην, *I may speak:*

	SING.		DUAL.	
1	Pàyà m	φαιη ν	Pàyà va	——
2	Pàyà s	φαιμ ς	Pàyà tām	φαιητον*
3	Pàyà t	φαιη	Pàyà tām	φαιητην

	PLUR.	
1	Pàyà ma	φαιη μεν*
2	Pàyà ta	φαιη τε
3	Pàyus	φαιησαν

* I preserve intentionally the primitive form, instead of the contracted Φαῖτον, Φαῖμεν, &c.

Observations.—The μ of the first person is in Greek changed into ν, conformably to the prevailing principle of the language, which does not permit the use of a final μ. The characteristic of the third person is wanting, and so it always is, where it would stand at the end of a word. Neither τ nor δ ever close a word in Greek, unless the final vowel, be omitted, because of a vowel beginning the following word; and thus it is accounted for, why we have ὁ, ἡ, ΤΟ′, and not ΤΟ′Δ or ΤΟΤ like the Sanskrit pronoun sas, sà, tad, or tat, of which the accusative case is tam, tàm, tad, or tat, corresponding with τόν, τήν, τό. The Latin language has, in many instances, preserved the grammatical forms in a purer state than the Greek, the neuter of several pronouns, is in it denoted by a *d*; neither does the Latin acknowledge the propriety of rejecting the final *t*, but the Italian, following the example of the Greek and yielding too much to the love of euphony, rejects the final *t* of its parent tongue, *amabat* becoming *amava*. In the middle voice the Sanskrit suffixes a short vowel to the characteristic of the third person singular, this method being followed in the Greek also, the final ο prevented the characteristic τ from being rejected in the middle voice. The long *a* which precedes in Sanskrit the pronominal letters throughout the active, is omitted in the middle voice, and its corresponding η in Greek, which is really an astonishing coincidence, follows the example—dadyàt, he may give, forms dadìt-a, and dadyàma, we may give, dadìmahi; and so in Greek διδοίη, which originally must have been written διδοιητ, forms, διδοιτ-ο, and διδοιημεν makes διδοιμεθα. the similarity, which φαιητον, φαιητην, evince with pàyàtàm, pàyàtām, where the second and third persons dual in both languages, are distinguished merely by the measure of the personal termination, is too striking to be overlooked.

The first conjugation, as we have already observed, does not in the potential mood prefix a long *a* to the personal

characteristics, but as this conjugation in the first four tenses suffixes an *a* to the root, this vowel is contracted with the *i*, indicating the potential mood, into è; so the root *pach* forms pachèt, pachès, pachèma, &c., which agrees with the Latin *laudet*, *laudes*, *laudemus*, &c. Now, if this striking analogy is not merely accidental, which can hardly be believed of a language so constantly following the grammatical principles of the Sanskrit, then we must admit, that *laudem*, *es*, *et*, &c , are contractions of *laud*AIM (agreeing with *edim* of Plautus) where *a* would be the character of the first conjugation (*laud* being the root), and *i* that of the conjunctive. It is worthy of remark, that even in Italian the conjunctive is constantly characterized by an *i*; *amo* becomes *ami*, *amate*, *amiate*, *amano*, *amino*, *ho*, I have, is changed in the conjunctive into *abbia*, &c. It is very improbable that we should succeed in explaining with certainty the original meaning of every syllable or word, which in grammar produces a slight modification of the sense of verbs or nouns, but this ought not to prevent us from seriously inquiring into it. The reason why the vowel *i* expresses the potential mood cannot be discovered in Greek, in Latin, nor perhaps in any other European language, but in Sanskrit the radical element ì expresses wishing, desiring; and what syllable could be more properly employed to indicate an optative than the one to which the Hindu grammarians had given the primary signification of Kànti, *having desire*? I will not affirm that this is the primitive meaning of the root ì, and that the grammarians had a sufficient reason for putting Kànti at the head of their explanation, but certain it is, that ìmas has, among other significations, that of, *we desire or wish*. Now it is remarkable that the sense expressed in Sanskrit, and the languages here compared with it, by a syllable, signifying desire, incorporated into the verb, is in English, and often in German

also, expressed by detached auxiliary verbs, having the primary signification, of wishing.* The German *moegen* has frequently this signification, and the English *may* is of the same origin, derived from the Saxon *magan*, in Gothic likewise *magan*. It is the genius of modern languages to express by separate words, what in ancient languages was united into one body. In Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, &c. the pronouns, for instance, are suffixed to the verb, but in English, German, French, &c. they are placed separately before, and where the pronouns, formerly united with the verb, have left some remaining traces, they have now lost their signification, and therefore a repetition of the signs of the persons is become necessary. In the French, "*nous aimames*" the first person is expressed twice, and so is the third person in the German *er liebt*, he loves. The third person singular is generally indicated by a *t* in German verbs, in conformity with the Sanskrit, Latin, and Gothic, but notwithstanding this *t*, originally a pronoun of the third person, the pronoun *er* is always placed before the verb.

Imperative Mood.—That we may preserve the order in which the conjugation is exhibited in Sanskrit grammars, I shall now proceed to treat of the imperative. This mood has no particular characteristic to express command, like as we discovered in the preceding tense, an incorporated *i*, indicating wish, or desire. It is, however, sufficiently distinguished from the present tense by its personal terminations, which in the dual and plural it has in common with the potential mood, and generally also with that preterit, which is formed by a prefixed *a*. The first person singular is expressed by an *n* instead of an *m*, and the second by an *h* instead of *s*. In this person the root *As*,

* In Notker we read "*I mahta baldur wuinon*," vellem vehementer plorare.

to be, is entirely irregular, also in the second and third persons, dual and plural, its radical vowel is rejected, which rejection could certainly not have taken place but subsequently to the age, when emigrating colonies introduced into Greece and Italy, languages so intimately connected with that of India. If we restore the rejected *a*, then Asta, Astām will be exactly identified with ἔστε, ἔστον, ἔστων, and the Latin *este*. Other coincidences will be discovered in the following table:

SING.	DUAL.
1 Asà ni	Asà va
2 Ed'i	S tăm, ἔσ τον
3 As tu, ἔς τω, es to	S tām, ἔσ των

PLUR.

1 Asà ma
2 S ta, ἔσ τε, es te
3 Sa ntu, sun to.

The similarity between the imperative of the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin languages will be better understood by comparing that of the roots Pà, ΦA, and Da.

SING.			DUAL.	
1 Pà ni	——		Pà va	——
2 Pà hi	φα θί		Pà tăm	φα τόν
3 Pà tu	φα τώ	Da to	Pà tām	φα τών

PLUR.

1 Pà ma	——	
2 Pà ta	φα τέ	Da te
3 Pà ntu	φά ντων	Da nto.

Note. Sanskrit roots of the first, fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth conjugations do not join any pronominal letter to the second person singular, of the imperative mood; so, for instance, b'*ava-si*, thou art, makes *b'ava*. Herewith agree the Greek verbs in ω and all Latin verbs, as τυπτε, *ama*, *mone*, *audi*, &c. Also in the Teutonic

dialects, the second person singular of the imperative is generally the mere root, without any addition but a vowel. Only the Gothic dialect uses the potential mood as imperative. The Attic form of the third person plural, φάντων, is more than φασωσαν, used in its place, analogous to pàntu and danto, and more conformable also to the practice prevailing in the Doric dialect, of indicating plurality by an ν prefixed to the characteristic of the third person.

First preterit Tense.—This tense is formed by means of a short *a*, prefixed to the verb in the same way as the Greek augment. This *a* I cannot consider as a mere inflection, in the restricted meaning of the word, but it rather appears to have nothing to do with the root of the verb, and to be a foreign addition endued with a proper signification. I do not believe that at first it specifically expressed past time, and that therefore it possessed original adaptation to form a preterit tense; but languages are very seldom capable of expressing fully what they pretend to express; of every thing in nature, of every animal, of every plant, speech can seize only one quality, in order to express the whole by it. The elephant is called in Sanskrit *dantin* (nom. *danti*, from its teeth, or *dvirada* (endued with two teeth,) or from his trunk serving him for a hand, he is called *hastin* or *karin* (nom. hastì, karì;) from his habit of taking water in his trunk, and then drinking when he pleases, he is called *dvipa* (twice drinking.) Were the Sanskrit to express all the qualities of the elephant by one word, it would be obliged to join all those mentioned together, and to add a great number of others. The serpent is called, from its motion, *sarpa*, or *pannaga*, going not with feet, (from *pad*, foot, *na*, not, and *ga*, going;) or *uraga*, going upon the breast. This will remind us of that passage of Scripture, in which God cursing the serpent, says, "Because thou hast done this, thou art cur-

sed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; UPON THY BELLY SHALT THOU GO, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Besides many other names the serpent has also, in Sanskrit, that of pavanàs'ana, wind-eating. Although in this language, admirable for its beautiful structure, the reason of appellation is much easier ascertained than in Greek and Latin, it is however sometimes impossible to discover from what quality a thing has received its name; the less striking qualities not seldom give rise to the appellation of objects. It is gratifying to observe, how with apparently few means, by a wise employment of them, languages succeed to convey in an unequivocal manner, an immense number of ideas. But as language is incapable of expressing all qualities, even of material things, by one word; being obliged to indicate one quality only; how could it be constantly possible fully to convey the finer shades of modal and temporal meaning? And if languages here likewise bend to the necessity of sometimes expressing a part, how can the philologist always determine with certainty, what part is expressed, and what supplied by the usage of language? Precisely such is the case with the *a*, prefixed to verbs in order to form a preterit. What it originally signified, I do not know, but this I know, that it is prefixed in the same manner to nouns with the sense of a negative or privative particle; for instance, adìna, happy (not miserable,) *anindita*, dear (not despised,) *abala*, weak (without strength,) &c. It would not by any means be contrary to the general practice of languages, if by the words adìna, *anandita*, exceeding the primary sense of the negative particle *a*, the Sanskrit had also signified one *who has been miserable, who has been despised*—but who is not now miserable, not now despised; in that case there might have been a closer connexion between *a* negative and *a* preterit, than would be evident at first sight; or in other words, the par-

ticle *a*, expressing in its primitive sense negation, can very properly in a secondary meaning indicate past time, that is to say, deny the existence of the action or quality with respect to the present time. One might ask, why in this way *a* is not as well employed to form the future tense, for neither in this tense does the action or quality expressed by the verb, actually exist: but the usage of language is despotic, arbitrarily employing its means, without controul. Another objection could be taken against the original identity of the negative *a* and the *a* expressing past time, from the case of the first being employed in Greek under the form of *a*, the second under that of an ε, so that different forms answer to different meanings. But it is very often the case, that one original word produces, in languages originating from others, two, three, or more words, with slight variations in form and meaning; and this practice has particularly contributed to the copiousness of the English language. For instance, to *stay* and *to stand* have the same origin, both the variations of the Sanskrit root St'à, to stand. *I stay* agrees with the German verb, *ich stehe*, signifying I stand, of which the preterit is, *ich stand*, (I stood,) which is considered as a new root in English.

The personal terminations of the first preterit, in Sanskrit, are, in some measure, different from those of the present tense, but this difference, in my opinion, does not contribute any thing to the change of the sense, which is sufficiently and solely expressed by the prefixed *a*. It ought to be noticed also, that these terminations, whilst they differ from those of the present tense, agree generally with those of the potential mood, the signification of which is much more widely remote than the present tense, from that of the preterit. In Greek it is likewise the augment only, which evinces the true characteristic of the imperfect, the terminations of the dual and plural, the third per-

son excepted, agree with those of the present tense. The perfect agreement of the Sanskrit first preterit with the Greek imperfect will be fully explained by a comparison of the conjugation of Apàm with that of the Doric εφαν.

	SING.		DUAL.		
1	Apà m	εφα ν	Apà va	——	Apà ma εφα μες
2	Apà s	εφα ς	Apà tăm	εφα τον	Apà ta εφα τε
3	Apà t	εφα	Apà tam	εφὰ την	Apà n εφα ν

Note. It has been already observed, that the Greek is abhorrent to the use of a τ at the end of a word. With respect to the language of the Hindus we have now to remark, that in the state in which we find it preserved in that portion of their literature remaining extant, as far as I have been able to ascertain by a careful examination, a final *t* never occurs with an *n* preceding. This letter, preceding a final *t*, always causes it to be rejected. So, for instance, to the accusative of the present participle *adant-am.* (*edent-em*, εδοντ-α), to the plural *adant-as* (*edent-es* εδον-τες) to the feminine adan-tî, answers the nominative masc. *adan*, εδων,* instead of *adant* εδοντ. One might say that *t* is afraid in Sanskrit to appear at the end of a word, preceded by an *n*, and that the Greek τ is still more timid ; wherever they can avail themselves, if I dare so say, of the shelter of a following vowel, then they resume their deserted station. Thus, as from the singular *ab'avat*, he was, the middle voice is derived by suffixing an *a*, making *ab'avat-a ;* in a similar way from *ab'avan*, they were, or rather from *ab'avant* (as it originally must have been written) is produced the middle voice *ab'avant-a.* It is scarcely necessary to add, that the Greek middle voice likewise, ἐτύπτοντ-ο and ἐτύπτετ-ο prove the anterior existence of the active forms ετυπτοντ and ετυπτετ. From these

* It is the practice of the Greek to lengthen the vowel, when in the nominative of the third declension the final consonant is rejected.

observations it would follow that in apàn and εφαν* there is only plurality expressed, for, in the present tense, pànti and φανσί are distinguished from their corresponding singular pàti and φασι by means of an *n* prefixed to the characteristic of the third person. This way of indicating plurality I consider as a mere inflection, because a nasal is sometimes even inserted in the midst of a root, where it may be regarded as modifying only the pronunciation of the vowel; and in the Sanskrit alphabet the anusvàra, a sign which may represent any of the five nasals, is ranged among the vowels.

It will not be out of its place here to observe, that the Gothic language has a passive, which is formed in exact analogy with the above mentioned *ab'avata*, εστυπτετο *ab'avanta* εστυπτοντο, namely, by addition of an *a* to the personal characteristics. "*Ni liugand, ni liuganda*" is Ulphila's translation of the Greek text, ὔτε ὑπανδρευσν, ἐδέ ὑπανδρευσνται; they neither marry, nor are given to marriage. S. Mark xii. 25.—"*Afletanda thus fravaurhteis theinos*" is the Gothic translation of ἀφέωνται σοι αἱ ἁμαρτιαι σε, Thy sins are forgiven thee, S. Luke v. 20.—*Afletanda* is derived from the active *afletand*.—Conformably to a rule of euphony a final *S* in Gothic is always changed into Z when a vowel is joined to it, therefore the second person singular, terminating with *S* in the active, cannot become *Sa* in the passive, but *Za*. However, as *haitis*, vocas, *haitith*, vocat, do not form the passives *haitiza*, and *haitida*,† but *haitaza*, *haitada*, changing into *a* the vowel *i*, which in the active connects the personal characteristics with the root;—it puzzled the grammarian Hickes, and whilst he

* I shall perhaps succeed in proving εφασαν, which is more commonly used for εφαν, to be of a compound form, when I shall have occasion to speak of the incorporation of the substantive verb with the attributive verbs.

† *Th* is always changed into *d*, when followed by a vowel.

explains very properly the origin of the above *liugand-a*, *afletand-a*, and other similar forms, in order to explain *haitaza*, *haitada*, *afnimada*,* &c., he has recourse to the passive participle, formed by a suffixed *d*. But unfortunately the roots, *hait*, *nim*, &c. do not form their passive participle by a suffixed *d*, but an *n*, conformably to the English participles, *taken*, *given*, &c. Besides there exists no participle formed by *z* or *s*; the nominative, sing. masc. only has *s* for its characteristic, which disappears in the oblique cases. Hickes ought to have considered, that in Greek also ἵστης, thou standest, does not form in the middle voice ἵστησαι, but ἵστασαι, resuming its radical *a*, for which in the active, an η has been substituted. From the first and third person, plural, *haitam*, *haitand*, and from the first, singular, *haita*, one would expect the second and third to be *haitas*, *haitath*, but, although the usage of language here chose an *i*, to connect the personal characteristics with the root, this has not affected the passive, where the *a* resumes its place.

Where the active already terminates with an *a*, in the passive, this vowel is changed into *au*, much after the same principle that changes the final *i* of the present tense, Sanskrit and Greek, in the middle voice† into è (being the contraction of *ai*) and αι, as b'avantè, τυπτονται, from the active

* *Pranfetes hauhistins haitaza*; προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ. Luke i. 76.—*Afnimadaaf im sa bruthfaths*; (ὅταν) ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφιος. Matt. ix. 15.

† In Greek the passive is in almost all tenses the same with the middle voice; but the Sanskrit has a proper characteristic of the passive, namely, the insertion of the syllable *ya* between the root and the personal terminations, which are the same as those of the middle voice. Thus Pàtè is the middle voice of Pàti, and Pàyatè the passive. It might be said that the change of *i* into *e* indicates the reflection of the action upon the subject, which the passive has in common with the middle voice, and that the syllable *ya* indicates that the subject does not himself perform the action.

bavanti and the Doric τυπτοντι. The third person, plural, of the potential mood terminates with *na* (instead of *nda*) having lost its pronominal letter *d*, in the passive this *d* has preserved its place, and the following *a* is changed into *au*; thus *andhausyaina* (originally *andhausyainda*), *audiant*, makes *andhausyaindau*,* *audiantur*; *gaumyaina*, *videant*, (*gaumyainda*) produces *gaumyaindau*,† *videantur*.

To return now to the Indian substantive verb *As*, we have to observe, that this root, belonging to a conjugation which does not add any servile vowel or syllable, requires necessarily a vowel to connect the pronominal consonants *m*, *s*, *t* with the root, in the singular of the first preterit, which Pâ, as well as the Greek ΦΑ, could receive without the interference of a foreign vowel. It is generally a short *a* which performs this office to those roots of the second conjugation terminating with a consonant. Thus *ad*, to eat, which out of aâd, produced by the augment, makes âd, contracting by a rule of euphony two short vowels into their corresponding long one (as ἠδ in Greek originates from εεδ), forms in the singular of the first preterit, âdam, âdas, âdat. The Greek language is here, as in many other instances, less regular than the Sanskrit, because it interposes between the root and personal characteristics, sometimes an ο, sometimes an ε, making ἤδουν‡ ἤδες, ἤδε (ἤδεσ-ο) and not ἤδον, ἤδος, or ἤδεν, ἤδες, &c. which would, at the same time, be more regular and more conformable to the example given in the Sanskrit grammar. In the plural and dual, where the pronominal consonants are followed by vowels, the interfering *a*, being unnecessary, disap-

* Ὅτι . . . εισακουσθήσονται, ei . . . *andhausyaindau*. Matt. vi. 7.

† Ὅπως ἂν φανωσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *ei gaumyaindau mannam*. Matt. vi. 5.

‡ ἤδον would be formed by analogy, but is not in actual use.

pears, as àdma (ἦδο-μεν,) and not àd-a-ma. The root *As* makes by the augment ās, contracted from āās, and so in Greek the root 'ΕΣ produces ἦς instead of εες. The first person singular is àsam in Sanskrit, in the second and third person, *i* is chosen as intermediate vowel, therefore, àsìs, àsìt stand for àsas àsat. The Greek verb substantive is mutilated in the singular of the preterit, and this mutilation, I believe, is due to the hatred the Greek idiom constantly shews against Σ.* As εστην stands for the first person, singular, and for the third, plural, originating in the first case from εστηομ (plur. εστηομ-εν, middle form εστηομ ην.) in the latter from εστηοντ (εστηοντ-ο ;) thus we may conclude from ἦσαν, they were, which sometimes we find changed into ἦν, in Herodotus, Hesiod, &c. that the first person singular, was originally likewise ἦσαν (ἠσαμ-ην, agreeing with the Sanskrit àsam.) The rejection of the syllable σα, which happens occasionally in the third person plural, became general with respect to the first of the singular. If this was primitively ησαν, the second and third must have been ησας and ησε. But leaving the decision of this question to those who make the Greek language the object of particular investigation, and who cannot but be aware of the love of abbreviation, predominant in this language, particularly when Σ is concerned, we shall only compare the dual and plural with the first preterit of the Indian substantive verb.

* Even in Sanskrit *S* is liable to much change, or to total suppression, but only when it appears at the end of a word: In this case it is, conformably to general rules, either changed into *visarga*, having the power of an *h*, or into *r*, or it is changed in ò, together with the preceding *a*, or it is dropped entirely, only in a few cases it retains its original shape. The Latin language proves itself more indulgent than the Greek and Sanskrit to *S*. Where it does not substitute an *r* for it, it is always preserved, as well in the midst as at the end of a word: but to the transmutation of *S* into *R*, the Latin is excessively addicted.

	SING.	DUAL.	
1	A'sa m	A's va ——	A's ma η μεν
2	A'sì s	A's tām ησ τον	A's ta ησ τε
3	A'sì t	A s tām ησ την	A'sa n ησα ν.

The persons here compared with the Sanskrit make it highly credible that ἦμεν originated from σἦ-μεν. which would be distinguished from the correspondent person of the present tense, εσμεν by the mere augment, which distinguishes also ἦσ-τε from ἦσ-τε.

The *S* of the Latin root *Es* is changed into *R* in the imperfect, a change which very frequently occurs in Latin, and even in Sanskrit *S* is often changed into *R*, but only at the end of words, and according to invariable rules. In consequence of one of these, for instance, *patis mama*, conjux meus (or rather *mei*, of me) is changed into *patir mama*, because a final *s*, preceded by an *i*, is always changed into *r*, when the following word begins with *m*. Also in all the Teutonic dialects, the Gothic excepted, the change of *s* into *r* frequently occurs; in the Icelandic this permutation is quite characteristic. The Gothic *was*, I was, for instance, whose plural is *wesum*, is in German, in both numbers, changed into *war* (*ich war*, *wir waren*); the English preserves the original *s* in the singular, and changes it into *r* in the plural—*I was*, *we were*. To give another instance, where an original *s* is changed into *r* in Latin, I shall mention the genitive plural of the first, second, and fifth declensions, terminating with *rum*, but instead of *musarum* we find the obsolete form *musasum*. This I am the more inclined to consider as the original form, because it is connected with the Sanskrit, in which all the pronouns terminate their genitive plural, with sàm, or, when this termination is preceded by an è, s'àm, because *s* always is changed into *s'*, when following an è. Etàsàm signifies istarum, and kàsàm quarum, of which the masculines are ètès'àm kès'àm, istorum, quorum. Pro-

nouns more usually preserve the oldest forms of declension, and, in English, it is well known, the pronouns only, have preserved any traces of declension by final terminations, as, he, his, him ; who, whose, whom,—whilst all other words have laid aside the use of them. As a consequence of this fact, we may presume, that sàm, the characteristic of the genative plural, was extended originally also to other nouns of the first declension,* at least the supposition is rendered probable by the Latin using the termination *rum*, which is not merely confined to pronouns. The tendency for changing *S* into *R* is too conspicuous not to be observed, and therefore we cannot doubt that *eram* stands instead of *esam*,† which would agree with the Sanskrit àsam, and at the same time be analogous with the conjunctive *esem*, which in the oldest Latin stands for *essem*, the *s* having in later times been repeated. Conformably to the principle above explained, *esem* would be derived from *esam*, by the insertion of *i*,

* The first Sanskrit declension comprises the first and second of the Latin language, the masculines and neuters terminating their nominative singular, with *as* and *am*, agree with the Latin terminations *us* and *um*, and the feminines in à, answer to the first Latin declension.

† I cannot pass over in silence an old Etruscan form of the first person plural of the substantive verb, found in the 5th Eugubian table: "*Vutu: asama: kuvertu: asaku: vinu: sevakni*," which Lanzi translates: "*Vovimus quartum assum, vinum hornum.*" He considers *asama* as making one word with *vutu*, and observes that *devotare*, occurring in Plautus, ought to be remembered.—*Saggio di lingua Etrusca*, t. I. p. 367.—In another part of the same work he observes, that *asama* is connected with ἐσμέν, or a similar Grecism. According to my opinion, it is more nearly connected with *eramus*, if restored to *esamus*, its original shape. But rather than with the Greek and Latin, it agrees with the Sanskrit *asam* (we were), from which it merely differs by an a, connecting the personal termination with the root.

the characteristic of the potential mood, and *ai* would have been contracted into *e*, as it generally happens in the Sanskrit language.

[This comparison, is continued by its author, through several other parts of the verb ; but is finally terminated abruptly. It has already been copied perhaps, further than some of the readers of the Repertory, may deem desirable. The remainder must therefore at least for the present be omitted.]

[The Printer deems it necessary to state, that the irregularity observable in the preceding article, as to the presence of the accents in the Greek, arises from an insufficiency of those accented letters, which are of frequent occurrence, and which could not be procured in time.]

Geo. Chr. Knapp's

DISSERTATION ON 2 PET. I. 19—21,

AS EXHIBITING THE NATURE AND USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES; ESPECIALLY THOSE WHICH RELATE TO THE MESSIAH.

—

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN:—BY E. N. K.

KNAPP'S

DISSERTATION ON 2 PET. I. 19—21.

&c.

Most nations in every period, have entertained the opinion of a *Golden Age;* that is, a state of great happiness enjoyed by the primeval race of men. And although they differ in their particular descriptions of it: each one conforming their ideas concerning it to their own genius and taste; yet they all agree that this infancy of the human race, was freed from those imbecilities and afflictions, which the society and habits of men introduce and increase. If any one will compare the descriptions of this happy age, by ancient and modern nations; he will find that they contain many things, which notwithstanding the greatest dissimilitude in the taste and manners of those who wrote them; agree in a manner so remarkable, that they approach to almost historical fidelity and accuracy. But as men naturally consider the present age as worse than the former, so they are accustomed to animate themselves, and to fortify their minds against the reverses of fortune, with the hope of future felicity. So that we observe that it is also common to most people, that whatever they believed concerning this future felicity, was reduced to the form of history and inserted in their mythology. This is the return of the golden age (*reditura ætas*

aurea, reversio Astræ, instauranda deorum in terra domicilia.) of which the poets so often sing.*

The Hebrews likewise expected a future age of greater felicity in this world; in which, man should enjoy the highest blessings and greatest abundance. Nor does the idea of this period, which the Jewish common people entertained, differ much from that which we see expressed in the ancient records of other nations; although it was peculiar to the Hebrews, that they united with it, the persuasion of a Messiah hereafter to be born. They beheld among their ancestors, great and brave men, illustrious for their wisdom and the splendour of their exploits, by whose prowess they had often conquered their enemies and been liberated from their bondage. If then they were at any time depressed by afflictions, they would rouse their desponding minds, by the hope of future deliverance; seeking comfort from the representations, derived from their ancestors, of the future prosperity and restoration of their nation by a certain great leader and prince. And their prophets directed their efforts, especially to solacing the miserable, and encouraging the despairing, by their prophecies. Wherefore they selected, from the whole apparatus of their imagery, whatever accorded with the popular taste and disposition and was adapted to excite the popular feeling. Hence their descriptions of this future age (הבא עלם) so nearly resemble the poetic descriptions of the golden age; from which however they excluded the false and erroneous sentiments which the multitude had adopted. These prophetic descriptions made under

* Hesiod's Ἐργ. και ημερ. v. 109—201. Ovid's Met. i. 89—162, and Eusebius's selections from Plato and Diod. Sic. in *Præp. Evang.* i. 7. xii. 13; also Virgil's *Eclog.* iv. Among the moderns, see Pallas' *Travels in Russia*, Vol. I. Sec. 10. Steller's *Description of Kamtschatka* p. 272, and the accounts of Travels in Africa, America, and the Indies.

the influence of divine inspiration, pourtrayed the Messiah as a great leader and prince, under whose mild government, the most perfect and uninterrupted tranquility would prevail. (Isa. ii. xi.; Mic. iv. &c.) In his reign the golden age should return, the beast of prey should lose his ferocity, [Is. xi. 6---9; lxv. 17---25 Hos ii. 18. seq.] justice and the train of virtues revisit the earth, the knowledge of divine things and the worship of the true God be spread far and wide in the earth. But this happy state of things was, for the most part, but faintly perceived by the prophets; they indeed anxiously desired, and looked forward to this happy revolution of human affairs; yet the most of them had but indistinct conceptions of its true nature and of the time when it should occur. Beholding as it were, from a distance, (and in the words of Paul, δι'ἐσόπτρου), this luxuriant landscape; they admired its fertility and exuberance; but could neither distinguish with accuracy its parts, nor embrace its extent in their vision. At length Jesus commenced his life and public ministry on the earth. His instructions gradually corrected the views of men, concerning the happiness and destiny of the virtuous. And the notions of the Jewish common people concerning the *terrestrial* kingdom of Messiah, he taught them to rank in the class of fables and human fictions. He taught them that the course which mortals run, is not bounded by the precincts of this life, but extends far beyond them; that this life is only a state of preparation for solid, perfect, and absolute felicity in heaven. The assiduous inculcation of these doctrines, produced in the minds of his disciples, the gradual dawning of day; and the darkness and clouds, which they had heretofore observed resting on these flourishing fields, now so vanished, that the day shed its light upon every object. And being now taught by the accomplishment of prophecy, to interpret it more correctly than heretofore; they discovered that these splendid and

magnificent expectations which they had derived from their scriptures, should be referred to Jesus and his Gospel. Nay, they also observed, that there were many things in these prophecies, the meaning of which, the prophets themselves scarcely understood. For then, the prophets saw "afar off" [Heb. xi. 13,] the things which were now brought clearly to view.

There is a remarkable passage, and appropriate for the illustration of these remarks, contained in the Second Epistle of Peter, c. i. 19—21: "And we have the word of prophecy rendered more sure, to which ye do well, if ye take heed, as to a candle which shone in a dark place, until the day dawned, and the day-star arose in your heart. For ye knew this before, that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation. For prophecy never came by the will of man, but holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Pernicious errors were now extending themselves in those Asiatic churches, to which Peter wrote, (1 Pet. i. 1, comp. 2 Pet. iii. 1, &c.) and which Paul had formed from Jews and Gentiles, as also in some European churches. These errors were principally propagated by those Jewish corrupters of the Christian doctrines, whom the presence of Paul had heretofore repressed and restrained. See Acts xx. 29, 30; 1 Tim. iv. and 2 Tim. iii. comp. ii. 16—18, iv. 34; Tit. i. 14; 1 Tim. i. 4. et seq. vi. 20; and the Epistles to the Corinthians and Thessalonians. Some of them had gone so far, as to deny that the humble, poor and crucified Jesus (εν σαρκι ἐληλυθοτα,) was the Messiah and Son of God. 1 Jo. iv. 2. et seq. ii. 22. And Peter speaking of the same kind of deceivers, calls them ψευδο διδασκαλοι, (ii. 1,) who introduce damnable heresies, (after the example of the false prophets among the Israelites,) and deny Jesus, "the Lord who bought them. He seems also to refer to these deceivers in denying that he had

followed cunningly devised fables, in speaking of Christ's παρουσια ; (i. 16,) for they speaking with feigned words, (πλαστοις λογοις,) had insinuated that the Apostles were deceivers and μυθοποιοι, and thus brought their doctrine of the παρουσια του κυριου και σωτηρος into contempt. (c. iii. 3, 4.) But that we may impartially determine between the different opinions concerning the meaning of this "coming" of Jesus Christ ; (c. i. 16,) let us examine the force and distinction of the three words used to express it. Επιφανεια, αποκαλυψις, παρουσια. The New Testament informs us of a twofold appearance or coming of Christ upon earth ; which Chrysostom (on Tit. ii. 11—13,) has briefly, but happily thus explained. Επιφανειαι——εισι δυο· ἡ μεν προτερα, χαριτος· ἡ δε δευτερα, ἀνταποδοσεως, και του δικαιου.* One, to wit his first appearance, was altogether visible and embraced his ενανθρωπησις, or appearing in the flesh, (1 Tim. iii. 16,) and all his ενσαρκον οἰκονομιαν, or life which he to effect our salvation passed on earth humble and mortal ; (Heb. v. 7,) the other, or latter, which followed his ἀναληψιν εν δοξη, relates to the institution, confirmation, propagation and final consummation in heaven, of his kingdom. This latter appearing is *partly* invisible, though known by its effects ; (1. by his opportune presence and aid which his sincere followers loving him though unseen, 1 Pet. i. 8, experience in every situation, (Matt. xxviii. 20,) and 2. by his providential punishment of the insolent and refractory ; a signal instance of which, often threatened and at length executed, is the destruction of Jerusalem, and conquest of the Jewish nation :) And it is *partly* visible, and is to occur at the end of the world ; at which time, he will give the most splendid proofs of

* See what Suicer has collected from ecclesiastical writers concerning this word in his *Thesaur. Eccles.* Vol. i. p. 1196. sqq. also concerning the other words ἀποκαλυψις and παρουσια. Vol. i. p. 448, and ii. p. 603.

his power, his majesty and his justice; by the resurrection of the dead and passing the final and irreversible sentence of judgement on every man. (Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31—46 2 Cor. v. 10.) Each of these appearings or comings is called in Scripture ἐπιφανεια; also very frequently by ecclesiastical writers. Profane authors also frequently use it to designate the manifest indications of the presence of their Gods. This word is also used in 2 Tim. i. 10. (Com. Luke i. 79. Tit. ii. 11,) for the *first* appearing; and for the *latter* (which is also called επιφανεια της δοξης s. ενδοξη) in 2 Thess. ii. 8, where it is called ἡ επιφανεια του κυριου της παρουσιας, 1 Tim. vi. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. Tit. ii. 13. But the word αποκαλυψις joined with Jesus Christ or του κυριου, both in the New Testament and by the Fathers, refers only to the *latter* appearance of Christ to judgement; thus in 1 Pet. iv. 13. and 2 Thess. i. 7, see also 1 Cor. i. 7, 13, and compare Luke xvii. 30. 1 Pet. v. 1, i 5. Rom. viii. 18, 19. But although ἡ παρουσια is often used to signify *both* appearings by ecclesiastical writers; yet every where in the Scripture it only refers to the *latter*, whether visible or invisible, and sometimes both to the ὀρατη and ἀορατη at the same time. See Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39. 1 Cor. xv. 23. 1 Thess. ii. 19. iii. 13. iv. 15. v. 23. 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8. Jam. v. 7, 8. 2 Pet. iii. 4, 12. 1 John ii. 28.* So that their opinion is manifestly erroneous, who think in opposition to the use of the word in every other part of the New Testament; that in this place (2 Pet. i. 16,) it refers to the *first* appearing of Christ,

* The best piece on this subject is H. A. Schotts *Comment. exeg.—dogmaticus in eos J. Christi sermones, qui de ejus reditu ad judicium futuro, et judicandi provincia ipsi demandata, agunt*; (Ienæ 1820) with which compare Jo. Jahns *Erklaerung der Weisagungen Jesu von der Zerstoerung der Stadt Jerusalem, des temples und des Iudischen Staats*; in Vol. ii. of Bengel's *Archiv fuer die Theol. und ihr neueste Literatur.*

that is, his life in this world. Peter himself, not only in the former epistle, (to which frequent reference is made in this—comp. c. iii. 1,) makes frequent mention of the revelation of Christ—της αποκαλυψεως του Χριστου, which, as was before said, designates his return to judge the world,) but also in this second Epistle c. iii. 4, speaking of την επαγγελιαν της παρουσιας αυτου (viz. of the Lord and Saviour, v. 2.) he calls it in v. 12, την παρουσιαν της του θεου ημερας, δι' ην ουρανοι πυρουμενοι λυθησονται. Moreover, our author, as Acts x. 24, together with Paul and the other Apostles, when speaking of Christ, both in his speeches and writings, bears the weight of his testimony to this point, the splendid return of Jesus Christ as the constituted judge of quick and dead. And in this Epistle, his grand aim is the confirmation of his readers against the insidious attempts of their false teachers; hence in c. i. 10, he admonishes them to adhere with firmness to those truths concerning his majesty, which they had received from the Apostles, who being the intimate friends of Christ were witnesses of his mighty works (εποπται, vs. 16, comp. 1 Pet. ii, 12. iii, 2.) See 1 Jo. i, 1—3. iv. 14. Jo. i, 14. xxi, 24. Luke. 1, 2. In verses, 17 and 18 he introduces the transfiguration of Jesus on the mount, as seen by James, John and himself, (and also the voice that proceeded from heaven,) as the most demonstrative proof, and as it were, a specimen of his future majesty. Nor could any thing more appropriate be adduced to reprove the rashness of the false teachers; who renouncing their obedience to the Lord that bought them [c. ii. 1.] contemned as fabulous, the promise of his coming. This coming is called η του κυριου δυναμις και παρουσια for η δυνατη παρουσια, i. e. η εν δυναμει παρουσια [comp. Rom. i. 4. 2. Thess. i, 9.] where the word δυναμις properly refers to the indications or insignia of the royal power of our Lord Jesus Christ [c. i. 11, comp. Acts, ii. 36. x, 36.], who is also called δεσποτης

(c. ii, 2.) and κυριος κυριων και βασιλευς βασιλεων (Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16.) and ὁ ἐρχομενος ἐπι των νεφαλων του ουρανου, μετα δυναμεως και δοξης πολλης. Matt. xxiv, 30. Mark xiii, 26.

The Apostle now opportunely introduces the passage concerning the prophecies, of which he treats from the 19th verse. This joint testimony of prophets and apostles to the majesty of Christ, he exhibits in a manner peculiar to himself and his fellow disciples—And this concurring testimony is not only exhibited in his First Epis. (c. i. 10—12.) but also in his orations (Acts. x. 38—43. ii. 22—36. iii. 8—26. iv. 10—12, 20.) For this was their strong hold of argument both with Jews and Gentiles; (Acts x.) seeing that in these prophecies were centred all the hopes of the Jews concerning the Messiah, and in them they placed the most unlimited confidence. This was the common ground, on which the parties met, and from this they endeavoured to lead them on to the belief of the Christian doctrines—And although these prophecies possessed sufficient authority in themselves, as coming from God, (comp. Luke xxiv. 25, 27. Matt. xxvi. 54, cet.) yet they were confirmed to the minds of men by being fulfilled. Paul has expressed the same sentiment in Rom. xv. 8. Εἰς το βεβαιωσαι τας επαγγελιας των πατερων. For if any scruple had remained in the minds of men, either from the obscurity of the words or the subject, or from other sources, it should now be removed by the accomplishment of these prophecies, by which they have been so explained and confirmed, as to render our faith in the things taught by the Apostles concerning Christ and his doctrine, more confident. Wherefore we suppose these words, Και ἐχομεν βεβαιοτερον τον προφητικον λογον, to mean, Και νυν (1 Pet. i. 12. Rom. xvi. 26. Eph. iii, 5, 10.) βεβαιοτερος ἡμιν ἐστιν ὁ προφητικος λογος, i. e. Those things which the prophets declared concerning the Messiah, are now confirmed to us, (viz. "concerning the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow,"

1 Pet. i. 11. comp. Rom. xv. 8,) that is, since we were eye witnesses of the majesty of Jesus, (vs. 16. com. Joh. i. 14,) and heard the honorable testimony of God the Father, to his character, vs. 17, 18.* Ἐχομεν can indeed refer to all Christians, as the Apostle may be supposed to have spoken per ἀναχοινωσιν: but we prefer the application of it particularly to Peter himself and the other *witnesses*. For the words almost immediately preceding, ἐγνωρισαμεν —ἐποπται γενηθεντες (vs. 16,) and, ἠκουσαμεν—συν αὐτῳ ὀντες (vs. 18,) apply to the witnesses alone; (who, in the language of Paul and John, Acts iv. 20, could not but speak the things which they had seen and heard;) and in what follows, the discourse is turned to other christians, ᾧ καλως ποιειτε προσεχοντες; and in vs. 16, ἐγνωρισαμεν ΥΜΙΝ. A similar passage occurs in 1 Pet. i. 12, in which the prophecies are declared to have been given by the command of God, for the purpose of confirming the faith of the Apostles, and other teachers, on whose instructions the Christian Church was to depend, comp. Heb. ii. 3. But ὁ προφητικος λογος (which phrase Philo frequently employs,) is not to be understood of any single prediction; much less, according to Warburton's theory, of the prophecies of John and Paul concerning Anti-Christ;† but of the whole range of

* Josephus adopts the same form of expression. *Ant.* v. 10, 4. ετι μαλλον βεβαιοτεραν εἰχε την προσδοκιαν, also *de Bel. Jud.* iv. 6, 4; and the word βεβαιουν often signifies *to confirm, to confirm faith, to add authority*, Mark xvi. 20. Heb. ii. 3. Rom. xv. 8. An ancient Scholion, in a Codex Coislinianus, interprets this passage: Ἐλαβε παρα θεῳ δοξαν· και εχομεν εκ τουτου βεβαιοτεραν πασαν ὑπο των προφητων περι αὐτου προκαταγγελιαν. See also Oecumenius' *Comment* ad h. l.

† See a refutation of the opinon, that ὁ προφητικος λογος refers to prophecies made by Christians, (to which προφητεια γραφης vs. 20. is opposed, to mention no other objection) by C. F. Stoessner in his Essay *De Oratiunculis Prophetarum Christianorum apud Petrum non reperiundis, occasione novae interpretationis* (Griesbachii and Doeder-

O. Test. prophecy concerning Messiah. For in vs. 20, πασα προφητεια γραφης is mentioned, and whatever we read in vs. 21, concerning the impulse and divine *afflatus*, by which the prophets were inspired, is spoken generally and universally, and certainly pertains to all the prophecies of that class, as 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. Peter has also said, Θεος ἀ προκατηγγειλε δια στοματος παντων των προφητων αὐτου, παθειν τον χριστον, επληρωσεν οὑτω and Τουτῳ παντες οἱ προφηται μαρτυρουσι, κ. τ. λ. Acts iii. 18, 25, x. 43. And Paul also denominates the prophecies concerning Christ, προφητικαι γραφαι, Rom. xvi. 26. comp. Rev. i. 3. In the ensuing words, "to which ye do well, that ye take heed," the desire to investigate and understand the prophetic writings is commended;* because by comparing the prediction with its accomplishment, Christian faith was extended and confirmed; and especially in those cases, where the prophecies had long been the subject of study. For it is now evident, that Jesus is worthy of that testimony which the Father bore to him, (vs. 17.) "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Hence too we find, the Berœans commended, (Acts xvii. 11,) because they had cordially received the doctrines preached to them by Paul and Silas; "searching the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so." This method Christ also employed for confirming the faith of his hearers; as in Luke xxiv 25—27, 44—47. Jo. v. 46, 47, &c.; and for the same reason he seems to speak in an approving manner, when he says, Jo. v. 39. "Ye search the S. S. because

lini,) *loci* 2 Pet. i. 19. Halæ. 1789.—Griesbach's Dissertation *de verbo prophetico*, 2 Pet. i. as revised and enlarged in *Comment. Theol.* Tom. vi. Lips. 1799, pag. 419, sqq.

* Καλως ποιειτε s. επoιησατε, is a form, 1. of expressing thanks as (Acts. x 33. Phil. iv. 14.) 2. of praise and approbation, as in this place and 3. Jo. 6, it is of much the same force with ευ πραξετε. Acts xv. 29.

ye think in them ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." In which he was imitated by the Apostles and other teachers of that age. Comp. Acts xxvi, 22, 23, 27. ii. Tim. iii. 16, 17, &c.—Peter, while writing this, seems to remember the μυθοι και πλαστοι λογοι, (i, 16. ii. 3.) of the false teachers, to which Christians should not give heed; on which point, Paul also admonishes them. 1 Tim. 1, 3, 4. Tit. i, 13, 14. That Peter referred to them, is evident from the ensuing passage in the second chapter. Ἐγενοντο δε και ψευδοπροφηται ἐν τῳ λαῳ, ὡς και ἐν ὑμιν ἐσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοι. Where the particles δε και sufficiently shew that reference is made to what was just before said in c. i. 16, 19—21, concerning the testimony of the authors of the Old and New Testament, which has now been confirmed. A most absurd interpretation of this is given by Wollius; in which he is followed by Zachariae, (in his *German Paraphrase ad h. l.* and in *Theol. Biblica*, Tom. 1. p. 46, seq.) connecting ἐν ταις καρδιαις ὑμων with προσεχοντες, and throwing the intervening words into a parenthesis. For omitting other objections, it is contrary to the analogy of the Greek language, to say προσεχειν (τον νουν) ἐν τινι, but προσεχειν is every where in the N.T. joined to the dative.*

In the remaining words of this verse, the O. T. prophecies are compared to a candle which was formerly shining in a dark place. The word φαινοντι is incorrectly translated as if in the present; it certainly should be, as J. A. Bengel has remarked, in the imperfect tense, just as

* Προσεχειν corresponds to the Latin verb *advertere;* which is sometimes used concisely for *advertere mentem* s. *animum*, or *animadvertere*, *animum referre ad aliquid.* Some times also προσεχειν refers to the effect of animadversion; and is the same as *dictis fidem habere* or *parere dicto audientem esse alicui.* See Kypke's *Obss. ad Act.* xvi. 14. and what Krebs has adduced on Acts viii. 9. from Josephus.

οντες in the 18th vs.* For, the succeeding verbs are both in the aorist tense; διαυγασῃ, ἀνατειλῃ, *shone*, *arose*, and not (διαυγαζῃ, ανατελλῃ,) in the present, as the Latin vulgate (and Luther also) translates them. This is besides opposed by the scope of the passage. That is, the διαυγασαι and ανατειλαι as attributed to the *day* and the *morning star*, are spoken of as having already taken place, when the Apostle was writing.

Αυχμηρος is a word seldom used; and as employed by the ancients, mostly designates a *filthy*, *dry*, *desert* place; as Kypke (ad h. l.) has shewn from examples. But here the propriety of the figure leads us to select the signification---a *dark* or *obscure* place, ὁ αχλυωδης; (as the ancient interpreters also have it). To this we add the authority of Hesychius and Suidas, who interpret it στυγνον and σκοτεινον; and also a place in Aristotle's book *De Color.*, where το στιλβον και λαμπρον is opposed to ὁ αυχμηρος και ἀλαμπης.* It is also corroborated by the Alexandrian translators, who represent עפל by αυχμωδης Mic. iv. 8, which Aquila, in the same place, translates σκοτωδης. So that there is no necessity of reading with H. Stephens and R. Bentley, ἀμαυρῳ. This *darkness* is a figure often used to denote the ignorance in former days of divine things, together with the evils necessarily attendant upon it; or "the times of ignorance," as Paul calls them. Acts xvii. 30. comp. Matt. iv. 16. Luke i. 79. Is. ix. 1, &c. 1 Pet. i. 14. The phrase αυχμηρος τοπος therefore not only refers in general to the night and darkness of the O. T. dispensation; but by its connexion with the last words of the verse, (in your hearts,) implies that the hearts of those who read the Scriptures are dark places, as long as destitute of the full and saving knowledge of Jesus Christ, who

* With Xenophon too, αυχμηροι is opposed to λιπαροι. *Mem.* ii. 1. 30.

has now come. Thus Paul in Eph. v. 8, "Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord." Moreover ἡμέρα and φωσφόρος in this place, are in opposition to λυχνος, so that the *light* or *lamp* refers to a more obscure knowledge of things, resembling the light of a lamp; but the *day* and *day-star*, to the clearer, more confirming and salutary knowledge of Christ and his blessings. Comp. Rom. xiii. 12, sqq. Acts xiii. 47, 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6, and the words of John in his 1 Epis. ii. 8. "Because the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth;" also in the O. Test. Prov. iv. 18, 19. Isa. lx. 2, 3. 2 Sam. xxiii. 4. But, the latter part of the sentence: Ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα, κ. τ. λ. is connected rather with φαινοντι, than with προσεχοντες. For the Apostle is not directing *how long* they must take heed, but rather declaring how long the *light* or *lamp* had shone in a dark place. So that it is manifest, how unfounded are the conclusions of those, who, carrying this figure too far, from this passage, hold the prophetic writings in contempt; arguing, that as the day has now dawned, we, of course, no longer need the lamp, which is used by night in a house or upon a journey, but when the day has arisen, being no longer of any use, is extinguished. But according the opinion of Peter, and the other Apostles, the lamp of prophecy is of use, even after the day is come. And it would certainly have been an instance of great inconsistency in the Apostle, first to praise the Christians for taking heed to that light, even after the day had dawned (ᾧ καλως ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ προσεχοντες·) and then to insinuate that the prophecies were unworthy of their attention.* But the *day*, which at that time had *dawned*, is the full day of N. T. light: καιρος ευπροσδεκτος, ἡμέρα σωτηριας, 2 Cor. vi. 2.

* Bengel has happily explained these concise remarks of the Apostle in *Gnom. in loc.* "Truth delivered by the prophets, is still truth. The lamp is not day, yet it dispels darkness.—The light of

Comp. 1 Jo. ii. 8.) and they in whose hearts the *day-star* had *arisen*, were those, who had passed from the darkness of their former ignorance and errors, into the glorious light of the Gospel, and had cordially conformed their lives to its precepts. To these, as if awaked out of sleep, or resuscitated from the tomb, Christ is said by Paul, to have given light; (Eph. v. 14. comp. Rom. xiii. 12,) and in this view, Christ is himself called το φως του κοσμου—των ανθρωπων, as Jo. i. 9, sq. also in Rev. xxii. 16, ὁ αστηρ ὁ λαμπρος ὁ πρωϊνος, and in Zechariah's song,(Luke i. 78, 79.) ανατωλη εξ ὑψους. See 2 Pet. i. 3—8, 12. Whence I am strongly inclined to adopt the opinion of some ancient interpreters, who suppose that by the *day-star* in our text, is intended Christ himself. This word, φωσφορος is not used in any other place in the New Testament, nor by the Alexandrian and other Greek interpreters of the Old Testament. The word ἑωσφορος however is used by the Alexandrians for *Venus* as the morning-star, the harbinger of the Sun: (as Isa. xiv. 12, Job. iii. 9, which very word is employed in this place in the codex Guelpherbytanus (Griesb.69,) and written in the margin of the codices of the later Syriac version. A difficulty arises here, however, from the fact, that in Isa. xiv. 12, Lucifer is called the son of the morning, and does not follow, but precedes the day. So that if the Apostle had written them in the contrary order, and placed the *day-star* first, it would appear at first sight, to render the figure more correct. But we must remember the character and pretensions of the Apostle, and not bring him to the strict rules of rhetoric. Even Homer and Hesiod abound with ex-

day renders distinct what was obscurely seen by candlelight.—Peter does not accuse of tardiness, those who had as yet believed the prophets more implicitly than they had the Apostles. Every man is laudably attached to that which forms the ground work of his faith. Yet the Apostle invites them to make greater attainments.

amples of this inversion; which was the result of ancient simplicity, and cannot with propriety, be tested by the refined principles of modern criticism.* Besides this, it is matter of doubt, whether the Apostle intended to connect the phrase εν ταις καρδιαις ὑμων with ἑως ὁυ ἡμερα διαυγασῃ, which immediately precede. For it may very properly be separated and stand by itself. Nor is their opinion unfounded, who suppose that the two phrases φωσφορος and ἡμερα may convey the same idea: for the word φωσφορος may properly mean a great splendor or light, as that of the morning star.† Nor again can I object to the Syriac translation, making it φωσφορος ἡλιος instead of φωσφορος ἀστηρ. Suidas, perhaps, referring to this very place, says—φωσφορος ὁ το φως αναστελλων ὁ ἡλιος. Thus the figure is proper. For the former darkness was dispelled, when the day shone; and much more, when the Sun had arisen and illuminated their hearts. But in whichever way, we interpret these several terms; this is the spirit of the passage. "Your faith in Jesus Christ is confirmed by the testimony, both of *later* witnesses, (αυτοπτων, vs. 16, 18,) and of the ancient; (viz. prophets, vs. 19—21, comp. 1 Pet. i. 10—12.) And we, your teachers, so far from amusing you with fables, in declaring the glorious appearing of Christ, consider the ancient propheeies concerning Messiah, as rendered more sure, and more worthy of credit since they have been con-

* See the judicious observations of F. A. Wolf on an instance of this in Hesiod's *in Thegon.* v. 268. [obss. ad Hesiod. p. 91.]

† The Poets often use Lucifer for the day itself: Ovid's *Fast.* i. 46. Pliny [H. N. ii. 8,] says that "Venus rivals the Sun and Moon even in their names;" and he thus explains it: "For as she precedes the Sun, and rises before morning, she takes the name of Lucifer, as another Sun maturing the day: on the other hand, shining from the west, she is called Vesper, as dispersing the light, and performing the office of the moon.—Such indeed, is her brightness, that distinct shadows are made by bodies intercepting her rays."

firmed and illustrated by their accomplishment. For we were privileged to witness the proofs of his majesty, (comp. vs. 16. and Jo. i. 14. 1 Jo. i. 1—3,) and to hear the testimony of God (vs. 19.) And as we your teachers have, in obedience to divine command, diligently investigated the Scriptures, and have experienced, and do experience great benefits from our study, both as it instructed us, and as it enabled us to judge for ourselves; so you also (who, crediting our testimony concerning Christ, have become his disciples,) by diligent investigation and comparison for yourselves, of the prediction with the event, will derive the same benefit. For the *light* of every divine institution is, at all times opportune and useful. (Ps. xix. 9, cxix 9, 105; Prov. vi. 23, &c.) Yet these prophecies, being comparatively obscure, until the events, which explain them, had occurred, though sufficiently clear when thus explained, are not improperly compared either, to a candle shining in a dark room or to a torch lighting the way of the traveller,

Obnubila, obsita tenebris per loca,

although with a dim light. A light however, though feeble, is still preferable to darkness. In like manner, the prophecies *formerly* afforded you a faint light opportunely shining in your darkness—that is, before the appearance of Christ on the earth and your επιστροφην to him; *now* when the *day hath shined* and the *day-star arisen* in your hearts—that is—after the Gospel of Jesus Christ was explained and you embraced it; the darkness has vanished, and the full splendor of day has quenched the faint light of the lamp. In other words, *our* knowledge of the character and offices of Christ is far more clear and full than could be obtained from consulting the O. T. prophets only, with which however, it became us to be content while we were under the Jewish dispensation." Comp. Matt. xi. 11—13, xiii. 16, 17. Luke x. 23, 24.

The first Sentence in verse 20, τουτο πρωτον γινωσκοντες, may be explained in two ways, the most usual explanation is, to consider it equivalent to "I wish you to know and diligently consider this as a thing of the first importance." For, πρῶτον or πρῶτα for πρότερον, or πρώτιστον or πρώτιστα (which are usual poetic forms,) are mostly equivalent to πρωτον παντων (1 Tim. ii. 1,) *before all, in the first place, principally;* in which sense they are also frequently used by Josephus. But I prefer the interpretation of Bengel: "for ye knew this before" (i. e. previously to my writing,) "either from the discourses of your present teachers, or your former instruction." In which sense this very phrase is evidently used in the ch. iii. v. 3. for there the words of the 1 and 2 vs. demand this meaning, (διεγειρω εν ὑπομνησει, and μνησθηναι των προειρημενων, &c.) For, in all this Epistle, the author seems not to *teach*, but *remind* his readers of what they before knew. See c. i, 12, 13. comp. vs. 15, and Phil. iii. 1. For in c. i. 12, he thus speaks: Οὐκ ἀμελησω ἀει ὑμας ὑπομνησκειν περι τουτων, καιπερ ειδοτας and in verse 13, διεγειρω ὑμας εν ὑπομνησει. Comp. v. 15, and Phil. iii. 1. Paul and John have both similar expressions; ου χρειαν εχετε ἱνα τις διδασχῃ ὑμας αυτοι γαρ οἰδατε,---αυτοι γαρ ὑμεις διδακτοι εστε. 1 Joh. ii. 27 1 Thess. iv. 9, v. 1, i. 8. comp. Heb. v. 12. The ὑπομνησις, in c iii. 1, evidently embraces all that had been before proposed. For a reason is rendered why they should still be mindful of what had been spoken obscurely by the holy prophets; that from the event, and from the testimony of eye-witnesses (vs. 16--19,) they might learn their full meaning. The ensuing phrase Ὁτι πασα προφητεια———ου γινεται, is a Hebrewism, (כל, with the negative particle, as Matt. xii. 15, Luke i. 37, &c.) and is equivalent to Ὁτι ουδεμια προφητεια ἰδιας επιλυσεως γινεται. In place of επιλυσεως, (which is found but once in the New Testament, and not at all in the Alexandrian version.) Some substitute επηλυσεως;

(which Calvin and Grotius adopt,) others επελευσεως;* and others with P. Junius εμπνευσεως. But the common reading, preserved by every Codex except one (Steph. ιγ. Griesb. 9,) which has διαλυσεως (dissolution,) is not to be set aside. Επιλυσις, from the constant *usus loquendi* of ancient writers when referring to things written or spoken, denotes *unravelling, explaining, interpreting.* Philo likewise called the explanation of Scripture επιλυσις; (which place, from his book, *de vita contemplat.* is remarked by Loesner and others,) and Aquila translates the Hebrew פתורן, Gen. xl. 8, επιλυσιν; in which place Symmachus has διακρισιν, and the Alexandrian translators διασαφησιν; Symmachus also uses this same word επιλυσις for תרפים, Hos. iii. 4. To this is to be added that in the New Testament επιλυειν is used in the sense of interpreting, Mark iv. 34; and in the LXX, Gen. xli. 12, where it is the translation of פתר, (a word elsewhere rendered διακρινειν,) Acquila also in vs. 8, of the same chapter translates פתר by επιλυειν. Lamb. Bos. has shewn (in his *Exercitt. philol. in nonnulla N. T. loca.* p. 283.) from Athenæus and Heliodorus that επιλυειν and επιλυσις were spoken by the Greek writers, of those men, who either interpreted oracles and dreams, solved difficult questions, proposed to them (προβαλλομενας) or explained enigmas. The use of the word is figurative, comparing the solution of difficulties to untying a tightly drawn knot; comp. also Acts xix. 39, whence, a man skilful in the solution of difficult questions, is termed επιλυτικος: to which also the Latin usage corresponds; as in Cicero, *enodatio nominum, enodare rem, enodata preecepta, enodate narrare;* and in Gellius, (N. A. xiii. 10, 1,) *enodare juris laque-*

* Επέλευσις also signifies, *approach, access, and impetus.* And επηλυσις, επηλυσιη, επηλυσία often mean *approach, coming;* and also *incantation*, when spoken of sorcery.

os: also in Tacitus (Ann. iv. 28, 6,) *exsoluti legis nexus*; (i. e. a cleared obscurity,) and Livy xl. 55, *exsolvere nodum erroris*. But this eliptical phrase ἰδιας επιλυσεως οὐ γινεται, from a very usual Grecism, which the Latins imitate; is to be thus supplied ἰδιας επιλυσεως εργον (πραγμα, χρημα,) ου γινεται sc. ουκ εστι, it is not a work of private interpretation.* There is a great diversity of sentiment, among those who have attempted to explain this passage. The popular explanation refers ἰδιαν επιλυσιν to the readers and interpreters of the Old Testament prophecies, in this way. "The prophecies are not to be interpreted according to the will of every reader:" which is a true sentiment, nor is the interpretation contrary to the *usus loquendi*. For, το ἰδιον may mean *that* which pleases any one. But the scope of the passage is at entire variance with it. Wolfius (*in Cur. philol.* ad h. l.) and E. G. Hempel (in *Diss. de loco* 2 Pet. i. 20, Lips. 1783,) have indeed made a defence of this interpretation. But their arguments are certainly weak and unsatisfactory.† For, in verse 19, Peter had referred to the *obscurity* of the prophecies, and not

* The same form of expression is used by Paul, Rom. ix. 16; Ου του θελοντος, ουδε του τρεχοντος &c. where τουτο εργον εστι is understood.

† Hence Storr in *Comment. de Epp. Cathol. occasione et consilio*; opuscul. acad. Vol. II. p. 391, sq. also referring these words to those who possess the prophecies, and frequently use them, wishes them to be thus translated. "Ye will do well if firmly persuaded that no prophecy is to be interpreted or weakened according to your own fancy," (using ἰδιας for ἰδιας ὑμων, as c. iii. 17.) But besides that it cannot be established by pertinent examples, that επιλυσις can be taken in the sense of καταλυσις or διαλυσις and especially in such a connexion as this, (for in Matt. v. 17, 19. Jo. x. 35, and similar places—we cannot substitute επιλυειν for καταλυειν and λυειν,) it is opposed to this interpretation, that Peter in this place addresses those, who had no propensity to destroy or fritter away the prophecies.

to any false or perverse explanation of them. Nor is there any connexion between the 21st vs. and those preceeding, if these words refer to the arbitrary explanation of those who read the prophecies. It is evident from a comparison of the 21st vs. with the 19th that the Apostle makes no reference here, to the mode of interpreting prophecies, by those who now read them ; but he is accounting for the obscurity of prophecy—which he does by saying, that the prophets did not speak and write from their own instigation, nor deliver their own private opinions on these subjects ; but that they spake as excited by divine influence. Wherefore we think, that this expression relates to the prophets themselves, and that ιδια επιλυσις means ιδια των προφητων (or αυτων των προφητων) επιλυσις. v. ἑρμηνεια, that is, the *explanation* or *interpretation* of the prophets themselves.* But this επιλυσις relates not only to the words by which they expressed their ideas ; but refers also to the explication and investigation of the things which were treated in their prophecies. By these words, we are taught ; that such an explanation was not the province of the prophets ; that is—it was not for them

The day had shone into their minds (v. 19,) and they were εστηριγμενοι εν τη παρουσῃ αληθεια (vs. 12,) and therefore could not be classed with those cavilling interpreters, whom he describes as perverting the Scripture c. ii. 1, iii. 3, 16, 17, &c.

* This nearly accords with the explanation given by Mill, and L. Boss, (in his book mentioned before, p. 284.) "The prophets have not exhibited their own views," (interpretati sunt voluntatem) to the people, but have declared the mind and will of God; for, they were interpreters, of God, ἑρμηνεις θεου." This is correct—but besides this, it should have been intimated, that having themselves very obscure views of their own prophecies; although they often wished to explain them more clearly, they could not. This interpretation of Mill and Boss, (approved by Benson, Whitby and Gill,) has been

as prophets (though prophecying of Christ,) either fully to understand, by their own exertions, the subjects of their prophecies, or to be able of themselves, clearly to explain them to others. Those predictions which are the result of human art and knowlege, or human ingenuity, require, as well as to the subject as the language a human ἐπιλυσιν. But it is far different with the subjects of true prophecy, or *divine impulse* by which the prophets were excited to speak and write. It is the duty of a prophet to investigate for himself, the deep things revealed to him (1 Pet. i. 11.) But when he assumes the character of an investigator, he lays aside that of the prophet. Which idea is contained in the word ἀνθρωπου, vs. 21, meaning a *mere man;* one indeed, who foretells future events or conjectures concerning future things: and this stands opposed to οἱ ἁγιοι του θεου ἀνθρωποι, men who only declared those things, which God delivered to them; and the particle γαρ in the beginning of the verse, shews the reason is here given, why the explanation of their prophecies did not belong to the office of the prophets. For if any man undertakes to predict future events, by his own sagacity, judging from the past and present, and the known relation of cause and effect; he then makes known the future to *himself*, and may, and should explain his conjectures to others. But nothing can, after all be more

anticipated by the author of a Scholion in the margin of the codex Coislinianus; (apud Wetstein. ad h. l.) οἱ προφηται τα ὑπ' αυτων εἰρημενα ουχ ἡρμηνευσαν. Nay, ουκ ἠδυναντο ἑρμηνευιν, unless God granted them ἑρμηνειαν sc. επιλυσιν. What that interpreter has subjoined does not very well accord with the opinions of the ancients. Οἱ προφηται—ἠδεσαν μεν και συνιεσαν τον (απο του θεου) καταπεμπομενον λογον αὐτοις προφητικον, οὐ μεντοι και την ἐπιλυσιν αυτου επιουντο·—οἱ μεντοι ἁγιοι προφηται οἱ παλαιοι, καιπερ εἰδοτες, ου χρειαν εἰχον ἑρμηνευειν τα ὑπ' αυτων, κ. τ. λ.

uncertain than these conjectures; since the same man can be led to anticipate entirely contrary and irreconcilable things, by the powerful influence of his desires (θελημασι ανθρωπου, vs. 21.) leading his imagination to give reality to the wished for events;* from which come the σεσοφισμενοι μυθοι (i. 16.) and πλαστοι λογοι.* Whatever prediction, therefore, originates in human conjectures; however it may wear the semblance of truth, and appear to be established by the soundest reasoning, and however clearly it may be expressed; must still be uncertain and worthy of little confidence. But whatever God reveals by his prophets, though obscurely understood by them, and though obscurely expressed; yet when proved to be truely divine, by the occurrence of the predicted event, it is rendered more sure (βεβαιοτερα· v. 19,) to them who so give heed, (προσεχοντες. ibid.) as diligently to compare the prediction and event. For, the μυστηριον του θεου (every hidden purpose of God,) must of necessity be accomplished ὡς ευηγγελισε τους ἑαυτου δουλους, τους προφητας. Rev. x. 7. Wherefore, it could not be reasonably expected or demanded; that the prophets should themselves explain the obscurities of their prophecies; unless God had given them the explanation; for they were not permitted to write or speak any thing but what God (το πνευμα ἁγιον) spake in them. And the Apostle by using the present tense, seems to signify, that whatever is true of the prophetic writings in general, is particularly true, in regard to these—q. d. "so far does this truth extend: Προφητεια ἰδιας ἐπιλυσεως οὐ γινεται, *that every prophecy* (*of Scripture of whatever kind*, not excepting those which refer to

* Αυτοι—προαιρεσεις καρδιας αὐτων προφητευουσιν, as Jeremiah says concerning the false prophets c. xiv. 14, comp. xxiii. 16, and Ezek. xiii. 3. Pliny H. N. xxviii 2. "Hæc satis sint, exemplis ut appareat, ostentorum vires *in nostra potestate esse*, ac *prouti quæque accepta sint, ita valere.*"

Christ, v. 19.) *are embraced within it.*" Now we may see how these words are connected with those which follow, vs. 21, "There is no reason, why the obscurity of prophecy should be a cause of offence; (vs. 19,) for the prophets could not deliver any thing more than what was revealed to them by God." For, they often declared, by the command of God, things the meaning of which they were not permitted to know. Προφητης γαρ, as Philo says,* 'ΙΔΙΟΝ ΟΥΔΕΝ—or ΟΙΚΕΙΟΝ ΜΗΔΕΝ—ἀποδεγγεται· (therefore neither ἰδιαν προφητειαν, nor ἰδιαν προφητειας επιλυσιν·) αλλοτρια δε παντα ὑπηχουντος ἑτερου.——— Ἑρμηνεις γαρ εἰσιν οἱ προφηται θεου καταχρωμενου τοις ἐκεινων ὀργανοις προς δηλωσιν ὡν αν εθελησῃ. And he also introduces a prophet saying: Λεγω ουδεν ἰδιον, αλλ' ἀττ' ἀν ὑπηχησῃ το θειον. Comp. 2 Kings iv. 27. And the interpreters of dreams themselves, assert this, Gen. xl. 8, xli. 16, Dan. ii. 27, 28, 30. Δια του θεου ἡ διασαφησις εστιν·——οὐκ εν σοφια τῃ ουσῃ εν εμοι, τῳ μυστηριον απεκαλυφθη, κ. τ. λ.) Besides, almost all the prophecies are obscure until after they have been *fulfilled.* And yet the most obscure becomes perfectly intelligible when explained by the occurrence of the events it predicted. This is well expressed by an anicent poet, (apud *Auct. ad Herenn.* ii. 42.)

Aperte fatur dictio (*oraculum*), *si intelligas.*

For they generally appear so plain when fulfilled; that we are surprised at our dulness in not having understood them. And Peter uses the fact, that the prophets did not understand what they were declaring concerning Christ; as a strong argument to shew that they were divinely inspired.† But that noted place from the first Epis. i. 10—12, to which we have so frequently referred, throws much light on this whole subject. For the Apostle exhorting

* The whole passage may be found in Wetstein ad loc.

† This remarkable proverb is found among Jewish writings. "Prophets sometimes prophecy, they know not what." And Socrates in

his readers to persevere in the profession of the Christian faith, lest through the dread of suffering, they might apostatize, presents to their consideration, the most blessed and happy condition of Christians, (σωτηριαν) in these words "concerning which promised salvation, the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophecied of the great grace of God, that should be conferred on you," (through Christ.) They therefore desired to emerge from the darkness, and to enjoy the fullness of day, which should succeed the night and shades of the Old Testament, (comp. Luke x. 23, 24, Jo. viii. 56.) Hence "they searched what manner of time, the spirit of Christ that was in them

the *Io* of Plato, speaking of the poetic rage, denies that poets can compose verses, or prophets utter predictions, unless raised above themselves by divine power. Nor can any one, who is *compos mentis* make verses or prophecy. Therefore Poetry and Prophecy were not the result of art, but of divine inspiration—(Οὐ γαρ τεχνῃ ταυτα λεγουσιν, αλλα, θεια δυναμει the same sentiment is expressed in the *Phaedrus* of Plato.) "For which cause" Socrates proceeds "God takes from poets and prophets their own minds, that he may employ them as his servants and the messengers of his predictions; that we who hear them, may know, that it is not they who declare things of such moment; [comp. Mark xiii. 11,] but that it is God, who addresses us men through them." For Plato is here endeavouring to shew—that Poets and Prophets delivered and understood nothing of themselves; but were merely God's instruments and interpreters. And although this was spoken by him in contempt, yet sufficiently indicates the popular sentiment on this subject. He also remarks on this sentiment in his *Menon*. [extr.] Ὀρθως ἀν καλοιμεν θειους τε ὁυς νυν δη ἐλεγομεν χρησμωδους και μαντεις·——λεγοντες πολλα και μεγαλα πραγματα μηδεν ειδοτες ὠν λεγουσι. This suggests what Phemius ἀοιδος says concerning himself: in Homer's *Odyss.* xxii. 347, sq. Αὐτοδιδακτος δ' ειμι· θεος δε μοι ἐν φρεσιν οἱμας παντοιας ενεφυσεν. Also what Telemachus says concerning the other ἀοιδοι, *Odyss.* i. 347. sq. Ου νυ τ' ἀοιδοι αἰτιοι, αλλα ποθι Ζευς αἰτιος, ὁστε διδωσιν ἀνδρασιν αλφηστησιν ὑπως ἐθελησιν, εκαστῳ. [comp. 1 Cor. xii. 11.] Passages may also be found in Daniel and Revelations, which illustrate the doctrine contained in this passage and also in 1 Pet. i. 10.

did signify," (for this was a common belief of the Jews; that the Messiah in the exercise of his care for his people, had enabled them to perform many great deeds; and had inspired their prophets; as is manifest from the Chaldee paraphrases, and the Rabbinical writings. Comp. Jo. viii. 56, 58, xii. 37, 41, 1 Cor. x. 4, 9.) "when it testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed," (lest they indulge an impertinent curiosity) "that not unto themselves, but unto us" (the Apostles and other teachers,) "they did minister these things, which are now" (after the appearing of Christ on earth,) "reported unto you by them who impelled by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, have preached* the Gospel unto you, which things the Angels desire to look into." (The Angels being intelligent, and holy, naturally desire to investigate the manifold wisdom of God, developed in his eternal decree for the salvation of men, purposed in Jesus Christ, Eph. iii. 10, 11.—And the Scriptures represent them as ministering to Christ, and sedulously laboring for his interest and honour, and cordially favoring his plan of salvation. See Matt. i. ii. iv. 11, Luke i. ii, Matt. xxv. 31, xxvi, 53, xxviii. 2, sq. Luke xxii. 43, Jo. i. 52, Luke xv. 10 cet.) Paul has spoken, of the ancient prophecies, much to the same effect. For as he says, Rom. xvi. 26. "*The Gospel is now*, (in the time of the N. T.) *and was before this time, made manifest by the writings of the prophets;* so he professes that he knew that which (v. 25,) was unknown before Christ; (μυστηριον, χρονοις αιωνιοις σεσιγημενον) but was

* Erasmus has well explained this in his Paraphrase ad h. l. "They indeed earnestly desired to see what you see; but for this reason, their prophecies preceded, that our faith, who now announce the things, which they predicted, might be more certain.

now revealed by Christ and his Apostles. Comp. Eph. i. 9, 6, 19. iii. 5, 9. Col. i. 26, ii. 2, Isa. xlii. 9, 16.

But although we do not utterly contemn the interpretation of this phrase, (Ὅτι προφητεια ἰδιας επιλυσεως ου γινεται,) which H.G. Reichard thus expresses (in his Latin version of the N. T.) "No prophecy of Scripture is to be explained, as detached from the others" (ex se ipso q. d. ἑαυτην ουκ επιλυει.) and which S. F. N. Morus (in *Prælectt. in Jacobi et Petri Epp.*. a Donato editis, p. 208, sq.) has undertaken after S. Werenfels to establish; (for it is not opposed by the *usus loquendi*, context or scope,) yet we maintain our opinion; first, on account of the manifest resemblance between the proposition thus understood, and the sentiments of Jews and Gentiles, above exhibited; secondly and chiefly from the passage in the first Epistle which we have seen to be evidently parallel to this. For, he there clearly asserts that the prophets did not understand the contents of their own prophecies. Moreover their interpretation would make the declaration of the apostle too broad. Since it cannot be said with truth, that *no prophecy* (πασα προφητεια ———ου) can be understood by itself, but according to this view it should be, *not every* prophecy οὐ πασα, &c. can, &c.

Now we are taught in the 21st vs. (as was just before observed) why the explanation of prophecy could not be expected from the prophets themselves. "*For prophecy came not in old time by the will and reflection of man:*" by the invention and meditation of man, i. e. in such a manner, as the prophets would desire to express their own thoughts and feelings; (τα ἰδια) which however, the false teachers do; some of whom we know to have feigned a divine inspiration. (c. ii. 1. comp. i. 16.) For ψευδοπροφηται ματαιουσιν ἑαυτοις οραση, απο καρδιας αυτων λαλουσι, και ουκ απο στοματος κυριου. Jerem. xxiii. 16, 21,

xiv. 14, Ezech. xiii. 3, sq. The phrase πνευμα ἁγιον is used antithetically to θεληματι ἀνθρωπου, and is equivalent to *afflatus*, *instinct*, or *Divine inspiration* by which they were excited to prophecy; thus in Josephus *cont. App.* i. 7, 8, where (ἡ επιπνοια ἡ απο θεου is opposed to τῃ των γραφαντων βουλησει) Rev. xix. 10, το πνευμα της προφητειας, s. το προφητικον πνευμα. Prophecies and oracles have been, by almost every nation, attributed to a divine afflatus or inspiration. It is usual in speaking of the character and actions of the Deity, to use the same language with which we speak of the characters and actions of men; while at the same time we are aware that it conveys very inadequate ideas. Hence the simplicity of the ancients, led them to attribute to Him, corporeal members and organs, and of course led them to speak of His actions as corporeal. As an instance of which; when they spake of the divine communications to men, they referred them to the mouth of God. Hence the divine oracles are called פי יהוה, דבר יהוה &c. To the same source, we trace these Greek words; φημη, φατις, λογιον, θεοφραδια, τα θεσπατα, χρησμος, or as Philo elsewhere expresses it, θεοχρηστα, λογια· and by the Latins, (as Cicero has remarked, Topic. 20,) the oracles were so called, (oracula) because they were the *orationes* of the Gods. And since words cannot be spoken without the emission of breath, all that God says, is called רוח פיו & רוח, as Ps. xxxiii. 6. There is also a great force in wind or breath, which, whilst distinctly felt and heard, is invisible. Whence all immaterial nature is compared to breath, air or wind, and those things which God does, or is supposed to do; of which, we perceive only the effects, are all attributed to the wind or breath of God, which proceeds from Him, or which is breathed from his mouth. And therefore, not only the life which we enjoy (for life and the vital principle are

contained in the breath, Gen. ii. 7, Ps. civ. 30, Ez. xxxvi. 9, 10, 14,) but especially that divine influence, by which the prophets were excited and enabled to deliver their prophecies, (ὁ ἐνθουσιασμος, ἡ ἐνθουσιασις,) are almost universally referred to the spirit and breath of God, by which they are supposed to be inspired and animated. It was also an opinion of the ancients, that every great man was inspired.* From which, we discover, why the ancients supposed a deity to reside in the air and wind, i. e. a certain divine influence or force, (vim.) See those symbolical narrations: 1 Kings, xix. 12, Acts ii. 2, Jo. xx. 22, cet. This common sentiment may be traced in every language. The Hebrew expresses the prophetic inspiration by רוח, רוח אלהים, or what is equivalent; רוח הקדיש (πνευμα ἁγιον,) and the same in the Greek. We see it in all these words, πνεω, πνευμα, ἐμπνεω, ἐπιπνεω, ἐμφυσαω, εμπνευσις, εμπνευστος, θεοπνευστος, (2 Tim. iii. 16,) πνευματικος, πνευματοφορος, επιπνοια θεου. All which refer to the divine inspiration, and are spoken of those in whom God was. To this, their opinion concerning the Delphic oracle corresponds, for they supposed,† that there was in that place a *Terræ Oraculum*, a gentle breath or spirit (frigidus spiritus,) proceeding from a deep cave, driven up by some force like the wind, (which Strabo calls L. ix. πνευμα ἐνθουσιαστικον, Justin xxiv. 6,) and communicating the oracles to the prophets. (Diod. Sic. L. xvi.) Hence Lucan says of Pythia: (Pharsal, v.163, sq.)

* Cicero *de Nat. Deor.* ii. 66. comp. the passage before adduced from Plato's *Io*, and add this from Seneca [Ep. xc. extr.] "Non negaverim fuisse alti spiritus viros, et ut ita dicam, a diis recentes, neque enim dubium est, quin meliora mundus nondum effetus ediderit."

† Cicero *de Divinitat.* i. 50, says, "Credo—anhelitus quosdam fuisse terrarum quibus inflatae mentes, oracula funderent." See Longinus, περι ὑψους. Sect. xiii.

Concepit pectore numen,
Quod non exhaustæ per tot jam sæcula rupis
Spiritus ingessit vati.—

Also in the Latin; *inspiratio* and *inspiratus* are derived from *spiritus* (i. e. *aura* s. *aer* as Pliny correctly defines it, H. N. ii. 5,) and of the same class are these phrases: *afflatus divinus*, *afflatum esse numine dei*, *inflari divino spiritu;* (Cicero pro Arch. c. 8.) and what Livy says concerning a poet, (v. 15, xliii. 1,) "eum cecinisse *divino spiritu instinctum* vel *impletum*," also Seneca, (Ep. xxviii.) concerning the demeanor of an excited Sibyl, multumque habentis in se spiritus non sui: not to mention many others, which the limits of this essay forbid us to introduce. Such being the opinions, and mode of speaking on this subject, prevalent, among the ancients, it cannot be doubted that Peter here speaks of an impulse truely divine, by which the Jewish Prophets were incited, and enabled to prophecy, comp. 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. For this was the uniform persuasion of the Jews, concerning the inspiration of their prophets,* which Peter also expresses in this place; and to which the other Apostles and their master, add their sanction. The prophets are beautifully said to be φερομένοι ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγιου, or θεοφορητοι, θεοφορουμενοι, θεοφορητως λαλειν, (which words are used by the classic authors, and by Philo, Josephus, and Christian theological writers). The word φερεσθαι indicates any *vehement motion* or *impetus*, as of the wind or waves (Acts ii. 2, xxvii. 15, 16,) as the words ὁρμη and ὁρμαομαι, which also designate the divine inspiration, as in Plato's *Io;* Ἐφ' ὁ ἡ Μουσα αὐτον ὡρμησε. Nor is the figure a forced one; for the

* Josephus [*Contr. App.* i. 8.] calls the xxii. books of the O. T., written by the prophets: βιβλια δικαιως θεια πεπιστευμενα, he says it was inculcated on every Jew, εὐθυς εκ της πρωτης γενεσεως, το νομιζειν αὐτα θεου δογματα, και τουτοις ἐμμενειν, και ὑπερ αυτων, εἰ δεοι, θνησκειν ἡδεως.

mind of the prophet was violently affected when under this influence; (Jerem. xx. 9,) so much so, that it was manifested by the voice and gestures of the body. Whence also this ἐνθουσιασις or θεοφορησις is called a divine vehemence; and those who prophecy, are said to rage, μαινεσθαι, also to be possessed by God κατεχεσθαι ἐκ θεου, sc. λαμβανεσθαι, to be taken away or agitated by God* (κινεισθαι τῳ θειῳ πνευματι).

The phrases ἁγιοι, ἁγιοι θεου, or as in this place ἁγιοι θεου ἀνθρωποι,† also simply ἀνθρωποι θεου, and δουλοι θεου are used, first, to designate those, whom God has consecrated to himself for particular services; and secondly for the prophets or interpreters of the divine will; who should teach men by the authority and inspiration of God, future things, and other truths which God wished to make known. Comp. Deut. xxxiii. 1, Jos. xiv. 6, 1 Sam. ii. 27, 2 Kings. i, 9, iv. 7, 9, Luke i. 70, 1 Tim. vi. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 17. For which reason, the Messiah also is emphatically called, ὁ αγιος, ὁ ἁγιος θεου, ὁ ἁγιος παις θεου; being the best interpreter of God's will. Luke iv. 34, Act. iii. 14, iv. 27, 30, comp. Jo. x. 36. The poets and prophets too, among the ancients, were called holy, because they were the subjects of a divine influence, and were considered the ministers and interpreters of the gods. Socrates,

* See Virgil *Aen.* vi, 46. sq. also 77—80, and the passages on v. 48, quoted by Cerda. Comp. Lucan's *Phars.* v. 161, sq. Cicero too *ad Qu. Fr.* ii. 10, calls those excited or inspired by the Muses, or carried away with poetic vehemence Μουσοπάταχτοι. From the fact of their agitation, and as it were, being carried away, the terms *to rage*, *to be frantic* were applied to them. And indeed the word *vaticinare*, which the Latins applied to them, means in its simplest sense, *to rage*, (as in Cicero *pro Sext.* c. 10,) and the Hebrew התנבא, 1 Sam. xviii. 10 comp. xix. 24. Also the Greek μαντις from the primitive μαινω, μαινομαι, is applied to the ενθεοι.

† *Holy men of God*, the antithcton of *man* in the former part of the verse. See what was before remarked on this.—Commonly: οἱ ἁγιοι; but the best codices have not the *article*.

in Plato's *Io*, Κουφον γαρ χρημα ποιητης ἐστι—και ἱερον. and Ovid, (Fast. vi. 5.)

> Est deus in nobis; agitante calescimus illo:
> Impetus hic *sacræ* semina *mentis* habet.

Cicero in his oration *pro Arch.* c. 8 and 12, speaks of the sanctity of poets, and its causes. This likewise gave rise to the term θειοι as applied to poets and prophets; of which Socrates, in the passage quoted above, from Plato's *Menon*, speaks. Seneca, *de tranq. animi*, c. 15, extr. speaks thus; "Non potest grande aliquid et supra ceteros loqui, *nisi mota mens.* Cum vulgaria et solita contempsit *instinctuque sacro* surrexit excelsior, tunc demum aliquid cecinit *grandius ore mortali.* Non potest sublime quidquam et in arduo positum contingere, *quamdiu apud se est.* Desciscat oportet a solito, et *efferatur*, et mordeat frenos, et rectorem *rapiat* suum: eoque *ferat*, quo *per se* timuisset escendere." Hence it is, that Velleius (*Hist. Rom.* i. 16.) calls the tragic poets Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, *divini spiritus viros.*

But to conclude. I must now remind you, my fellow disciples, of the magnitude of those blessings, to the memory of which, the piety of our fathers consecrated this season.* Compare the darkness of ignorance and error that rested on former ages, with the clearest exhibition of the light of divine truth, that we enjoy. We are accustomed to trace these effects to a succesion of causes; but the leading one is the Gospel of Jesus Christ; from which as from a perennial fountain, open to all, these blessings have flowed. For the light which emanated from other good and wise men before him, was both more obscure, and more limited in its influence, confined to the few who were considered wiser and more intelligent than others.

* See date at the end.

But Christ has restored and increased that faint and almost extinguished light and commanded it now to extend its cheering rays to all. The institutions of the Gospel are not now confined to one nation; but according to the designs of God, have gone to every people, and are to be enjoyed by the whole human race. Whoever then desires to partake of the fruit of these life-giving institutions and doctrines; let him, *deo juvante*, so live as to prove that he walks in the light, not in the darkness. Rom. xiii. 12—14. Let us then, contemplate and imitate the life of Christ. For this is the condition of union with him, that after the pardon of our sins; imitating his example, and walking in his steps, we press on to the attainment of that eternal felicity, which he has provided for us.

University of Halle,
Dec. 24, 1785.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS

OF

JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS

FROM

Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,

BY PROFESSOR PATTON.

AN ACCOUNT

OF THE

LIFE & WRITINGS OF J. D. MICHAELIS.*

The life of the man of letters, who attains to a good old age, seems, at its close, no longer to receive its merited recompence. At the death of the active man of business, both city and country are frequently immersed in grief. At the grave of the scholar, who finds an early tomb, loud lamentations are frequently heard. But around the remains of the grey-headed veteran in this honorable service, there reigns, for the most part, a dreary stillness. The multitude of those to whom his deserts are known, are not assembled around his bier; for these are scattered far and wide, in different countries, by the various allotments of Providence. The friends of his youth, who estimate their loss with enthusiastic ardor, and in the language of poetry, can no longer bewail his death; for the greater number already slumber in the tomb, and the surviving few, oppressed with years, have only strength enough remaining to drop a silent tear over his grave. His influence upon the sciences, owing to their incessant changes, has diminished with his declining years. His earlier services operate imperceptibly, and in scattered rays, in the vast empire of truth, appreciable only by a devoted few. The tidings of his death were already long anticipated. How could the news of that event, under

* Born Feb.—1717, died Aug.—1791.

such circumstances, prostrate like a sudden and afflictive stroke? How could the distant feel his death like those who are near? The absent like the present? This would be contrary to the course of nature. An event, for some time anticipated, makes at last, but a feeble impression. A remote event affects us not like one which is near; nor that removed from our sight, like that before our eyes; what is scattered operates more feebly that what is concentrated at one point. Time, however, makes amends for all; it gathers, weighs, compares, and estimates; and awards, at length, to greater merit, its appropriate praise.

Let this, then, be the consolation of all the friends and admirers of the illustrious Michaelis of unfading memory, (who ceased, on the 22d of August, to adorn Gottingen with his presence,) although the tidings of his decease, could not be expected to agitate all Germany, like an unexpected shock. Exhausted of his bodily vigor for many years before his death, he sank away slowly and gradually, at an unusually advanced age, loaded with honors and with years; and even till the last week of his life, industriously employed in communicating oral and written instruction to his contemporaries and to posterity—a genuine teacher of Europe. Such a man needs not a noisy publication of his praise; greater than every other and far more eloquent, is the silent praise of his surviving merits. He needs no proud monument erected by friends and admirers; the most illustrious and lasting monument, he has himself erected, during his active life of seventy four years—the honorable monument of his intellectual achievements.

To contemplate these achievements, to form a lively idea of his eminently industrious and meritorious life, and to recall thus the image of the man; to transport ourselves to the period at which his career commenced, and to estimate the difficulties with which he had to grapple; to ascertain the means by which he surmounted the obstacles of

education, and subdued the prejudices of his earlier and later contemporaries ; to trace the footsteps of his discursive mind, and enquire how far he advanced and where he stopped ; where we could only follow in his track, and where we could pass beyond him—this is all that he has left for us. This alone can be denominated honoring his name and celebrating his memory, according to his taste, in such a manner as he himself, if a departed spirit indulges solictude for the concerns of earth, would regard with complacency Shallow praises he would despise, as he despised them when on earth. He who was alive only to merited reputation, would now be gratified only by that praise which is his due. He who was unceasingly engaged in the investigation of what mankind denominate truth, would be gratified only with the truth concerning himself. He who found in literary employment his only satisfaction, and the only recreation of his declining years, would doubtless be delighted, if by recalling his example, we should animate ourselves to the like industry and activity.

Let this then be the offering which I deposit on his grave —a poor and trivial offering, it is true, compared with that which his other pupils or his older friends will bring. But even the smallest present, made with a fond and grateful heart, has its value and desert. No one, during his life, clung to him with a more devoted attachment, a more lively admiration of his greatness, and a greater degree of gratitude for his manifold services ; nor shall any one surpass me now after his decease.

In tracing the developement of his mind, no one could have assisted us better than Michaelis himself, if he had left a circumstantial and accurate history of every period of his life. His earlier friends might still, in part, supply the deficiency, who, as is the fact with some, enjoyed his friendship from his earliest youth ; or, at least, were witnesses of his literary plans and connexions, and of his method of study, during certain active periods of his life,

or could furnish much pertaining to these subjects from his own mouth. I cannot avail myself of these satisfactory sources. I can only have recoruse to a few leaves which inform us of the more important revolutions of his life, and to my own recollection of scattered information which I have met with in his writings.

Michaelis received his whole education, up to the time of his first appearance in public as *Magister Legens* in the year 1739, in Halle, his native city, at that time not the most eligible place for the literary education of a theologian.*

The Orphan house, where he received his final preparation for the university, was the residence of a wild fanati-

* [The reader will doubtless be struck, with the revolting manner, in which, the author of this life of Michaelis, speaks of the venerable University of Halle, and of the piety for which it was so long, and so eminently distinguished. The writer, it is presumed, is the celebrated Eichhorn, whose talents and attainments have placed him at the head of the present literati of his country. Those who have had any opportunity of becoming acquainted with his character, are aware of his laxity of sentiment, his contempt of practical piety, and his hardihood in trifling with the most sacred subjects. Such persons will not be surprised, at his sneers at what he terms the extravagant fanaticism of Halle; and will be able to appreciate the value of all those remarks, with which the article abounds, relative to points, in which religion or sound doctrine are concerned.

Our reasons for inserting the article, are, that its objectionable portions, when the character of its author are known, must be entirely harmless: and that the life of John D. Michaelis, fills a larger space in the literary history of Germany, for the 18th century, than that of any other individual. Living as he did, during the period at which, the great revolution in the opinions and mode of study of the theologians of that country was occurring, and being himself one of the most prominent actors in the scene, there is (apart from the varied and intrinsic merit of many of his works,) much, in the mere circumstances in which he lived, to secure the interest of every intelligent reader.—Editor.]

cism. The school connected with the same, although at that period far superior to most of the similar institutions in Germany, embraced no regulations fully adapted to promote the solid education of the future university man of letters; for which situation his father, at an early period, seems to have intended him. The universally important study of the ancient classics flourished there only to a moderate degree and within narrow limits. The latin authors, it is true, were explained, but were explained much too imperfectly. In regard to the Greek, they employed their grammatical drudgery upon the New Testament as if there were no other Greek writings in the world; and, in general, all the instruction in the ancient languages was directed solely to the grammar and the lexicon, and not to the cultivation of taste which should always remain the principal object.* On the other hand, absurd as it may seem, a full course of instruction in the philosophy of Wolf was given under the unsuspected sanction of the Orphan house; a course which no one, even at the university, would have ventured to give, while yet the curse of the Hallean theologians rested upon it.

The peculiar situation of the university at that time was well adapted to cripple and discourage both heart and mind of the young theologian. The philosophy of Leibnitz as modified by Wolf, the best at that time known, was there decried as fraught with poison for every pious soul. Ecclesiastical history was at the service of fanaticism, and, in its genuine sources, and its whole extent, was a thing unknown. Exegetical learning was regarded as superfluous, and hostile to real piety. Buxtorf's Jewish-christian chimeras prevailed here, as elsewhere, with tyrannical sway. The philologist Doctor Michaelis spun out tedious

* Life of Michaelis in Beyer's Magazine for Preachers, B. II. Art. 6, p. 2. Reiske's Life, p. 7.

etymologies, and put in requisition all his wits for the comparison of Greek and German words with Arabic and Hebrew roots, without employing his philological learning for the interpretation of the Bible, or for the improvement of theology. In didactic theology, Lange's *Oeconomia Salutis* was an oracle universally esteemed; and in the department of christian morals, they gave themselves up to an overstrained piety and an extravagant fanaticism. Whoever was dissatified with this state of things, or manifested a desire for more profound theological learning, was regarded as fallen from his first love, inasmuch as he wished to become wiser than his Saviour.

What direction could such a school afford to the young theologian? What literary provision for the future life of letters? What seeds for future developement? Michaelis left this school, as was naturally to be expected, mis-educated, miserably furnished, both in mind and heart; in a state of genuine literary and moral starvation. Baumgarten, indeed, whom the Orphan house had assisted to obtain the theological professorship, that he might in this situation, promulgate his faith, was at that time, to the scandal of the christian brethren, fallen from grace, and was engaged in teaching a philosophical and synoptical theology. Michaelis however could not entirely fancy this theology, and was not yet disposed to draw from the prolific source, which soon after proved so productive for many of the greatest theologians of the present day. It was a happy circumstance for the mind of Michaelis, that his prudent father still cherished in his bosom a fondness for the ancient classics, and still further confirmed it by the instruction he was called to give in this department at the Orphans house; and also, that he placed within his hands, for his individual study, the metaphysics of Wolf, and afforded him an opportunity af receiving oral instruction in Mathematics, Natural Philosophy and History. The

direction which Chancellor Louis communicated to his mind, in the last mentioned department, was retained by him during the whole course of his life. As a theologian, however, he terminated his course at the university with his head full of prejudices, sadly deficient in genuine, theological, and exegetical learning, and, as is very manifest from some printed letters which were written about that time, deeply tinctured with the extravagance and fanaticism before alluded to, which entwined itself with his very nature.

A man whose education has been thus perverted, must, if he would not remain forever useless, turn himself about and form himself entirely anew. I should not be able to mention a single individual of his proper contemporaries, those, to wit, who were mis-educated as he was, who felt, as he did, the necessity of his change, (for Baumgarten was somewhat earlier ;) still less should I be able to point out an individual of this school at large, who has actually undertaken thoroughly to reform himself. Michaelis took a direction which might afford an universal example. The prejudices of his earlier years, he succeeded, for the most part, in obliterating, at first in himself, and then in Germany. From an ignorant disciple of ignorant instructers, he became an immensely instructive teacher of others, both in his own and in other kindred departments, in Germany, and far beyond its limits. In regard to his overstrained piety, however, his reform did not succeed so well.

In this revolution, which affected his whole nature, his residence, during one year, in England, must claim the first share. On his return to Halle, in the year 1742, he prosecuted his lectures, as private teacher, with greater openness than formerly. The *awakened* soon discovered the great change that had been wrought in him, and rendered thanks to God, in secret ejaculations, that, by his

call to Göttingen, they were rid of an apostate, from whom they had no new concessions to hope.*

What was begun in England was consummated in Göttingen, through the influence of the distinguished men into whose society he was thrown, in the year 1745; especially, if I correctly understand many passages of his writings, through the influence of Mosheim, Haller and Gesner. After a few years, (from about the year 1750,) he became, what he continued to be through his whole life, a scholar, towards whom the eyes of half the world were directed. Ordinary men require a long time to reach their moderate elevation: great men rise always rapidly, formed, as it were, in the twinkling of an eye.

In no department did he deviate less from the direction he received at Halle, than in that of history he advanced; however further, with a manifest improvement. Through the influence of Chancellor Louis, of whom he spake, even in his latest years, with manifest pleasure, he had apprehended this department from a statistical point of view. But Louis certainly never had introduced him to the critical appreciation and discrimination of the original sources; for he himself had scarcely dreamt as yet of historical criticism. But Michaelis advanced continually, resting on this sure support, from the time that he employed himself in his writings with historical investigations; and he had, undoubtedly, at an earlier period, in his oral instructions, exercised this salutary criticism, at a time when it was much less frequent in Germany than it afterwards became; for he manifests, from the very commencement, a decided familiarity with it in his writings. Whether he took the hint from earlier German works, which exhibit traces of a critical investigation of historical truth—from Gundling,

* Semler's Life, Part I. p. 86.

for example, Mascov, Kohler, or even from its genuine originator, Peter Bayle; or whether his own philosophical taste, entirely of itself, or perhaps from the most trivial suggestion of others, attained to this point of perfection, I am unable to decide.

It was during the first years of his public and active life, (in the year 1744,) that the Universal History appeared, by means of which, the name of Baumgarten, at that time universally revered, awakened an interest in this department throughout our country; and gradually prepared the way for the revolution which, about twenty five years afterwards, affected the study of history in Germany. It is manifest that by it Michaelis was led to extend his views from the history of individual kingdoms and states, to universal history; that from the influence of this work, and from the observation of its gross offences against established truth, he arrived at that copiousness of ideas concerning history, which, through the medium of a school of oriental and exegetical learning, contributed to the earliest formation of some of the most eminent historical scholars of Germany.

Had it been his fate to labour principally in this department, he certainly would have formed, of himself, that epoch in the study of history, to which, as it was, he contributed only at a distance; and would have united in a close and amicable manner, enquiries after historical truth with a pragmatical mode of presenting them. His notions on this subject were, to say the least, perfectly correct, pure, and manly; equally averse from the affectations of many modern, reputed writers of this class, and from the coarseness, stiffness, and pedantry with which most of our earlier historians have disgraced this noble department. But in regard to the merit of the ancient classical historians, in this respect, he was unjust in his decision, when he derided their interwoven orations. In our times, and in

Germany, this pragmatical manner of presenting historical truths, would be, decidedly, a ridiculous affectation; but was it so in its own times, and in its origin? Eloquent Statesmen were at that time the writers of history. Was it not natural, that in the midst of simple narration, they should be carried away into debate? Did they not describe revolutions which originated under the constant influence of this political eloquence? It is universally acknowledged to be a master-stroke of historical composition, to convert the readers into contemporaries of the delineated events, by means of the plan and copiousness of the narration; and to place the objects before them, in such a manner, that every thing may unfold itself before their eyes in its actual progress. Could better means have been devised for affecting this delusion, than the machinery of political eloquence? Had the ancient classical historians even the choice left of another form adapted to their nearest readers?

It is to be attributed solely to accident, under whose tyranny the scholar so often sighs, that Michaelis did not devote his life principally to history. His inclination and his talents were early determined that way. With it he had commenced his career as an university-teacher; and he would have prosecuted the study uninterruptedly and with delight. But Münchausen drew him aside from these pursuits, in order to reform, by means of him, the theology of Germany. Still, even in old age, he did not desert the friend of his youth. As a lover of history, he continued to range, without restraint, through her immeasurable fields; but as a profound inquirer, he limited himself solely to those districts which bordered the nearest on his own department; especially to the most ancient genealogy of nations—the most difficult point in historical investigations; which becomes continually more difficult and obscure the further we have to penetrate into antiquity; which loses itself finally in a profound darkness,

where a ray of genial light can scarcely penetrate. He was desirous of seeing a comparison of languages combined with the ancient traditions which we yet possess; a noble thought of Leibnitz, adopted by Gundling, and applied by him, as far as his department permitted, imperfectly however, and like a novice, without a thorough insight into the peculiar nature of the languages. Being in the same place, and in connexion with the same faculty, he was led, soon after this, to an intimacy with Büttner, who was desirous of devoting the whole of his noiscless life, to this thought of the German philosopher. The nearer connexion with this learned philologist, strengthened and confirmed Michaelis in his design of illustrating, after this manner, the genealogical catalogue of Moses. The suggestions of Büttner are always, in the writings of Michaelis, designated by the mention of his name; where this is not the case, we may rest assured we have the investigations of Michaelis himself. In his comparison of languages, he was never contented with a partial and frequently accidental resemblance between words; but insisted, as was right, upon identity of grammatical structure, and regarded this alone as the most satisfastory proof of a kindred origin.

His historical and statistical views were expanded and improved into political reflections, at first through his long residence in England, and afterwards through his German contemporaries, who had awakened also in Germany a love for statistics and politics, by the success which attended their exertions to elevate them to permanent university sciences. It was now entirely in conformity with the spirit and plan of Michaelis, to keep pace with his contemporaries, in these pursuits also; and to make the most worthy and noble use of these new and favorite sciences, for his own department, at a time when no other student of antiquities in Germany indulged a similar thought. In his "*Marriage Laws of Moses,*" we see

already the dawn which brightened into the day of his "*Mosaical laws;*" the plan, however, was conformed too much to a canonical theology, to permit a free political spirit to pervade it. This work, however, assisted to place him on the track, and served, at least, as a valuable preparation. For he advanced upon this from individual parts to the whole, and contemplated, in the spirit of Montesquieu, the legislative system and the political constitution of the Hebrews. The spirit of philosophical reflection vied, as it were, with his statistical, political and antiquarian researches, and led to the production of a work, in comparison with which, every earlier attempt, of a similar character, of antiquarians and politicians, dwindled into insignificance—an original work, with which we can scarcely compare a single work on any ancient or modern political constitution. Before his time, every thing on this subject had been thrown together promiscuously. Ancient laws and regulations interfered with modern; genuine mosaic ordinances were mingled with spurious, which had been introduced, or new moulded, or certainly altered, partly by Persians, partly by Greeks, partly by Romans; real laws alternated with the mere ordinances of individual Rabbins, which owed their origin, sometimes to an excessive solicitude, sometimes to an idle misapprehension. Credulity and political ignorance reigned in all their investigations and reflections. In the midst of this, Michaelis made his appearance. He commenced the work with historical criticism and a philosophical estimation of the original sources, and discarded every thing from which no genuine Mosaical institution could be obtained. He then removed the materials, to which, before his time, no eye but that of the antiquary had been directed, into a free political light; at every portion of the constitution he penetrated into the nature of its origin, and then illustrated it from similar regulations of other nations. Reflections upon the object and design of the laws and upon their con-

sequences, upon their utility and the contrary, were mingled with remarks upon their local or temporal adaptedness, and with many others of this character, which, according to circumstances, might afford employment or even instruction to the philosopher and the politician, the historian and the antiquary. Before this time, none were seen to meddle with those subjects but the industrious students of antiquity; now a philosophical critic familiarly acquainted with history and with politics was seen engaged in the pursuit. Before this time, blundering and credulous compilers; now, a keen and critical enquirer. Before this, an intolerable political jargon was seen to prevail; now, political and philosophical reasoning. In this way, he introduced sense and entertainment for the Statesman, into a subject which, it was formerly believed, could furnish employment only to the timid, shy and secluded antiquary.

The work left but little more to be desired; less with regard to individual parts, here and there something more in regard to the whole. Sometimes, however, it seems to stray away into foreign regions and times, and to speculate upon effects which, from the circumstances of the case, Moses could not have regarded; sometimes we find, perhaps, a political castle in the air, without foundation, which the breath of historical criticism can demolish. And who does not regard this as perfectly natural and consistent with the progress of the human mind? Is it not in conformity with the situation of an author, who is desirous of bringing into reputation a science which has been disgraced by unworthy treatment, and of animating with new life the old inanimate mass? When industriously engaged in the search for political plans and designs, we are too prone to attribute to the law-giver secret plans and projects which never entered into his soul; or we connect, too refinedly, into a political system, those laws whose connexion is much more loose and vague. It is a happy circumstance that

Michaelis has distributed with so lavish a hand ; we can now, more easily, remove what is superfluous. The humble Tabernacle of Moses, with all its furniture, stands before us ; should any article be yet too splendid, we can easily supply its place with a meaner one ; the first erection of the building was the difficult and most important work. It remained perhaps only to survey the whole once more with an unbiassed regard to the times in which it originated, to other systems of legislation, which proceeded, perhaps, from the same point, and to the degree of culture which Moses really possessed ; and then in accordance with this, to appreciate the individual points. Thus revised, this portion of antiquity might be placed in the best possible light for the literature of our times. Posterity will provide for its own additional wants.

With his historical investigations, his geographical researches are closely connected. As far as it could be done, he placed the ancient names of countries and cities by the side of the modern ; he determined, more accurately than was usually done, their situation together with their boundaries ; and dwelt with pleasure upon their natural and political history. All his writings, it is true, abound with the results of these investigations ; but we may form an acquaintance with his geographical manner, most satisfactorily, from his explanations appended to *Abulfeda's Geographical Description of Egypt*, which connect together the ancient, middle, and modern geography of the country. In the prosecution of those favorite researches, he derived immediate advantage from the instructions he had formerly received at the university. The study of the Mathematics, which are altogether indispensible to every scholar, whether speculative or practical, and which, when neglected, wreak, sooner or later, ample vengeance.— this study had not been slighted by Michaelis. He had at least so much general mathematical knowledge, that he was enabled to assist himself in his enquiries in order, to disco-

ver, to correct, and even to avoid the errors of others in this department. Finally, his statistical taste did not desert him here, but preserved his investigations from an insipid dryness.

Michaelis prosecuted for the greatest length of time, and in the most distinguished manner, his enquiries concerning the geographical and genealogical catalogue of Moses, (Gen. x.), and concerning the passages which bore any relation to this in the writings of the Hebrews. Bochart had led the way illustriously, for, as to what could be obtained, in relation to the names in this catalogue, from the ancient classics, from translators of the Bible, and from Arabians, he had left but little remaining to be done. There was, however, one source of illustration, already partially laid open, to wit, the modern journeys in the East, which he had despised ; whereas he abounded in etymologies, and had frequently converted questions of history into purely etymological investigations. Finally, another abundant source of geographical discoveries, was, after Bochart, laid open by Assemann, of which no one as yet had been able to avail himself. Michaelis was determined now to ascertain how much light could be borrowed for this dark portion of antiquity from travels and from learned Syrians. He was desirous of examining critically the etymologies of Bochart, and of confining within narrower limits the use of the same in geographical investigations, and conforming these last again more nearly to the course of historical researches. A subordinate design also was to obliterate utterly the yet surviving notions of Rudbeck, according to which, information is to be found in Moses, concerning the origin of all the nations upon the wide earth, and in tracing the history of all nations we must commence our researches with Noah's arc. He limited therefore this catalogue to those nations which could be known to the Hebrews, through the medium of Arabia,

Egypt, and Phenicia, because in it were found merely names without explanation and accompanying places of residence ; consequently nothing can be found in it which was unknown to its first readers.

Not a word more has since been said on the idle fancies of Rudbeck. As to other questions, many have been fully settled, others nearly so, and for the decision of others abundant materials have been collected. Michaelis rejected the idle dream, that the genealogies of nations, like those of individuals, can be traced back to one original ancestor, and regarded therefore the names of this catalogue, not as the names of individual persons, but as the names of whole tribes.

This whole mode of proceeding seems to be philosophically correct, and probably met with universal approbation. Still, however, we cannot suppress within ourselves the doubt, whether this whole fragmentary relic has not been regarded too much in the light of modern times ; and whether the want of uniformity in the mode of explaining and handling it, does not oppose this view of it. At the commencement, the names are regarded as the names of individual persons, (Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth,) the succeeding names, although similarly constructed, are to be considered as the names of whole tribes ; Gomer for example, of the Galatians ; Madai, of the Medes ; and Javan, of the Greeks. Is it not purely capricious, to treat similarly constructed names in so different a manner? Sometimes indeed, a city, a province, and a country bear the name of the individual. In the instance before us, however, this would have been the case in a long list of names of a whole genealogical table. How much probability then can this hypothesis claim for its support ?

All this conducts us to another question, viz. whether the genealogical enquiries of nations, in their infancy, have not proceeded on the supposition, that every nation was to

be derived from an original ancestor of the same name; and whether the names of such original ancestors were not first suggested by the names of the nations themselves. Mankind collectively were regarded as the descendants of one individual: and, in conformity with this, every nation was regarded as a smaller family, whose genealogical catalogue terminated also in the name of a single individual. The ancients regarded with admiration the depth of wisdom to which they had attained by this happy thought, and contrived a childish hypothesis under which to range some traditions which had been inherited by them. It was an hypothesis, however, fully consistent with the early childhood of historical investigations. Do we not daily, in all the sciences, construct in the same manner, hypotheses, out the materials of our present thoughts? And why should we ridicule them, unmindful that a wiser posterity may also ridicule us? the genealogical table of Moses furnishes us with an exposition of the names of countries and of tribes known at that day. The ancient traditions were here made use of and were laid at the foundation. These traditions are, to some extent, still extant. We receive them with gratitude from the hand of time, and we connect them, as far as practicable, with other traditions; but a man must be a dreamer indeed, who would search in them for correct geographical and genealogical information.

A fondness for more accurate geographical knowledge, and for his principal department, that of oriental learning, awakened in Michaelis the desire of possessing a better acquaintance with the moral, physical, and geographical situation of Arabia Felix. The defectiveness of the descriptions of this country, hitherto published, was attributed to the defective preparations of those, whom mere accident had thrown into Arabia. Unacquainted with that which the scholar especially desires to know, and ignorant of what yet remains to be investigated, they had furnished merely what came within their notice, unsought,

and uninvestigated; whereas, he alone returns richly laden from a journey, who entered upon it well supplied. It so happened that Michaelis was enabled to communicate his wishes to Count Bernstorf, an illustrious minister of state, and a man of cultivated science, who succeeded in procuring for them the encouragement of his King. The proposition of a learned expedition, previously prepared, and at the royal expense, was acceded to by the King of Denmark; and Michaelis was entrusted with all the necessary preparations—a royal reward for a successful and bold proposition, which contributed to spread, far and wide, the fame of Michaelis. The notoriety of the expedition, the number of scholars selected to accompany it, who embraced within their little circle the noblest departments of knowledge, the complete literary outfit, the instructions, composed with prudent foresight, and sanctioned by the royal authority, the invitations to the most celebrated Academies and Societies to take part in the expedition, by means of queries—all these circumstances spread the name of Michaelis far beyond the limits of our country. Besides all this, he crowned the reputation which accrued to him from these causes, by the questions which he furnished for these learned travellers: many of which, owing to their matter and compass, might be denominated instructive treatises, rather than learned questions. They referred mostly to the physical portion of Biblical antiquity, yet so obscure; the names, to wit, and nature, of the beasts, plants, trees, and precious stones, which, as objects of science and as serving to illustrate many obscure passages in the Hebrew writings, could not but awaken a spirit of investigation. The exuberance of knowledge displayed by these questions in diverse branches of learning at that time not expected in a philologist, proved, for the first time, to Germany, what Michaelis was. And as the work was at the same time published in French, it procured for him abroad

also the fame of a most comprehensive scholar, whose reputation extended even to Spain. France now endeavoured to appropriate him to herself. The Academy of Inscriptions at Paris included him, for the present, in the number of their foreign correspondents, until they could reward him with a more distinguished honor, the situation of a *membre etranger*, the number of whom, at any one time, was restricted to eight. Seldom has such an honorable and rich reward followed so immediately upon desert, after so short a contest with envy. The reward, in this instance, was received from the hands of a King, from a foreign land, and from the noblest families abroad, who are seldom influenced by the most wily operations of a crafty jealousy, restricted as it is in its effects, to the narrow circle of its pitiful connexions in its own country.

If this literary expedition, with its extraordinary preparations, and the propitious circumstance of royal support, has not answered the expectations of all, the blame was certainly not to be attributed to the originator, but solely to the tyranny of accident and of death, which removed, in the midst of the journey, all excepting one of the scholars who were selected to accompany it. Niebuhr, however, has exceeded the proudest expectations; and his productions, on occasion of this journey, outweigh, in intrinsic importance, half a library of other travels in these lands.

Of these and the earlier travels in the East, Michaelis made a diligent use, for the purposes of Biblical learning. In pursuance of this object, he trod the path which others had already trodden before him; he pursued it, however, further, and in his own peculiar way. It had been observed already, before his time, that the manners and customs, such as they are represented by the Old Testament, from the time of the patriarchs, downward might receive more or less elucidation, from the manners and customs of other nations of entirely different origin and language; and under

entirely different climates,—from notices of America, India, Greenland, &c. The earlier collectors had thrown together into a promiscuous heap, resemblances, wherever they discovered them, without distinction of country or people. That much of this was apposite, was not to be denied; but Michaelis, accustomed to historical criticism, could not regard this mixture with approbation. He separated and discriminated, and without enquiring whence this resemblance in the case of nations so different in their origin, and under climates so various might proceed; perhaps also because no ready solution of this difficulty suggested itself, he limited this mode of illustration entirely to the East and to the Shemitic nations. By this mode of proceeding, the exegetical use of the travels became, to say the least, more sure; and, so long as it was only calculated for individual passages, it was certainly well founded. But in thus narrowing the limits, an important consideration escaped his otherwise so philosophical eye, to wit, the genuine source of the observed resemblances. He regarded them, perhaps, as merely accidental: an accident however which obtains so uniformly, and extensively, can no longer be regarded as an accident. Thus the observation presses itself upon us, that a similar situation in regard to civilization and intellect, would lead us to expect a similar intellectual and moral character, and similar manners and customs; and that, if left to themselves, and undisturbed by foreign influence in their progress towards refinement, mankind universally elevate themselves according to the same laws, and advance by steps universally ascertained, and well defined. This observation, confirmed by the progress of human culture in every period of history, seems to open entirely new avenues to remote antiquity; and to conduct to results by which we are enabled, as it seems, to penetrate much deeper than formerly into the spirit of the Hebrew writings.

The Old Testament, when Michaelis engaged in the

study of it, was shrouded in the darkness which Buxtorf had thrown around it. The day, it is true, that might have dispersed it, had already, a long time before, dawned upon Halle; but it enlightened there the eyes of no student of the Bible. They thought, instructed, and wrote, as if they still lived in the midst of the deep darkness of that earlier night. A Bible with various readings had been printed at Halle, in the year 1720, and notwithstanding the use of the whole noble apparatus, they adhered still pertinaciously to the infallibility of the vulgar text. They had in their possession collations exhibiting various departures from the punctation of the printed text; and still they adhered obstinately to the divinity and absolute correctness of every point in the printed Bible. They had discovered, upon investigation, and exposed to view in this edition of the Bible, the contradictions of the Masora—the most satisfactory evidence of their fallibility; and yet they had sworn, in as solemn a manner, to the absolute infallibility of the same, as they had sworn to their symbolical articles. They were verily blinded by the excess of light.

Michaelis, on his first appearance as a public teacher, was full, to overflowing, of this faith of his fathers. In the year 1739, he decked out, after his fashion, in a dissertation "*de punctorum hebraicorum antiquitate*" the whole fallacy of the so denominated divinity and sanctity of the Hebrew punctation system, in all its extent. In the year 1740, he came forward in the disputation, *de Psalmo* xxii. as an advocate of the infallibility of the entire text; and sought to establish anew the jewish paralogisms which before that time had been publicly defended. His journey abroad shook in no respect this faith received from his fathers: for the same chimeras, adapted to palsy both mind and soul, prevailed yet in England and Holland. Nay, in the year 1745, he composed a Hebrew Grammar in which he arrayed in defence of this superstition, as it became a

bold champion in the service, the whole host of Grammatical sophistries. Had he continued to live and teach a longer time in Halle, he would still, for a long time, have remained of this sentiment: for it would have raised there a frightful storm, and perhaps have cost even a martyrdom to the cause of Biblical criticism, to have declared himself publicly the advocate of another faith.

He came to Göttingen. He had lived, and taught, and prosecuted his studies here scarcely for the space of five years, remote from the constraining influence of the faith of the pious Jewish-Christian party, when all these prejudices took their flight. This mental crisis may be dated somewhere in the period from 1750 to 1752. We find him, since that time fully engaged in critical philological studies, under the guidance of enlightened principles; and preparing the way for that revolution which, from about the year 1760, he was enabled to effect in the department of biblical criticsm and exegesis.

Until this time, the study of the Oriental languages, had been prosecuted in Germany, almost without an object and with the most contracted partiality. At one time there reigned among the scholars of this department, a slavish deference for the Rabbinical Lexicon; at another, a capricious changing and transposing of consonants, in order to unravel the meaning of an obscure word; at another, mere conjecture, as to the meaning, from the connexion of the words: always, however, a blind confidence in tradition. A few only—perhaps no one in Germany, studied the known Shemitic languages, in the connexion in which Castell had previously set an illustrious example; and those who followed him yet at a distance, followed him at least in his less satisfactory steps. This department received finally a distinguished assistance from two learned men, from Kromeyer, a German superintendent and philologist; and from the celebrated Albert Schultens; both

of whom made an excellent use of the Arabic in their Hebrew enquiries; the former, as a scholar, in a small provincial town, with scanty and inconsiderable assistance; the latter, with incomparably greater effect, as an university scholar, in the neighbourhood of the Leyden-library, abounding in manuscripts. Halle brought at length the Oriental languages into a closer union and connexion with one another, than other German universities; in which the Missionary institutions also had a remote share. The learned Doctor Michaelis, was already more extensively, and perfectly acquainted with them, than the rest of his know contemporaries, but he manifested an attachment to many idle notions, and to etymological drudgery, which as soon as it is elevated to the principal rank, cripples both mind and soul of a philologist.

Michaelis brought with him from the instructive school of his father, a multitude of nice philological observations —the richest portion which, as a theologian, he had received from the university. But it required years of time to digest them; to separate the dross from the gold; and to introduce, into the whole study of the languages, more philosophy, and derive from it more abundant advantage for the Old Testament. During the first ten years of his residence in Göttingen, he seems to have devoted his attention, principally to the genuine sources of Hebrew philology, and to the writings of Albert Schultens. A result of this was his "*critical examination of the means of becoming acquainted with the Hebrew language,*" which appeared in the year 1756, in which we every where discover, the industrious and docile disciple of Schultens. In his critical course of instruction, he had conceived, in the year 1759, the design, among others, of further explaining the rules he had there expounded, by means of more abundant examples and proofs, drawn from his own researches. In the same year, appeared, also, his work on the influence of languages upon the opinions of men, in which he

elevated philological enquiries to the rank of philosophical investigations. In this spirit he continued his philological researches, without interruption, into his latest years; he engaged in them, however, only occasionally and individually, as was nesessary, in order not thereby to oppress the mind. He scattered through all his writings a great portion of his results. In the evening of his days, he had leisure to collect and revise them, and to present the full and mature results of his long research—the philological harvest of almost half a century—in his "*Supplementa ad Lexica Hebræa*," which work was left by him nearly completed, and is now almost through the press. They form an acute, perpetual criticism upon the earlier Hebrew Dictionaries; upon the significations which they adopt; and upon the genealogies which they exhibit, composed according to the principles which he had adopted for himself in his years of maturity. How correct soever his theory may be considered, in regard to the application of it, we may still frequently differ in opinion. In his solicitude to avoid, in the comparison of Oriental dialects, a capricious change and transposition of letters, he despised it even in those cases, where Albert Schultens had already defended it, from the charge of caprice by unobjectionable examples. He thus deprived himself of a valuable assistance, in the case of Hebrew words which occur but seldom, or only once. His want of confidence in establishing the meanings from the connexion, seems, frequently, to have withdrawn his attention from this connexion, and to have led him to the adoption of meanings, entirely at variance with it, drawn from the Oriental dialects. His confidence in the more correct philological views of the old translators of the Bible, in the case of difficult or rare words, seems frequently too unlimited, and not adequately moderated by the suspicion, which a bare inspection frequently confirms, that they, in such cases, might have been no better off than ourselves. These however are

spots, which ought not to come into consideration, when regarding such a master work ; and serve, at most, to show that even the most vigilant attention sometimes flags in a work so barren and discouraging, and so oppressive both to soul and body. We are astonished rather, when we follow him step by step, at the admirable fidelity and care with which he availed himself of his sources ; we are astonished, not that errors or inadvertancies sometimes surprise him, but that they have not much oftener surprised him ; that his ardent and vivacious mind with such assiduity, perseverance and patience, was able to endure so oppressive, dry and meagre an employment. In his remarkably acute, critical, and correct use of those sources which were accessible to him, what could we have wished more, than that a free access had been permitted him to all. For this purpose, however, he must have lived in a place abounding with manuscripts, and not at Göttingen. As it was, he could extend his philological illustrations, drawn from the Oriental dialects, no further than the printed dictionaries enabled him. Neither Golius, however, nor Castell, nor Giggeo, nor yet the contributions of the richer Arabic scholars, even when gathered from their writings with the utmost care, suffice for the accurate and thorough survey of the various significations of Arabic words. It is frequently impossible to understand them satisfactorily, without the aid of Janhari, and Firauzabad, much less then to make use of them. Here a wide field, which promises a rich harvest, spreads itself before those scholars who have access to these sources. He performed what in his situation was possible, and he performed much ; let others, in more favorable circumstances, accomplish more.

When entering, however, upon an inheritance, how rich soever it may be, the heirs may still have some wishes remaining. For the enlarging and enriching, therefore, of these lexicographical treasures, we could have wished

that, in his latter years, before delivering over to the public this illustrious bequest, he had revised again the rich philological works of a Pocock, a Schultens, a Schröder, &c., in order, again, after the additional experience of so many years spent in philological studies, to estimate critically what, before this, he had despised. As it now is, his opinions clash with theirs in many instances where truth seems to incline to their side.

His accurate grammatical knowledge of the Syriac and Arabic, is abundantly attested by his grammars of those languages. Although in the theoretical part, they exhibit but little that is new, after the thorough *Syriasmus* of Doctor Michaelis, and after the labors of Erpenius and of Schultens; still, they recommend themselves by clearness, and by a more intelligible exhibition of grammatical rules: and, in the historical part, by the results of nice investigations, in which other grammarians had not yet employed their minds, or for the prosecution of which they had not yet access to the original sources. His edition of *Castell's Syriac Lexicon* proves that, in his Syriac studies, he had advanced with his age; and his *Abulfeda on Egypt* shews that, next to Reiske, the greatest Arabic scholar of modern times, he has acquired the most deserved reputation as an expounder of the Arabic text of the Geographer.

Of the criticism of the Old Testament in Germany, he must be considered in the most proper sense of the word, the father. Before the appearance of the dissertations of Kennicott in the year 1752, the thought of a critical mode of proceeding in relation to the Old Testament, seems never to have been awakened in his bosom. Up to that time, at least, all his writings take for granted the absolute correctness of his text. It needed however, only the feeble essay of Kennicott for this purpose, and Michaelis was immediately upon the right track; perhaps even on a better track than Kennicott himself. He was already fully

ripe and prepared for such a direction; and, in all probability, he would, without the aid of Kennicott, in a short time, have adopted it of himself.

A short examination of the labors of his predecessors, convinced him where they failed in the critical treatment of the Old Testament. Capell was too bold, too deficient in industry, too ignorant of the Oriental languages; Kennicott, too much a novice in every thing pertaining to the business, too deficient in all the preparatory branches, and, notwithstanding his manifest ignorance, too presumptuous and too much inclined to alterations; Houbigant, too slightly acquainted with the Hebrew grammar, too lavish of his bold conjectures, too sparing of various readings, which, however, he might have furnished merely from the Paris manuscripts. Time has confirmed the correctness of these opinions. Who has now, after the lapse of nearly forty years, any hesitation fully to subscribe to them?

In order to repair, as far as possible, this deficiency, and to expedite the progress of the criticism of the Old Testament, he commenced immediately a course of critical lectures on selected passages of the Old Testament, and published, a few years after, in the year 1759, as a specimen of the same, his critical course on the three most important Psalms concerning Christ. This production only verifies our experience, that we must first be accustomed to walk before we can walk safely. Thus every thing here also remained in its natural order. The attempt, however, attracted the universal attention which it deserved. No work, on the Old Testament, in any language, could be compared with it in richness, profundity and originality. Philological and critical learning tendered jointly their aid; the significations of the difficult works were etymologically investigated and classed, and the illustrations of the older translators, collectively used for this purpose; the explanations both of words and of things, of the most esteemed Rabbins, were examined;

the Various Readings of the manuscripts and old editions, as far as they were accessible at that time, were appreciated and exhibited, for such various readings might be sought for and estimated from the older translators. He even ventured upon conjectures, and found himself in the full use of all those critical and exegetical sources from which he continued afterwards, but with more solid experience, to draw. The completeness of the critical and exegetical apparatus and a careful appreciation of it, were the principal objects of regard with him, in order to furnish in his work a model for future critical illustrations of the Old Testament.

Only a small portion, therefore,—three Psalms of moderate compass,—was subjected to a critical examination, so that the materials in all their extent, could easily be surveyed at once; and the Psalms themselves were wisely selected. The theologians recovered from their panic. They had trembled lest the criticism of the Old Testament, now awaking from its slumbers, should subvert all doctrine, and exhibit another history of the Creation, another history of the Fall, and another doctrine concerning Christ. On the contrary, they found in this first critical essay on three Psalms pertaining to the Messiah, that from the assistance of criticism, even a confirmation of the system might be expected. And was not this the most glorious recommendation which this new science could receive on its first introduction to the public?

He longed for the appearance of Kennicott's collection of various readings from Masoretic Manuscripts, the departures of which from the vulgar text seemed to be so numerous, that he was led to indulge sanguine expectations, from this collection, in regard to the rectification of the Hebrew text. He indulged also the hope that among the multitude of manuscripts collated, some, at least, of high antiquity, might be found, or transcripts of the same, of equal value. He promised himself by means of them, the

purification of the text from the most obvious errors of the transcribers; numerous corrections of the punctation, if attention should ever be directed to the subject, as it then was to the consonants; and a system of criticism for the Old Testament, as well established and as sure, as that for the New. As it was not the business of Germany to encourage the undertaking, as the British did, by pecuniary contributions, he did as essential service to the cause, by awakening an enthusiasm in its favor. His word availed every where. Every one looked with longing expectations towards England. Men who had nothing to do with various readings, talked now of such collections. No name was more frequently mentioned than that of Kennicott. The enthusiasm impelled many to take part in the collation; for they ventured to hope, that the highly prized immortality of their names would be secured in the immortal work of Kennicott. In this manner Michaelis inspirited the collaters, in so barren an employment; and encouraged the zeal of Kennicott himself, and of his coadjutors. The result has not answered the great expectations that were formed; on the contrary, it has very much depreciated in our view the value of the Masoretic Manuscripts. It was well, however, that the contrary opinion formerly prevailed. To this error we are indebted for what we now possess. Michaelis himself, after the appearance of Kennicott's collection of various readings, acknowledged the poverty of the Masoretic manuscripts, and estimated them at no higher rate than they really deserve. Under the pressure of age, he made a use of the collective body of various readings which, only few as yet had made. He traced the mutual relationship of the manuscripts among one another; investigated their connexion with the Masora, passage by passage; and ascertained the value of individual readings.

Thus he continued to employ himself unceasingly in critical investigations even to his latest day, and remained

always at the head of his contemporaries. The greatest number of his critical observations on the Hebrew text, are found in his *Oriental Magazine*, where he specifies the readings adopted or not adopted by him, with the grounds on which he proceeded. They constitute a rich collection of acute and ingenious conjectures, intermingled with a goodly number of emendations, which will doubtless maintain their ground against the assaults of time and a more improved criticism. Granting that conjectures and emendations are also exhibited, which might apparently have been dispensed with, which are rendered improbable by the connexion, and by an accurate knowledge of the language, or by the period of the Hebrew literature to which the emended portion belongs ; still, they continue to be, in another respect, valuable, by presenting inducements to the interpreter to remove the difficulties, by a better interpretation, by a satisfactory explanation drawn from the kindred dialects, or by any other method ; and thus to render the further assistance of criticism unnecessary. We now possess, from the hand of Michaelis, a brief specimen of criticism on approved principles, applied to all the writings of the Old Testament. May others, who in future, devote their attention to these writings themselves, or to his labors, continue to follow his example, and proceed with the same critical judgement, correcting and completing them, advancing further, with more acuteness and certainty ; first illustrating and then using the sources of criticism, and cherishing continually those nobler and more elevated aims, for which his age was not yet ripe.—It is long continued exercise alone, and the matured experience accruing from this, which establish the course of criticism, and sharpen and correct the critical tact. Michaelis led the way and furnished the most noble contributions. If we have not attained this critical tact the blame must rest with ourselves.

Of a work, in which he aimed to rise from mere verbal

criticism, to one of a higher character, viz. his *complete introduction to the Old Testament*, we have been deprived by his advanced age and his death—a serious loss, provided the materials for it should not be found among his papers, which, even in a fragmentary condition would be worthy of publication. In the first part, which is already in our hands, on Moses and on Job, he could only revise his earlier investigations in relation to these writings, arrange them differently, and thus present them under a new aspect. In the volumes yet to follow, we may anticipate a rich harvest of original observations. This is probably the only work which he has left unfinished. It is the commencement of a great building, which serves to remind us that the experienced architect is no more.

His philological merits in regard to the New Testament are not so great as those in regard to the Old. In the latter he was under the necessity of creating every thing for himself, but in the former he could only help forward the good work already begun. Before his time, scholars, misled by commentators, drew their philological illustrations, for the most part, from the ancient classical authors of early Greece, from Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, &c. About his time, Otte, Carpzov, Krebs and others, directed the attention to the Alexandrian school, and opened, for the first time, the genuine source of illustration. Michaelis was faithful to this source. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the history of the Resurrection, and the first book of the Maccabees, he resorted most chcerfully to Philo, Josephus, the Septuagint, and the other Greek writers on the Old Testament, and kindly assisted Ernesti in promoting the good cause. His own contributions consisted of frequent comparisons of Syriac, Chaldaic and Talmudic words and expressions with the Greek, which none of his predecessors or contemporaries, had furnished in such abundance,

and for which purpose no individual had been able to use the collections of Wettstein in so masterly a manner. But where deep and extensive knowledge of the Greek was requisite, Ernesti and other moderns may have excelled him.

For the criticism, however, properly speaking, of the New Testament, in Germany, we are indebted for the most part to Michaelis, he received it poor and uncultivated; he left it rich and matured.

Down to the middle of the present century, the criticism of the New Testament was decried by almost all the German Theologians. With what violence did the theological cabal attack even the pious Albert Bengel, when he first endeavored to introduce it! How timidly did the father of Michaelis come forward in his work de Variis N. T. lectionibus! How poor and imperfect does it appear, even in the year 1750, in Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament!

Still his heart doated upon this youthful work with the affection of a parent; he cherished and nourished it, till his latest days, and thus it received at last its fixed and manly form. It would be unjust and ungrateful to enquire what it was at first. It is now what its title declares it to be, *an Introduction to the study of the New Testament*, furnishing an easy general survey of the points of principal moment, in the criticism of the same, indispensible to every theologian—a genuine magazine of critical learning. Whatever was agitated, before and at the time of Michaelis, in relation to the criticism of the New Testament, with the exception of a few hypotheses, may be found here discussed, with a constant regard to the original sources; so that, under his hands, they become properly the results of his own study, deprived only of the merit of having been first announced by him. We see here recorded the history of his opinions, and of his progressive

study of the New Testament ; we see him here wavering, fluctuating, weighing, conjecturing and erring, until he arrived at the point which he thought he could maintain ; we see here discussions in which, at every step, he subjected himself as well as others to a rigid criticism. The style of the work, it is true, is rendered thus more broken and heavy; but it becomes, on the other hand, more instructive for every one who wishes to commence his acquaintance with such investigations.

To him we are indebted for many new results. He dwelt, with the most pleasure, on the merits of the principal manuscripts and of the older translations. He furnishes here a rich supply of original observations, and displays his critical talents in all their excellence. For an example, we need only turn to his investigations concerning the Syriac translations ; which are so novel, so rich, and so fruitful in inferences for every scholar in this department. Even where he pursues some favorite hypothesis of his own, which can hardly stand the test of criticism,—as in the case of the Hebrew original text of the Epistle to the Hebrews,—still, those who differ from him on the main point, will find other subordinate investigations, abounding in useful instruction, which we would gladly receive from his hand.

For a long time, however, he appears to have acted unjustly and ungratefully toward Semler, his profound and critical contemporary; and toward the bold elevation which he had given to criticism. But in his latter days he exonerated himself from this reproach, and discarded a number of notions which he had cherished during nearly half a century. The edition of his *Introduction*, prepared in the year 1788, estimates, justly, together with Semler, the real value of the so styled latinising manuscripts, and the high antiquity of their text. It purports to be an abstract of critical proceedings adapted to certain principal divi-

sions of the general subject; made, however, in a peculiar manner, as Michaelis himself had always practised it. It establishes, also, more firmly than had heretofore been done, the authority of some of the writings of the New Testament; those, for example, of Mark and of Luke. Thus the mind of Michaelis, contrary to the usual course of things, remained, even in his old age, so pliant as to admit an entire change of his early ideas.

The same critical materials might, it is true, in our day, have been disposed of in a more novel, free, and summary manner; it is questionable, however, whether we should have obtained the same rich store of original results. But a capital consideration, which should not have been disregarded, has, unfortunately, been overlooked by Michaelis, viz. the enquiry into the religious notions of the Jews at the time of Christ and the Apostles, which would have enabled him to have seen, more satisfatorily, how Christianity arose out of Judaism; with what wisdom Christ and the Apostles conducted themselves in the first establishment and promulgation of our religion; how they connected their new doctrines with the old ones; where they adhered to the old path; where they advanced further; and where they moulded every thing anew. In the present state of these researches, the distance between the Old and the New Testament, and the transition from the one to the other, appear too great.

Sound exegesis was a thing unknown, when Michaelis commenced his carreer. It was even inferior to that which preailed two centuries before.

At the period of the reformation, all the arts of interpretation were in full exercise—a natural consequence of the enthusiasm, with which the study of the ancient classics had been prosecuted for nearly a century. This state of things was succeeded by the arts of controversy. Barbarism, however, as might naturally be expected, reigned

in all the departments of theology, until within about fifty years of the present day. Grotius, indeed, who had grown up in the study of the ancient classics, made an effort to restore this state of things; but his mild and benevolent voice was drowned amidst the barbarous yells of the German theologians, led on by Salov.

Meanwhile the study of the ancient languages was revived. The oriental languages established themselves at Halle, in the very school from which Michaelis came. But they lent no aid to the exegesis of the Bible. What was only the means was regarded as the end. Philological learning was sought for, merely for its own sake, as if no nobler use of it could be conceived. An idle rummaging among words, tedious etymologies, and grammatical speculations, afforded the principal gratification. The philologists knew not how to turn their treasure to advantage. If they applied them to the Bible, they busied themselves eternally with mere words and phrases and syllabification, and laid immense stress upon every syllable, which was certainly never intended by the original author. They had not even a remote apprehension of that which gives life and fruitfulness to the busines of interpretation, viz. penetrating views of the peculiarities of the ancient language, and of the course and connexion of the thoughts in any work; the development of these from the spirit of the times, and from the character and prevailing sentiments of every period. As to the didactic theologians, they occupied too proud a station in their lordly systems, to condescend to enter the humble abodes of philology. They adhered to Luther's translation, and expounded it—the genuine protestant Vulgate of those days.

The progress of deism, which was sounding, throughout England, its loud scoffs at all positive religion, at length constrained the British theologians to defend their territories by means of a better study of the Bible. But they had among them, at that time, no philologist who

could commence with grammatical-philological explanations. Their sagacity, however, provided a remedy. The significations of the words, and the sense of the whole, were elicited by an acute analysis of the whole connexion; and the results were comprehended in verbose, and diffuse paraphrases—the most effectual method of concealing their ignorance of the original language, from themselves and others.

With this sort of exegesis, Michaelis became acquainted, during his residence in England. With all its imperfections, it was still more rich and instructive than the miserable mode which prevailed in his own country; and he thought it, therefore, worthy of imitation, in Germany. To commence, he furnished Latin translations of English paraphrasts; of Benson, on James, in the year 1746; of Pierce, on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the year 1747. He then proceeded to paraphrases of his own. In the year 1750, appeared his paraphrase of the minor epistles of Paul; in the year 1751, his poetical paraphrase of Ecclesiastes; and in the year 1762, his paraphrase of the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews. This mode of exegesis was now fairly introduced into Germany, and remained in favor till Michaelis led the way again to a new one. No one was sooner convinced of its inconveniencies and its unhappy consequences. It is too easily satisfied with remote philological evidences in support of the adopted meaning, and leads us astray from accurate grammatical interpretation, which alone can furnish satisfactory results; it makes no distinction between the ideas of the paraphrased author, and those of the paraphrast, and the reader is in danger of mistaking the latter for the former; it obliterates also all the spirit of the author and communicates a spirit not his own. Michaelis, therefore, began with improving the English mode, and accompanied his paraphrases with rich philological observations, which especially adorn his epistle to the Hebrews; he finally abandoned it entirely,

and preferred, what was decidedly better, accurate translations with explanatory observations.

The Germans, under his guidance, began again to interpret the Scriptures for themselves; to elicit their meaning, as was customary at the time of the reformation, by means of grammatical interpretation; and also to investigate it, historically, from the spirit of those ancient times, from history, antiquities, customs, opinions, and modes of thinking; and to furnish materials, thus approved, for a systematic theology. In the criticism of the Old Testament, he continued to lead the way alone; in that of the New Testament, however, he found, in Ernesti, an active coadjutor.

With his *Commentary on the Bible*, if regarded in the proper light, commences a new period of Biblical exegesis. If I mistake not, the translation was merely a subordinate concern; the observations constitute the principal and by far the richest portion, of which the translation was only the vehicle.

The circumstances of the times, and the nature and compass of the work, prevented him from giving his translation a substantial and classical form. The period in which he was educated, was ill adapted to communicate to his German style, any degree of consciseness, flexibility and skill. After he had improved it, it was still too verbose for the concisely descriptive poetry of the Hebrews, and too fond of measured periods for their prose. In the poetry, he failed in a due measure of vigor and fulness; in the prose, he was deficient in thorough simplicity. A tasteful translation, however, is seldom the production of a philologist, absorbed in critical labors and buried amongst various readings. Weary and dispirited with his wanderings in the sandy desert of criticism, which must, of necessity, be passed; he must nevertheless elevate his mind with unwonted freedom in order to conceive, and express in another language, every new shade of meaning in the

ancient author, whose language differs from his so widely in spirit and character. A thorough proficient in the ancient languages, he must display an equal proficiency in modern languages also, in order to keep pace with his author in feeling, thinking, and expression. Abounding in learned philological researches, he must nevertheless lay aside his wealth, and find his greatness in a poverty and simplicity, to which he is not accustomed. How could a teacher at the university, occupied with a daily round of laborious employments, submit himself to the necessary task of examining, with rigid scrutiny, every word, in order to remain faithful to the original in their choice and collocation; and to communicate to the translation the same distribution of light and shade as the original possesses. And should he succeed in reconciling this with his ordinary employments, in a small portion of the Bible, could he be expected to make the sacrifice throughout the whole?

The learned interpreter is altogether a different person from the tasteful translator. The former amasses treasures for the use of the latter, that he may turn them to advantage in his own way. Each receives, however, his merited reward.

The design of the translation of Michaelis, accordingly, was merely to present, connectedly and comprehensively, the Hebrew writings, in the sense in which he understood them, and which he aimed to elicit, passage by passage, so that his readers might carry it along with them to the observations. To these he directed his principal exertions. In these he illustrated his text from manners and customs, from antiquities, and from natural and political history, with a fulness which could be expected only from the most erudite and comprehensive scholar. He then indulges in reflections on the intellectual and moral character of the ancient times; and on the doctrines and systems of faith which owe their origin to these times; and on moral and political maxims: which reflections evinced the

scholar familiar with the ancient as well as the modern world, the experienced philosopher, politician and moralist, and the skilful theologian, all combined in one man. That portion, however, was the most important and the most abundant in original views, which derived its illustrations from antiquities, Geography and modern travels. Here Michaelis was in his element. He was not so well versed in the intellectual and moral character of the ancient world. He conceived of those times, as in a condition of high intellectual and scientific cultivation. The Hebrew poets, especially, he considered as in possession of comprehensive natural knowledge, and of an abundance of other learning, which time, however, and accident, had, at a later period, obliterated. In this light he regarded Moses, and the philosophical poet who speaks in Job, and the rest in order, according to their circumstances. The discoveries of Linnæus, Waller, Buffon and others, he supposed could now elucidate those ancient writings. This same knowledge, however, he imagined, was extant before, but was obliterated, in process of time, and, as is often the case inthe world of science, revived again by the ingenuity ofmodern times. There are other passages of the work, however, which oppose these views, in which he draws his illustration from the manners and customs of the Bedouins, and represents the early condition of mankind as characterised by extreme simplicity. For mind and manners go hand in hand. If the latter remain simple the former continues the same, and unacquainted with scientific cultivation. These latter passages may serve, therefore, for the correction of the others. Michaelis would certainly not have liberated the human understanding at so early a period, from its swaddling-clothes, provided he had received his earliest education at a time, when opportunities were enjoyed of becoming acquainted with ancient Greece, its manners and customs, its mode of thinking, and its gradual refinement. But he had occasion to lament, even in his

old age, the scantiness of this knowledge, both at the school and at the University.* Otherwise, when he made use of the travels, he would have directed his attention more to the progress of mankind, in order to obtain from the descriptions in these travels, a consistant picture of the primitive condition of the human understanding, which would necessarily have thrown a very different light upon the works of the Hebrews. But his early education rendered this impossible. Let not this defect, however, detract, for a moment, from his reputation and his immense desert. It is a duty we owe to historical justice, to contemplate every great man in his own times.

Many of his exegetical explanations of the Old Testament are obnoxious to the objection before mentioned. But the New Testament approached nearer to our own times, and has been well elucidated by contemporaries. Like an experienced master of his art, Michaelis knew how to avail himself of the raw materials furnished by Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein, so as to present an admirable picture of the intellectual character of those times; he knew how to distribute, in a becoming manner, the light and the shade, and to mingle, in such a manner the earlier and the later coloring, that it eventually became what was necessary for the illustration of the New Testament. We may, perhaps, desire something different in particular passages; the work, however, as a whole, will still continue to sustain his reputation.

In the midst of this store of exegetical and historical learning, nothing but a knowledge of philosophy was wanting, to perfect in Michaelis the great theologian. He was not, however, entirely deficient in this department. With the philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolf, he had formed a more accurate and profound acquaintance, than many of its most distinguished advocates. It became his guide in

* Beyer's Magazine for Preachers, B. II. Art. 6. p. 2, 6, 7.

the labyrinths of theology, a far better and safer guide than the philosophising didactic theologians of this school, entirely destitute of the aid of philological learning, and whose names now repose in quiet with their ashes.* Michaelis, however, with his peculiar exegetical acuteness sought only to ascertain, in every case, what the Bible really taught. He examined rigidly the *dicta classica*, which under his hand, vanished, with the exception of a few, much to the fright of the didactic theologians. He then weighed carefully, upon rational principles, what remained after this refining process of his exegesis, and assisted, to the utmost of his abilities, to do away the old complaints, that the Bible and reason could not dwell together in perfect harmony. His theological style and manner was rather popular than scholastic; from which circumstance may be explained why, in the discussion of every doctrine, he did not connect exegesis and philosophy with history, for the purpose of eliciting from the spirit of the times, the origin and various forms of the doctrine, in all its bearings; and of placing its present form in the best possible light—the only means, if I am not mistaken, of rendering the young theologian skilfull in every part of this science, and of rendering it, without any reference to a future office, an interesting study for the philosophical mind. It was not the design, however, of Michaelis, in adopting this popular manner, to underrate the other which is altogether indispensible for genuine theological learning, although it be encumbered with the technical phraseology of the schools. He who was so substantial a promoter of solid learning, could never have designed to obstruct the avenue to the noble doctrinal works of the earlier period

* His application of the philosophy of Wolf may be seen to the best advntage in his Thoughts on the Doctrines of Sin and Atonement.

of the reformation ; which, happily for the reputation of a goodly number of modern theologians, are now no longer in general circulation.

He taught, generally speaking, the pure doctrines of the church ; regarding, however, more the spirit of its symbolical books, than the exact letter ; and he defended these doctrines, with a fund of theological learning, and in a manner, in which a few only, during the most efficient period of his life, were able to defend them.

His doctrinal views influenced powerfully the period in which he lived, and prepared the way for the present improvements in theology. This was owing, however, more to his exegetical writings, than to his manual of doctrinal theology. This last produced in Germany no general sensation ; undoubtedly because it could not boast for its author, a man in a black coat who had been dubbed a doctor of theology. In Sweden, much to the edification of the German zealots, a formal *auto da fe* was celebrated in consequence of it. Notwithstanding this, Michaelis triumphed also here with uncommon good fortune. Count Höpken, at that time Chancellor of the university at Upsala, who was led by the proceedings against the book to give it a perusal, expressed, in behalf of his nation, his chagrin at its treatment, and persuaded his king, eighteen years after this act of injustice, to make amends to the author for it, by conferring upon him the order of the Star.

Michaelis was not satisfied with the form which the didactic theology of Germany had assumed during the last twenty years. He was not pleased with the fashion, beginning to prevail of throwing together what was ancient and what was modern, without any compacted system, although they were so widely different in nature and spirit ; of giving with one hand what was taken away again with the other ; of destroying on one page, what had been established on the preceding. And what man, of any intellectual strength and character, could regard with compla-

cency this superficial and sophistical manner? Certain it is, this method is not the prevailing one in Germany; nor, from its very nature, can it ever come into general use, for any length of time. Still, there is reason to believe, that Michaelis regarded the condition of didactic theology as much worse than it really was. This was owing, perhaps, to the fact, that old age generally renders the mind more timid and scrupulous; or to the fact, that he could no longer embrace, within the compass of his reading, every thing which the modern investigations in theology had brought to light and established. Michaelis was, accordingly, in his later days, as much revered as the patriarch and support of the old faith, as he had been reviled and abused, in his younger days, as the leader of the reformers of theology. He could hardly have practised a deception in this case. This was not in his nature; his step also was too firm and his tone much too decided, to permit us to indulge the suspicion. It was perhaps a pause in the progress of his intellectual illumination, fully consistent with the law of our intellectual nature. It fares, in this respect, with an individual as with mankind collectively. As there is a fixed point in the period of the existence of mankind collectively, with regard to their illumination, beyond which they cannot proceed, and in any attempt to advance beyond which they must pay dear for their temerity; so it is also with every individual man. He may indeed become more learned, but not more enlightened. Whereabouts, in every individual case, these limits commence, is frequently determined by accident, mode of life, place of residence, intercourse of earlier and later years, peculiar organization, and an innumerable aggregate of trivial circumstances. Michaelis, by the aid of his extraordinary talents, reached rapidly and early his highest point. Here his limit was set. It seems indeed to evince uncommon strength and skill in a mind, to be able to assume every form at every age of life; but we should often be deceiv-

ed, if we attempted to test, by this standard, the powers of contemporary scholars. He who has marked out for himself an extensive sphere, can no longer, after a certain age, be present with his mind, in every part; while his neighbour finds himself easily at home in every part of his contracted circle. But which one deserves the greater admiration? How often is it the case that a scholar remains far in advance of his contemporaries, merely because he has had the good luck, and the science in which he labors the ill luck, to have been kept aloof, for a long time, from all men of talents; and that frequently, during whole generations, a curse seems to rest upon science. Praise and censure on the point are to be dispensed with much care. Let it suffice that Michaelis continued at the head of his contemporaries, in many other departments, until his death. Could this be expected of him in all?

In the midst of all the dislike which he manifested toward a great portion of the latest improvements in didactic theology, he continued always tolerant. For myself at least, I do not recollect, at present, in his writings, any violence of expression, any malicious side-long glances at the later theologians; but merely open-hearted disapprobation of their doctrinal-system, couched in serious language, such as is wont to accompany a man of intellectual firmness. Decidedly devoted, as he believed, to the system of doctrines of the symbolical books of his church, it was nevertheless entirely contrary to his views, to repress or forbid discussions concerning their contents. He expressed himself, in the last years of his life, on this subject, by word of mouth, before many witnesses, in a most decided and emphatic manner.

With his system of morals, my acquaintance, drawn from detached expressions of his translation of the Bible, is much too slight to enable me to characterize it fully. According to these expressions, it was deeply tinged with a rigid scrupulousness—undoubtedly a remnant of the over-strain-

ed piety of the school in which he was educated. He has left a work on this subject fully completed, which, according to his last will, is to appear in print before every other.

Michaelis thus embraced, in his capacious mind, many departments, in a manner always peculiar and always eminent. In every one he communicated the tone for a long time, and in many, until his death. For this great superiority, he was indebted to the unceasing study of the sources of his sciences. He took no one at his word. He considered no investigations as closed, and regarded no magisterial assertions. Sometimes, indeed, this new labor was superfluous; but it was never entirely useless. The investigation received, at least, through him, a new direction; it became new to whatever point it was directed; and conducted to other subordinate points hitherto untouched. And if he sometimes neglected, (as was perhaps the fact) to compare the labors of others, until his own investigations were brought to a close, still, no gap is left in his investigation, and no complaints can justly be indulged, of a proud disregard of earlier merit. He certainly availed himself willingly, in his researches, of the assistance and counsel of his friends at hand and at a distance. Every one also received credit for his own contribution, however trivial, as if it were a most important public concern; for every one found it again, with the mention of his name, in the writings of Michaelis.

Considering the striking peculiarity of his whole mind, the many new results with which his writings abounded, and his frequent opposition to prevailing notions, he could, in the ordinary course of events, scarcely count upon universal approbation. But what great man has not met with more opposition than applause from his contemporaries? A great and bold undertaking is not suited to the ordinary dimensions of human talents, and from this circumstance meets with opposition; but it does not follow from this that

it should not meet with a merited reception from talents of the right grade.

He was less solicitous about the exterior decorations, than about the internal value of his works. His latin style, during those years in which he was wont to polish with care, bore evident marks of a good knowledge of classical latinity ; and even in his later years, when old age enjoined a greater degree of haste, it still betrayed the good soil from which it sprang. With the improvement of our vernacular language, which took place during his years of manhood, his own German style was also improved ; and there was a period of his life, in which he was ambitious of the honor of being numbered amongst the wits of Germany ; after a while the serious sciences pleased him better, and thenceforth he aimed in his writings more at the excellencies of a conversational manner, than at elaborate ornament and conciseness. On this account, he was wont to entangle his discourse with participial connexions, and to interlard it with French words, even where they contributed, in clearness or strength, nothing more than the equivalent German expressions.

As an author he resembled a prudent and devoted father who is attentive to the wants of his offspring, and rigidly endeavors to supply them wherever they are observed. He made, continually, alterations and improvements in his works, and substituted new translations for old ones. Those who were not aware, from their own experience, of the labyrinth through which the human understanding must wind its cheerless way, were ready to complain, in his frequent and various retractions, of a neglect of earlier examination, and of the consequences of a censurable haste; an injustice which ingenious and inquisitive scholars must too often put up with from their meaner contemporaries, who have no resources beyond the meagre inheritance received from their instructers. Pertinacity of opinion in a

scholar is generally the consequence of his stationariness in the sciences, which is already half a relapse.

All these distinguished excellencies of Michaelis are known to the German public at large ; his pupils alone are acquainted with others, equally rare, which placed him in the number of the most eminent university teachers. With the exception, perhaps, of a slight excess of wit, he was free from most of the faults which attach themselves to that station. He always came forward after a full and previous preparation of the matter, and left merely the words to be supplied on the occasion. Filled with his subject, he spoke with order, clearness, life, fire, sometimes with inspiration, always with that interest, himself, in the subject, which awakens an interest in others even for the dryest communication. His preparation was always undertaken the day before. This afforded him time and opportunity for new investigations, much to the gain of his audience and the public; his style, however, lost that conciseness, which he would have given it, had he come forward immediately after his preparation. As it was, he was under the necessity of combining the thoughts of the preceding day with those last received, which were not very closely connected with the former; this frequently led, indeed, to new windings and combinations, but the thread was necessarily lengthened. Not unfrequently he engaged before his audience in full investigations, whose results merely he might have presented; by which means, the nobler minds learnt, from an experienced master, the art of research. The others, whose aims were lower, were satisfied with the naked result. All his studies and investigations had a bearing upon his business as an instructer, and hence his course of instruction was eminently learned, and became afterwards the proper source of his writings. His communications were never designed for mere amusement, and on this account were the better adapted to form a future taste for individual cultivation of the

sciences. All Germany is aware how great a number of learned men, in his and the kindred departments, proceeded from his school. His whole soul was alive to the interests of his best scholars, as long as they were under his immediate direction ; he assisted them with advice and encouragement to the extent of his power and opportunities. As soon as they displayed abilities and disposition for a speculative life, he assisted them diligently in obtaining those places, where they might rapidly unfold themselves; and to this end he regarded a distant place the best adapted, where they might turn to advantage the instruction received from him, better than when nearer to him. As soon as he saw them established, he left them to themselves, to establish their own fame, and gave his sole attention to his younger scholars, who were still beneath his eye. He designed that they should be indebted to themselves and their abilities, for the final establishment of their prosperity and reputation.

All this was accomplished by a single individual, for his scholars, for his contemporaries, and for posterity, by means of his high endowments and untiring industry. He first aroused his own talents, and then awakened, developed and ennobled the endowments of others. He was the father and nurse, the fosterer and the patron of science, in a state of tender orphanage. Poor and needy, after receiving all the treasures which came to him by inheritance ; and immensely rich in the fruits of his own labor, which descended, at his death, as an imperishable legacy, to posterity.

Such thou wast, revered instructer, and such, by thine own exertions, thou didst become ; in the midst of all the obstacles of education, which thou didst successfully surmount ; and all the difficulties of thy situation, which thou didst overcome ; and all the follies of thy contemporaries, which thou didst bear with patience. Such were thy labors, although reviled from the commencement by thy ig-

norant contemporaries, and frequently persecuted and attacked by malicious envy and bitter malice ; unappreciated in thy life time by many of thy contemporaries, and now in death—unrequited. Unconcerned about the arts of thine enemies, the designs of thine enviers, and the malice of the ignorant ; known and respected by kings, prized by their ministers, and admired by Europe ; thou didst pursue thine untrodden way, for the enlargement of the kingdom of truth and of science, and didst bear, with thine own name, the name of *Georgia Augusta* far beyond the limits of Germany, into every civilized land of Europe.

And now thou reposest, with all thine admirable endowments, where the ashes of common men repose. But thou shalt not be forgotten. Thine image remains deeply imprinted on the heart of *Georgia Augusta*, and time will carry thy name down through the endless lapse of succeeding generations.

SYNOPSIS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

THE

Antiquity and History

OF THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE.

The following article is intended as introductory to a Synopsis of Biblical Criticism : by which is meant that department of the Theological Science, whose object is to ascertain the Text of the Sacred writings. It is not long since this department was the main object of interest and study, among Biblical scholars. Until it was decided to what extent the Scriptures were corrupted, or how far the readings derived from various sources, differed from each other, and from the received text, critics were almost absorbed in the investigation, and the christian public were in anxious expectation of the result. But since it has been discovered, that only in a few passages, diversities materially affecting the sense, are to be found ; the public have returned to their former confidence, and critics have relaxed the ardor of their pursuit.

Although the further prosecution of this subject, is not likely again to call forth the same interest; it is obviously important to review what has been done. To learn what is the actual state of the Sacred text—to ascertain the sources, number, and importance of the various readings,—the means by which a knowledge of the genuine text is to be obtained—and to enquire into the history of the application of these means. The investigation of this subject, is the very first step in Theology ;—for we should know what the text is, before we attempt to learn its meaning. To present a general view of this subject, for the use of students, is the object of this Synopsis.

It is not easy at all times to designate with precision, the authority upon which every statement is made ; it may be sufficient therefore, to state in general, that the plan pursued has been to examine all the sources of information within the Editor's reach, on the several subjects, and then to present, as concise and as clear a view of the most important points as he could, making the references as minute as circumstances would permit.

ON THE

ANTIQUITY, HISTORY, &c.

OF THE

Hebrew Language.

A BRIEF view of the opinions, usually entertained, relative to the origin and history, of the Hebrew Language, may very properly be given as introductory, to a Synopsis of the Criticism of the Old Testament.

§. I. *Its Name.*

There are numerous appellations, which have at different periods, been given to the ancient language of the Jews. It is nowhere in Scripture called Hebrew. This term as it is used in *John* v. 2. (ἡ ἐπιλεγομενη Ἑβραϊστι Βηθεσδα) and in several other places in the New Testament, does not refer to the Biblical Hebrew, but to the Syro-Chaldaic dialect prevalent in Palestine, in the time of our Saviour. In Josephus however by γλωσσα των Ἑβραιων is always to be understood, the genuine Hebrew of the Bible.

In the 2 Book of Kings xviii. 26, it is called יְהוּדִית *the language of the Jews.* In the Targums, the appellation, *holy tongue*, is first applied to it. The name by which, it is usually distinguished, is *Hebrew*, as being the language of the Hebrew nation. As to the origin of this

term, however, there has been more controversy, than the importance of the subject, would seem to justify. *Loescher*, *Carpzov*, *Leusden*, and many other learned men, insist strenuously that it is derived from עֵבֶר *Eber*, or more properly, (Ἔβερ) *Heber*, one of the descendants of *Shem*. The two arguments of most plausibility in favor of this opinion, are, 1st, that this derivation is most agreeable to the analogy of the language, since nothing is more common, than this method of forming patronymics, by the addition of י to the root, whereas the regular derivative from עָבַר *transiit*, whence others say it is derived, would be עִבְרִי. 2nly, in Gen. x. 21, *Shem*, is said to be the father, *of all the sons of Heber*, or Hebrews, as *sons of Israel*, are Israelites. Hence it is maintained, that Hebrew, is as obviously derived from *Heber*, as Israelite, from *Israel*. But as no particular reason can be assigned, for designating *Abraham*, from *Heber*, rather than from any other of his ancestors, and as the name הָעִבְרִי (Gen. xiv. 13,) was first given to him after he had past over the Euphrates, *Walton* and most modern critics consider the name as coming from עֵבֶר *what is beyond*. עֵבֶר נָהָר being equivalent to *transfluvius*. The LXX translate לְאַבְרָם הָעִבְרִי by Ἀβραμ τῷ περάτῃ.

On the derivation of the word Hebrew:—see Walton's *Prolegomena*, page 58. *(Dathius' Edition.)* Loescher *De causis linguæ Hebrææ*. p. 53. Gesenius *Geschichte der Hebraischen Sprache und Schrift*, § 5. Leusden *De Appellationibus linguæ primæ*, Dissertation xxi. of his *Philologus Hebraeus*.

§ II. *The Origin of the Hebrew Language.*

The younger Buxtorf in his dissertation on the origin and antiquity of the Hebrew, lays down the following positions, which he endeavours to support. 1st. That man as soon as created had the use and command of some lan-

guage. 2d. That he received this language from God. 3d. That this language was the Hebrew, and, 4th. That it was the only language in existence in the early ages of the world. It need not be stated, that on most of these points there is great diversity of opinion. Many learned men have assumed as certain, that language arose very gradually. That at first man was conscious of nothing further, than the mere *faculty* of speech, and that he invented words as occasion required. In consistence with this opinion, they represent the original state of man, as a state of savagism, and regard his advancement in civilization, as tardy as his progress in the formation of language. As this subject is not necessarily connected with our present purpose, we shall merely remark, that all the evidence, which the Bible contains, of the dignity and perfection of our first parents, is hostile to the opinion, of their being sent abroad as *mutes* to gaze in silent wonder on the new creation, little removed from the irrational animals by which they were surrounded.

Whether this language, which we have little doubt, our first parents were enabled spontaneously to use, was virtually the same with the Hebrew, is a more doubtful point. The evidence in favour of the *presumption*, that this was really the case, will be found below. Our object here is only to state, in reference to the *origin* of the Hebrew, that distinguished scholars, particularly of the 17th and the early part of the 18th centuries, agree with the great body of the Jewish Doctors, in claiming for the Hebrew the epithet Θεοδοτος.

The Authors of the Universal History, *Sir William Jones*, and the majority of later critics and philologists, consider the original language as so far lost, that it is in vain, to attempt to discover any important traces of it, in any language now known. They of course, assign an origin to the Hebrew, consistent with this opinion. Some sup-

posing it to be the parent of the Oriental (Shemitish) languages, although not the primitive language of man; and others that it is the descendant of a language widely spoken among the descendants of *Shem*, yet not confined exclusively to them. This mother-tongue was spoken throughout Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Arabia, and Ethiopia. In this enumeration Assyria is usually included; but *Gesenius* and others, principally influenced by the fact that the Assyrian proper names, mentioned in Scripture, have no analogy to the languages of this general class, refer the Assyrian to a Medo Persian origin. *Geschischte der heb. Sprache, &c.* § 17. This widely extended language gave rise, according to *Gesenius*, 1. to the Aramean spoken in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia; which includes the Western Aramean or Syriac; and the Eastern Aramean or Chaldee. 2. To the language of Canaan, or the Hebrew, spoken in Palestine and Phœnicia, from which the Punic descended. 3. To the Arabic with which the Ethiopic is nearly related. The Samaritan is a mixture of the Aramean and Hebrew, *Geschichte* § 5. These are the languages now commonly called Shemitish.

According to this opinion, the Hebrew is distinctively the language of Palestine, and its origin, a language no longer in existence, which was the common parent of the Hebrew and its cognate tongues.

§ III. *The Extent to which the Hebrew was originally spoken.*

Upon this point there is the same diversity of opinion as upon the preceding. According to *Buxtorf*, *Loescher*, *Carpzov*, and other writers of that class, the Hebrew after existing as the general language of mankind, from the creation, to the confusion of tongues at Babel, was after that event preserved in the family of *Heber*, and by him communicated as a sacred deposit to *Abraham*, to be trans-

mitted with the knowledge of the true religion to his posterity.

Le Clerc, *Gesenius* and others of the later school, refer, as was just stated, the Hebrew, to Palestine, considering it distinctively as the language of that country. In support of this opinion, it is argued, 1st that the names of places and persons among the Canaanites, are evidently Hebrew ; as יְרֵחוֹ *Jericho*, שָׁלֵם *Salem*, שֶׁכֶם *Shechem*, קִרְיַת־סֵפֶר *Kirjathsepher*, בְּאֵר־שֶׁבַע *Beersheba* ; of persons אֲבִימֶלֶךְ *Abimelech*, מַלְכִּיצֶדֶק *Melchisedech*, רָחָב *Rahab*. 2. Another argument is derived from the fact, that the Israelites appear to have had easy intercourse with the Canaanites, without the aid of an Interpreter. 3. Again it is evident, from the remains of the Phœnician language, as exhibited in the proper names, and parts of inscriptions on monuments and coins, preserved by Greek and Roman authors ; that, the Phœnician and Hebrew have a close affinity. 4. And still further, the Punic as a descendant from the Phœnician exhibits the same relation. This is strikingly exhibited by a passage in *Plautus*, (Poenuli, Act. 5. Scena 1.) in which there is at least ten lines of Punic, in which the words are almost all of Hebrew origin. This relation of the Punic to the Hebrew, is expressly asserted by AUGUSTIN, "Hebraei dicunt Messiam, quod verbum Punicæ consonum est, sicut alia permulta Hebraica et pene omnia." JEROME makes the same assertion as in his commentary on Jer. v. 25, "Tyrum scilicet, et Sidonem in Phœniciæ littore principes esse civitates—quarum Carthago colonia est. Unde et Poeni sermone corrupto, quasi Phœni appellantur, quorum lingua linguæ Hebraeae magna ex parte affinis est." See upon this subject WALTON's *Prolegomena* iii. § 13, et seq. GESENIUS *Geschichte*, § 7. and especially BOCHART's *Georg. Sacra*, part 2nd, ii. c. 5.

This opinion, that the *holy* language was spoken by the

Canaanites, is strenuously opposed by *Loescher*, Chap. iii. § 10, who appears disposed (page 57,) to adopt the conjecture of *Steph. Morinus*, that some of the descendants of *Shem*, before the confusion of tongues emigrated to Palestine, and that from them, and not from the Canaanites, these Hebrew names were derived. His arguments, however, in reply to the evidence adduced above, are not satisfactory ; it must therefore be admitted, that the language of Palestine was either the Hebrew, or some language intimately connected with it. But it still remains to be proved, that this language was confined, to Palestine, and that it was unknown to *Abraham*, as *Le Clerc* maintains, before his sojourning in that land.—There is certainly no intimation, that *Abraham* met with any difficulty in communicating with the people, immediately after he came among them. And there is still further evidence, in the names of his family, &c. that the Hebrew was his native tongue.

A third opinion, therefore, as to the extent to which the Hebrew was originally spoken, is that maintained by *Vitringa*, in his *Observtt. Sacr.* L. I. chap. ii. He supposes that in the age of *Abraham*, the Hebrew was spoken almost universally through the East, at least, in Chaldea, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Canaan. The principal arguments in support of this opinion are, that the names of *Laban* and his family living in Mesopotamia, and of *Job* and his Arabian friends, are evidently Hebrew,—and that intercourse between the inhabitants of these different districts, was evidently carried on, without the necessity of an interpreter.

It appears very evident, from points conceded by the several critics referred to, that the languages of Western Asia, called formerly the Oriental, and of late the Shemitish, had a common origin, (a fact easily established from their character ;) and that at some period there was but one language spoken throughout that region. But

this region is generally admitted to have been the original seat of the human family, or at least the region, where the descendants of *Noah*, first settled. The language of this region was, therefore in all probability the language of *Noah*, and the language of *Noah* that of the Antediluvians. The question then arises, what was that language? Was it some language now lost, of which the Hebrew, the Aramean, and the Arabic, are the common descendants? Or is the Hebrew to be recognized as this fountain and the Aramean and Arabic as its streams? I am strongly inclined, to this latter opinion for the reasons detailed in the following section.

§. IV. *The Antiquity of the Hebrew.*

We have already seen, that according to the opinion of almost all critics, there was originally but one language, in that section of Asia, which includes, the region of the Euphrates, Syria, Palestine and Arabia. The original identity of the several languages, afterwards prevalent throughout this region, is proved, not merely by their having a great number of words which are common to all; but by their whole genius and structure. They abound in gutteral sounds, so accurately distinguished that western organs are not able to express the difference,—the roots are generally triliteral,—the pronouns in the oblique cases, are appended to the verb, noun, or participle to which they belong,—the verbs have but two tenses,—there are only two genders,—compound words are of very rare occurrance, &c. &c. *Gesenius*, § iv. 4. These, and other points of similarity, are sufficient to shew, that these languages have had a common origin. Of these cognate tongues, there is one of which the written documents which remain, are at least a thousand years older than the written monuments of either of the others. Of the Arabic little remains prior to the age of Mohammed, of the Sy-

riac, the Peschito, the version of the S. S. executed in one of the early centuries of the Christian Era, is, it is believed the oldest work extant; of the Chaldee, there is nothing earlier than the small portion of *Daniel* and *Ezra*, written in that dialect: whereas of the Hebrew we have evidence of its existing in its highest perfection fifteen centuries before Christ. There is something in this very fact, which seems to carry the Hebrew so far above its cognate dialects, that they appear at once to take the place of descendants, rather than coevals. It is true indeed, we have evidence, of the existence of the Aramean, as a dialect distinct from the Hebrew, at a much earlier period, than the time of the captivity; and that even in the time of Jacob a difference existed. But there is no evidence that the difference was then very great, as the utmost freedom of intercourse appears to have been kept up, between the Hebrews, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia. The Pentateuch, as the production of the age of *Moses*, does therefore contain evidence of the antiquity of the Hebrew, to which neither the Aramean nor Arabic can lay claim; since it shews the language was flourishing in full perfection, centuries before the date of any written monuments of either of the others.

2. Apart from the probability, in favour of the priority, of the Hebrew, derived from this source; there is a much stronger argument deducable from its character. Its simplicity of structure, the extensive range of the primary meaning of its roots, and the fact that it is a *pure* language, that is, that it does not consist of words derived from various sources, they are all Hebrew, there are no foreign terms, except here and there an Egyptian term of measure, or something of a similar nature. In the later Hebrew indeed, there are many traces of the influence of surrounding languages, but the remark just made is correct, as applied to the Pentateuch and early portions of the Bible. There is therefore in the Hebrew, every in-

dication of its being a primitive (or underived) language. As it is in respect to simplicity, and purity, so superior to both the Aramean and Arabic, there can be little doubt that it is much more, nearly identified with that original language, which formerly occupied the whole of that portion of Asia, where these several dialects subsequently prevailed. It should also be remarked, that there is strong historical evidence of the identity of the Hebrew, with this general Shemitish language. *Abraham* was a descendant of *Heber*, from whom, through his second son *Jochtan*, Arabia Felix was principally settled. The Ishmaelites, and the children of *Ketura*, also contributed largely to peopling this district, and they doubtless used the language of *Abraham*. In the age of *Joseph*, the language of the Ishmaelites was perfectly intelligible to the sons of *Jacob*. At a still later period, *Moses* found no difficulty in conversing with the Midianites. These circumstances show, that the Hebrew was virtually the prevalent language in this region at this time. *Abraham* coming from Ur of the Chaldees, into Canaan, (the proper abode of the Hebrew, according to some), found no difficulty in understanding the people of the land. And his grand-son *Jacob* on his return to Mesopotamia, experienced the same facility of intercourse. From these facts it may be inferred, that the language of Mesopotamia and the language of Palestine was at that period virtually the same. From these considerations, there is a strong presumption in favor of the opinion, that the Hebrew was in substance the general Shemitsh language, to which reference has already so often been made.

3. A third argument, in favor of this opinion, is derived from the perfection of the language, as it appears in the writings of *Moses*. It may be admitted, that the theories formed upon the idea, of the primitive rudeness of our race, and the human origin and gradual formation of language, are exceedingly fallacious; yet it is equally

certain that a high state of cultivation and refinement in a language, is an evidence, either that it has been long in use, or (as we suppose was the case with our first parents) that it came from "the inspiration of the Almighty." The perfection of the Hebrew, therefore, as it appears in the Pentateuch, is an evidence, that it had been long before cultivated: and as *Eichhorn* says (Einleit. ins Alt. Test. p. 50, vol. I.) it must have existed for centuries, as a written language. But only a few centuries are requisite to bring us to the Patriarchs, the immediate descendants of *Noah;* during whose life therefore it is presumable the Hebrew existed. But if it existed then, there is a strong presumption, that it was that one language, spoken before the confusion of Babel.

4. There is another argument commonly urged in favor of the antiquity of the Hebrew, which is perhaps of less force, than those already mentioned. I refer to the argument derived from the remains, of the Hebrew, in most of the languages of the earth.—It cannot be denied that the vestiges of the Hebrew, can be most extensively traced. *Bochart* has collected evidence of its influence, even among the ancient Gauls, *Geor. Sacra*, p. 662: in the names of their gods, terms of dignity and office, implements of war, &c. The same may be said with regard to almost every dialect of ancient Europe. With respect to the Greek, it has been the subject of frequent remark, that not only in words, but in modes of expression the coincidence is often peculiarly striking. See Erpenii *Oratio de ling Hebraica*, Ernesti *de vestigiis ling. Hebr. in lingua Graeca*, *Opuscula Philol. et Crit.* p. 171. The same claim has been made for it, in reference to the languages of Eastern Asia, but with less semblance of justice. That the Hebrew has had a widely extended influence is certain; but it still remains to be asked whether this influence is to be accounted for, on the supposition of the common descent of all languages from the

Hebrew, or from the widely extended intercourse of the ancient Phenicians with other nations, by commerce and the establishment of colonies. It is obvious that there is a very great difference, between the mere occurrence of a few words of Hebrew origin, in other languages, and that similarity of grammatical structure and general character, which at once establishes identity of origin. The former is satisfactorily accounted for, by casual intercourse, which is as much, perhaps as can be inferred, from the evidence as yet adduced from the presence of Hebrew terms, in the languages of Europe and Eastern Asia.

To determine whether all languages have descended from one stock, or whether, there have been several distinct sources, would require an extent of knowledge, and labor of comparison, to which no individual is adequate. Sir William Jones is disposed to class all the languages of the earth under three heads; 1st the *Indian*, which includes the old Persic, the Greek, the Latin, Gothic, and old Egyptian; that all these have had a common origin he deems incontestable. 2d The *Arabian*, which as certainly he thinks, includes, the language of the Jews and Syrians, the Assyrians, and a large tribe of Abyssinians; 3d The *Tartarian*, used by the various tribes scattered over the north of Europe and Asia. See his Anniversary Discourses, particularly the ninth, Vol. iii. of his works.—See also Murray's *Philosophical Analysis of the Modern Languages of Europe*, and Frederick Schlegel *ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier.*

Sir William Jones supposes that these tribes or families separated so early, that they carried with them very little of a common language, and that little, in his opinion, they very soon forgot. The language of *Noah*, therefore he supposes, irretrievably lost, and those used by the descendants of his three sons, he regards as essentially distinct. Whether this latter supposition be correct or not, does not materially affect the question of the antiquity of the Hebrew.

For although it would be a decisive argument in favor of the primeval character of the sacred tongue, could it be shown that all other languages are derived from it; yet it is by no means necessary, in order to establish the claims of the Hebrew to this high character, that we should be able to trace every language to it as its source. Because, even essential diversity may be accounted for, as it is by *Sir W. Jones*, on the supposition of early separation; or if this be deemed inadequate, we may appeal to the confusion of tongues at Babel, which this essential diversity, would then be a legitimate reason for explaining in its strongest sense.

5. Another argument urged by the advocates of the antiquity of the Hebrew, is derived from the fact that the names of most of the heathen gods are of Hebrew origin. Thus *Saturn* is supposed to come from סָתַר *to hide; Jove* from יְהוָה; *Belus* or *Baal* from בַּעַל *Lord; Ceres* from גֶּרֶשׁ *fruit.* The same may be said of the names of ancient nations. Thus *Asher* gave name to the Assyrians, *Elam* to the Elamites, *Lud* to the Lydians, *Aram* to the Arameans, *Gomer* to the Cimbrians, *Madai* to the Medes, *Javan* to the Ionians.—The origin of these and many other ancient names, being found in the Hebrew, is an evidence of the existence of the Hebrew prior to the origin of any of these nations. On the former of these arguments see G. Vossius *de origine Idolatriæ* and Selden *de Diis Syriis*, and on the latter, Bochart *Geographia Sacra*, Pars I.

6. The only other argument on this subject, which it is thought proper to adduce, is one upon which great dependence has always been placed.—It is, that the names of persons and places occurring in the early history of the world, are evidently of Hebrew origin, and are expressly asserted by the sacred historian to be derived from Hebrew roots.—Thus אָדָם *Adam*, is from אַדְמָה *the earth;*

חַוָּה *Eve*, is from חָיָה *to live*; קַיִן *Cain*, from קָנָה *to possess*; שֵׁת *Seth*, from שׁוּת *to place*; פֶּלֶג *Peleg*, from פָּלַג *to divide*; a great number of similar examples might be adduced. If these were really the names of the early Patriarchs, it is clear that a language very analogous to the Hebrew then existed. It is a very common and obvious objection to this argument, that *Moses* translated the real original names, into corresponding Hebrew terms. But this is a gratuitous assertion, and at variance with the general practice of the sacred historians. No instance can be adduced, even from profane authors, of the systematic and general change, of the proper names of one language, into the corresponding terms of another. This was not done by the Greek or Latin writers in their histories of foreign nations, nor by *Moses* and the other sacred penmen upon other occasions, as is evident from the numerous foreign names retained in the Scriptures. Besides, we know that in some instances at least, the names in the catalogues given by *Moses* are the true original terms, because, they have been retained and preserved in the proper names of the nations, of which the individuals to whom they at first belonged, were the parents.

On a subject of this nature, it is impossible that absolute certainty can be attained, it is rather a matter of surprise, that the probabilities are so strong in favor of the primeval antiquity of the Hebrew.

§. V. *History of the Hebrew Language.*

In a previous section (§. 3,) it was stated, that according to the opinion of the advocates of the primitive antiquity of the Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament, was the general language of our race, from the creation to the confusion of tongues at Babel. Subsequently to that event, some of those advocates, suppose that it was confined to the descendants of *Shem*, others admit that it was also used by the Canaanites, and others maintain

that it was confined to the single family of *Heber*. Another class of critics, regard it as peculiarly the language of Palestine, while others believe it was spoken throughout the whole region subsequently occupied by the Aramean and Arabic. This latter opinion appears to us the best founded. That is, that a language virtually identical with the Hebrew, was that general Shemitish language, which, with some slight departures from its original state, appears in the writings of *Moses*, and gradually past under the operations of causes, which cannot be specified, in one district into the Aramean, in another into the Arabic.

This language, *Abraham* learned from his ancestors and carried with him into Palestine. Finding here virtually the same dialect, his posterity retained it unimpaired, and carried it with them into Egypt. Being here secluded from the inhabitants of the land, and remaining a separate people during all the period of their stay, they returned to the inheritance of their fathers with their language uncorrupted.

It is universally admitted that the Hebrew never attained greater perfection, than it exhibits in the Pentateuch. From this period to the Babylonish Captivity, is regarded as its golden age. The historical books, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Samuel and many of the Psalms, and prophetical writings, present the Hebrew scarcely changed, in any perceptible degree from the state in which it appears in the writings of *Moses*. This uniformity of the language during a period of nearly a thousand years, is satisfactorily accounted for, by the secluded habits of the Jewish people, by their exemption from the ingress of foreigners, by the language being fixed and preserved in their sacred books, a standard always in use. The influence of this latter circumstance is exceedingly great, and is illustrated by the influence of the Koran on the Arabic of *Luther's* version on the German, and of our own version on the English.

The uniformity of the customs, manners, laws, and state of knowledge among the Jews goes far, to explain the reasons of the stability of the Hebrew, during this protracted period. This is not an isolated fact. The uniformity of the Syriac as exhibited in the Peschito, (a version of the Scripture, made within a few centuries from the birth of Christ) and in the productions of the thirteenth century, is scarcely less remarkable. The Arabic poems, anterior to the age of Mahommed, are nearly allied to the Arabic of the present day. And what is far more wonderful, the language of Confucius, after the lapse of two thousand years, does not differ from the Chinese of our own times.

Although there is this general similarity in the character of the Hebrew, from *Moses* to the captivity, there is a perceptible difference in many respects, between the productions of different portions of this general period. There are several particulars noted by critics as peculiar to the Hebrew of the Pentateuch. It is free from all foreign words, except a few of Egyptian origin; the words הוּא and נַעַר are used in the fem. as well as masc. gender; verbs in א and ה are frequently interchanged; the fem. plural of the future, often occurs without the final ה, &c. &c. There are also many words which occur in the Pentateuch which are not found elsewhere, and on the other hand there are many frequent in the later Hebrew, which are not to be found in the writings of *Moses*. Of this kind *Jahn* says he has collected more than an hundred, omitting the ἅπαξ λεγομενα, and such as relate to subjects not treated of in the other books.

After the time of David, when the kingdom was greatly enlarged, foreign words were gradually introduced. Hence a difference becomes apparent, between writings of this period and those of an earlier date. This difference, as might be supposed considerably increased after the time of Hezekiah, from whose reign to the captivity, the

influence of surrounding languages upon the Hebrew, became more and more obvious.

Many have remarked a difference between the poetic and prose dialect, during this period. The former being distinguished from the latter, by—the use of peculiar words, as אֱנוֹשׁ for אָדָם *man*,—אָתָה for בּוֹא *to come*,—כְּלָה for דָּבָר *a word*, &c.—words in a peculiar sense אַבִּיר the *strong one*, for *God*,—peculiar forms אֱלֹהִים for אֱלֹהַּ *God*—הָוָה for הָיָה *to be*—שָׁנוֹת *years*, and יְמוֹת *days*, for שָׁנִים and יָמִים, &c.—peculiar grammatical forms and constructions, the suffixes מוֹ and ימו for ם and יהם —the plural formed in ין and י for ים, the use of the Piel and Hiphil as intransitive,—the frequent use of the participle for the verb, &c. &c. *Gesenius*, §. 9.

The Hebrew then, as it existed before the Babylonish Captivity, is distinguished, both in prose and poetry by an almost entire exemption from foreign words and constructions. This character is most decisively marked in the earlier productions, whilst those which were written from the reign of David to the destruction of the Temple, were more or less affected by the intercourse of the Jews with strangers.

The Babylonish Captivity, was the first event, which to any considerable degree, affected the purity of the Hebrew. From this period therefore, is dated the commencement of its second or silver age, which extends to the time at which it ceased to be vernacular. The Jews during their captivity, were probably much dispersed, as individual slaves; which accounts for the fact that their language suffered so much more, during the comparitively short period of their residence in Babylon, than it did in Egypt. In the writings of *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Zachariah* and *Malachi*, in the *Chronicles*, some of the *Psalms*, and in a few other portions of Scripture, the characteristics of the later Hebrew

are to be found. These characteristics are principally, the following. 1st. The use of new words, as תּוֹרוֹת, גָּאַל, מִקְצָת, בִּירָה, &c.; 2d. of words in a new sense, as in the sense of polluting, אָמַר of commanding, אַרְצוֹת the *heathen* lands, סֹפֵר a scribe, עָמַד to arise, &c. 3rd. In the peculiar forms of words, as the prevalence of the forms ן, וֹן, and וֹת. 4th. In peculiar phrases, as נָשָׂא אִשָּׁה to take a wife, עָצַר כֹּחַ to confirm. 5th. In peculiarities of syntax, and inflexion, as ב constructed with diseases and clothing, to be diseased in the feet, to be clothed in purple or linen, &c. חַד for אֶחָד, שׁ for אֲשֶׁר, (this however, occurs frequently, in several portions of scripture, usually assigned to a much earlier period.) 6th. Peculiarities of orthography, as the frequent insertion of the vowel letters, the use of א for ה, and the interchange of verbs ending in א and ה. See *Loescher* p. 65, *Gesenius*, § 10. and *Gussetius Commentary*.

It is difficult to determine, how long the Hebrew continued the vernacular language of the Jews, after their return. It is very improbable, as has been commonly supposed, upon the authority of the later Jews, that the Hebrews lost their native language during the captivity, and returned with the Syriac or Chaldee, according to the place in which they had severally sojourned. This opinion is principally founded upon the passage in *Nehemiah* viii. 8, in which the Levites are said to have read the law, and made the people to understand the sense. This is generally explained of translating. But the word here used מְפֹרָשׁ means *literally, exactly;* they read the law *literally* and gave the sense; that is, they explained and enforced it. The reasons, which confirm this interpretation, besides those of a merely philological character, which might be adduced, are very weighty. It is, in the first place, very improbable, that under the most unfavorable circumstances, the Jews should lose entirely their

language in the space of of 70 years. The prophets after the return continued to speak in Hebrew, which it is hence to be presumed, the people were able to understand. *Nehemiah* (xiii. c. 24,) speaks of those who by marriage with the daughters of Ashdod, brought up their children to speak half in the language of Ashdod, and half in the language of the Jews, יְהוּדִית; which shews that the Hebrew was then generally spoken.

Although the influence of the captivity was not so fatal to the language of the Jews as has been sometimes represented; yet it was doubtless very considerable. Many of the captives in all probability learnt the language of their masters, and brought it mingled with that of their fathers to their native land. Under the operation of this cause, and the ascendency of the Syrian monarchy, the Hebrew was gradually banished from common life and was reserved for the learned. During the time of the Maccabees, it would seem, from the inscriptions upon the coins, belonging to this period, it was still in general use. But it is probable, that, it did not after this time long continue to be vernacular. Frequent intercourse with neighbouring nations, produced at length, that mixture of the Hebrew, with the Syriac and Chaldee, which is commonly called Syro-Chaldaic, a name given to the language of Palestine at the time of our Saviour. Those Jews who dwelt in the East, spoke a language in a great measure conformed to the Chaldee, as it appears in the purer Targums; whereas those of the West, had a language in which the Syriac predominated, and upon which the Greek and Latin had exerted no inconsiderable influence.—Of this dialect numerous traces are visible in the New Testament, as in the words Αββα, Ακελδαμα, Εφφαθα, Μαραναθα, &c. &c. From these words, and from other sources, it is evident that the constituents of the language, spoken at this period in Palestine, were, the Old Hebrew, the Chaldee brought from Babylon, the Syriac, principally induced by the subjugation of the Jews to the Saleucidae, and the

Greek and Latin, which the ascendency first of the Macedonians, and afterwards of the Romans, brought to bear upon the language of the Jews. After the destruction of Jerusalem, by *Vespasian*, this Syro-Chaldaic, was still further corrupted by the introduction of words, from various sources, giving rise to the dialect exhibited in the Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud; which is referred to the middle of the third century. This dialect is exceedingly barbarous, and is so filled with words derived from different and dissimilar languages as to be extremely obscure, and often unintelligible. The Rabinnical Hebrew, is this Talmudical dialect, mixed up with words derived from almost all the languages of the nations, among whom the Jews have been dispersed.

Although the spoken language of the Jews, was thus undergoing a process of progressive deterioration; yet the pure Biblical Hebrew was constantly an object of attention and study. This is proved, by the excellence of the versions made from the original Hebrew at different periods. By the Septuagint before the advent, and by the Syriac after it. This latter, whether executed during the first or third century, by Jew or Christian, shews that the Hebrew was thoroughly understood. The Jews of Babylon, and those of Palestine, had both their schools, in which their sacred language was carefully cultivated. The school of Tiberias, was in its greatest perfection, A. D. 230, about the time of the death of Judah the Holy.—From this period, this species of learning appeared to decline in Palestine, until the time of the Masorites; but in the East it still continued to flourish. By the christians of the Greek and Latin churches, the Hebrew was but little attended to:—the former contenting themselves with the LXX, the latter with the Latin version. When arguing with the Jews, they would appeal to the version of *Aquila*, which, from its adherence to the very letter of the original, they called the Hebrew; and from its being

made by a Jew, was secure of the confidence of their adversaries. *Origen* and *Jerome*, particularly the latter, are the two most honorable exceptions to the charge of neglecting the Hebrew; and if the Syriac version of the Old Testament, be, as is generally admitted, the work of a Christian, it affords decisive evidence, that in this section of the church, the holy tongue was carefully studied. The Masora, considered as the gradually increasing production of the learned men of Tiberias, proves that this school did not long continue to languish, and that from the 5th or 6th to the 8th or 9th century, the Jewish literati were laboriously engaged in Biblical and critical pursuits.

About the 11th century the Jews both in Palestine and the East, arose to an unwonted zeal in the study of the language, and examination of the text of their scriptures. Shortly after this period, the troubles in the East, led them to seek a more quiet abode in the West. Hence for the four subsequent centuries the North of Africa, and especially Spain, became the seat of their learning. In this latter country, they had schools established at Grenada, Toledo, Barcelona, and many other places. This period is distinguished, by some of their most learned Grammarians, Lexicographers, and Commentators. From the Jews, the desire of studying the Hebrew, passed over to the Christians. The revival of this species of literature is dated from the beginning of the 16th century. From this time to the middle of the 17th century, the foundation was laid for the investigations of later philologists, by *Reuchlin*, *Buxtorf*, *Wasmuth*, *Glass*, and others. *Schultens* is regarded, as having commenced a new era, in the study of the Hebrew, principally by calling in more extensively, the aid of the cognate dialects. Since the interest of Christians was fairly turned to this subject, it would be difficult to mention any department of Theological learning, which can boast of more numerous, or more distinguished names.

Cappell, *Morinus*, *Father Simon*, and *Bochart* of France; *Castel* of England; *Nolde* of Denmark; *Cocceius*, and *Schroeder* of Holland; the *Michaelises*, *Storr*, *Eichhorn*, and *Gesenius*, of Germany, are only a few of the celebrated men, by whom Hebrew literature has been most successfully studied. Loescher *De causis linguae Hebraeae*, from page 72 to 125, and particularly Gesenius *Geschichte der hebraischen Sprache und Schrift*, p. 69, to 137.

§. VI. *Importance of the Hebrew.*

The importance of the Hebrew, is a conceded point. Attention to the original languages, is regarded as an index to the state of the church. During the dark ages, these languages were neglected. Their cultivation preceded the reformation, and has extended and flourished under its influence. The men most distinguished for piety and usefulness, have been the most strenuous, in insisting upon the study of the Scriptures, in the original; and every enlightened church has made the knowledge of Hebrew, a requisition for admission into its ministry. An impression of the importance of this subject, so general, so strong, and so lasting, is not likely to prove unfounded. To exhibit in any detail the grounds, of this general conviction is not consistent with our limits. They do not consist in any thing, which relates merely to the character and history of the language: although even upon this ground, its claims would be second to no other. It may be less copious, and polished, than some more modern languages, but it is far from being barren or uncouth. It is remarkable for its purity, its strength, and its compass; and the portion preserved in a single volume, upon a single class of subjects, is sufficient to demonstrate, that when vernacular, it was sufficiently extensive. It derives no inconsiderable interest, from its venerable antiquity, from being, (peradventure) the primitive language of our race. It is, confessedly, the repository of the most ancient li-

terature, of the most sublime productions, the purest morality, the most refined notions of God and religion : add to all this, the higher consideration of its sacred character, its being the language of patriarchs and prophets, and the medium of God's communications, and we find in its character, and history, claims on the attention of the christian scholar, which cannot be asserted by any other language.

But the importance of the Hebrew, is not urged upon ministers, merely as christian scholars ; the single and sufficient reason for requiring of them, (as is done by every enlightened church), attention to this subject, is, that *a knowledge of the Hebrew, is essential to the proper discharge of their ministerial duties.* It is their official business to ascertain, to exhibit, and defend the truth of God. For this purpose, there is no qualification more obviously important, than that they should understand the language in which that truth is revealed. For the Priest, who goes to consult the holy oracle, that he may report the message to the people, to be obliged to ask a by-stander what that oracle says, would indeed be strange. Yet how many of the boldest reporters, of what the Lord has said, scarcely understand a word of the language, in which the communication is made. It is unaccountable, that while any individual, who should announce himself. as the expounder and critic of any of the ancient classics, acknowledging he knew nothing of their language, would expose himself to ridicule ; the official interpreters of the word of God, feel little apprehension in confessing their ignorance of the sacred tongues. Can this be, because, a less adequate perception of the force and meaning of what they explain, is requisite to the biblical, than to the classical interpreter ? Or is it a matter of less responsibility, and importance for the former to be correct, than the latter ? As the inadequacy of a translation is acknowledged in the one case, it is surprising that it should be denied, in the other. Were this the place, to enter into an argument

upon the subject, it might be clearly proved, from the nature of the case, from the want of correspondence between different languages—from the great diversity among the various versions of the Bible—and from other sources that it is impossible that any translation can exactly represent its original. The application of every rule of interpretation, supposes a reference to the original. It will avail but little, to ascertain the usage of an English word, when the object to be attained, requires a knowledge of a Hebrew term: And no inconsiderable portion of the false views of truth, which abound, arise, from taking it for granted, that the original will bear all the variety of explanation, which the words of the version may admit. —It is a point, therefore, in *theory*, universally admitted, that no one is properly qualified to explain the word of God, who does not understand the languages in which it is written.

Again, no man is qualified to defend the truth, unless he understand the original; because he is liable to be led into error as to its meaning—because his opponent may deny the correctness of his translation—because the controversy may, at any moment be carried beyond his depth, by an appeal to the only recognized standard, and thus the truth, (on which perhaps the most important interests may be depending,) may be defeated, through the incompetency of its defender.

Again, those who are ignorant of the Hebrew, are debarred from the best sources of theological knowledge. The best commentators, the best systematic, controversial, and even practical writers, are so filled with references to the original scriptures, that they cannot be understood, much less enjoyed, without this knowledge. Another consideration, of no slight importance is, that the acquisition in question, is becoming every day, more and more essential to ministerial respectability, and consequently to ministerial usefulness. The assertion may appear extravagant, that the Hebrew is hardly less essential for understanding the New Testament, than the Old. But

the New Testament, is confessedly Hebraic; there are very many of its idioms, and a large proportion of its words, which can only be explained by a reference to the Hebrew. Hence, few rules are more frequently applicable, in the interpretation of the New Testament, than that which directs us, to compare the Greek terms with the corresponding Hebrew words. But how can this be done, by those who are ignorant of Hebrew? To all this it may be objected, that experience proves that this knowledge is unnecessary, that many men attain great usefulness and respectability, who know nothing of the Hebrew. But what branch of theological learning has not been neglected by some distinguished and useful man. Is the argument hence conclusive, to these branches being unnecessary? If this be so, the course of theological education, would be reduced to narrow bounds. To make the objection valid it should be shown, that *caeteris paribus*, men are as useful without this knowledge as with it; that it can afford them no aid in interpreting, no facility in defending the truth; that it can give no clearness or confidence to their views; preserve them from no false expositions or inferences; save them from no mistakes over which an enemy might triumph; in no degree enlarge their field of theological knowledge; that it has no tendency, to bring men from metaphysical reasonings, (the bane of simple and scriptural views of truth), to the study of the Bible; and that there is no moral obligation, on those who are aspiring to the ministry, to furnish themselves for the work, not in the easiest, but the best manner, their circumstances permit. If no one be prepared to make all these assertions, no one should disparage, nor neglect the study of the Hebrew. *Haec eo dicta sint*, says the German Reformer, at the close of a strenuous appeal on this subject, *Hæc eo dicta sint, ut intelligamus nos evangelium nunquam retenturos esse, nisi fiat linguarum notitia.*