

## VIII.

# REVIEWS OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

---

### I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

HANDBUCH DER THEOLOGISCHEN WISSENSCHAFTEN in encyclopädischer Darstellung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Entwicklungsgeschichte der einzelnen Disciplinen, in Verbindung mit Prof. D.D. Cremer, Grau, u. a. herausgegeben von DR. OTTO ZÖCKLER, ordentlichem Prof. der Theologie in Greifswald. Nördlingen, 1883. New York: B. Westermann & Co. Zweiter Halbband (396 pages, lexicon 8vo).

This second half volume (the first was noticed in the October number, 1882, page 766) appears a little later than the promised date, but still in very fair time. It brings the concluding part of the Exegetical division. This part has considerably exceeded the limits assigned it, and the whole volume is a rather unwieldy one of nearly seven hundred pages. The work would have been more easily handled had it been planned to occupy six volumes rather than three; *i. e.*, assuming that it is desirable to have so much matter in a work of this kind.

This second part, in fact, rather forces upon one the inquiry whether, for an *Encyclopædie*, the work is not laid out upon too large a scale. The proverb of not seeing the forest because there are so many trees, may easily become applicable to such a work. If attention is absorbed by the details, if the separate parts expand into treatises, then the general scope is lost out of sight, or it becomes difficult to trace the relation of the parts to each other. But the very object of such a work is to exhibit the different sciences in their organic connection, and to give a general view rather than a series of independent text-books. Whether the endeavor to give more than the meagre outline of Hagenbach has led the editor too far the other way, or whether his collaborators have not been able to keep the due proportion of parts, the result is rather to overload the reader—at least if he stands at the beginning of his course of study. For the student, we think the work rather bewildering on account of its extent. For one who has pursued a seminary course, as well as for the older minister who would like to review his studies, the same objection could not be urged, and it seems probable that the work will meet the wants of many in this class.

The part now before us begins with a sketch of Old Testament Theology. This is defined as the science which has for its object "the Old Testament religion in its development toward the New Testament, itself resting on a saving revelation of the holy gracious God, and consisting in trust in Him for light, sanctification, and the satisfaction of man's highest needs." The definition is followed by a brief history of the discipline and a statement of its divisions. These are, according to Schulz, (a) Theology of the period before the Prophets, (b) of the Prophetic period, (c) of the post-prophetic period. This division does not seem the best that could be made.

Special Committee on Permanent Place of Meeting: Ministers—William P. Breed, William Irvin, Edwin F. Hatfield, William H. Roberts. Elder—Samuel H. Pennington.

Special Committee on Mission Work in the Indian Territory and among the Chinese in our cities: Ministers—Hervey D. Ganse, George D. Baker, Sylvester F. Scovel. Elders—George H. Shields, Homer N. Hibbard.

The Committee appointed by the last Assembly to nominate delegates, lay and clerical, to the Pan-Presbyterian Council, to be held in Belfast in 1884, reported the following names, which were appointed by the Assembly:

Ministers—J. A. Henry, D.D.; alternate, F. L. Robbins, D.D. A. A. Hodge, D.D., LL.D.; alternate, F. L. Patton, D.D., LL.D. R. D. Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D.; alternate, C. A. Briggs, D.D. W. Irvin, D.D.; alternate, H. Darling, D.D., LL.D. Henry H. Jessup, D.D.; alternate, W. C. Cattell, D.D., LL.D. H. Johnson, D.D., LL.D.; alternate, D. J. Burrill. E. Kempshall, D.D.; alternate, P. A. Studdiford, D.D. H. Kendall, D.D.; alternate, W. C. Roberts, D.D. E. D. Morris, D.D.; alternate, L. J. Evans, D.D. J. H. Nixon, D.D.; alternate, T. Lawrence, D.D. R. M. Patterson, D.D.; alternate, R. H. Allen, D.D. R. W. Patterson, D.D.; alternate, E. L. Hurd, D.D. C. S. Pomeroy, D.D.; alternate, A. A. E. Taylor, D.D. T. H. Robinson, D.D.; alternate, C. W. Stewart, D.D. R. F. Sample, D.D.; alternate, G. D. Baker, D.D. S. P. Sprecher, D.D.; alternate, J. P. Hendrick. J. F. Tuttle, D.D.; alternate, H. A. Edson, D.D. Anson J. Upson, D.D., LL.D.; alternate, R. B. Welsh, D.D., LL.D. M. R. Vincent, D.D.; alternate, E. N. White, D.D. S. J. Wilson, D.D., LL.D.; alternate, B. B. Warfield, D.D.

Elders—Hon. S. M. Breckinridge, LL.D.; alternate, Hon. G. S. Drake. Hon. J. W. Butler; alternate, Hon. R. P. Effinger. C. C. Brown; alternate, Hon. J. C. Conkling. Hon. C. D. Drake, LL.D.; alternate, W. Ballantyne. T. W. Dwight, LL.D.; alternate, I. L. Peet, LL.D. D. P. Eells; alternate, Hon. T. P. Handy. G. S. Frost; alternate, J. E. Mosely. H. W. Hughes; alternate, Hon. S. Matthews. Hon. C. Hulburd, LL.D.; alternate, A. McClure. F. W. Jackson; alternate, J. W. Taylor. M. K. Jessup; alternate, L. E. Jackson. G. Junkin; alternate, Hon. E. A. Rollins. Hon. R. McKnight; alternate, W. Thaw. Hon. S. M. Moore, LL.D.; alternate, H. J. Willing. Hon. J. K. Moorhead; alternate, J. H. Baldwin. S. C. Perkins; alternate, G. S. Graham. Hon. E. W. Scudder, LL.D.; alternate, A. D. Hope. J. D. Vermilye; alternate, J. C. Brown. E. Welles; alternate, W. A. Wheelock. Hon. H. W. Williams; alternate, Hon. D. Wills.

A Special Committee was appointed to consider the subject of Mission Work in the Indian Territory and among the Chinese in our cities, particularly with reference to the relative work in those fields of the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions. These were: Ministers—Hervey D. Ganse, George D. Baker, Sylvester F. Scovel. Elders—George H. Shields and Homer N. Hibbard.

A. A. HODGE.

*Exegetical Note on 2 Peter ii. 8.*—The modern exegesis is pretty nearly unanimous in construing the words *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ*, with which this verse opens, with the verb *ἐβασάνιζεν*. This unanimity has not, however, always existed. Sterling old Matthew Poole, for instance, whom Dr. Jno. Brown, of Edinburgh, justly thinks it would be difficult to praise beyond his merits, does not fail to inform us that there are three ways in which the words may be taken: “Illa, *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ*, referenda, vel, 1. ad *ὁ δίκαιος*, ut nullum hinc sit Hyperbaton, ut sensus sit, quod Lothus, [cùm] aspectu et auditu fuerit justus, et nihil turpe auribus aut oculis haurire sustinuerit, graviter discruciatu fuit, quod vivens inter illos, cogereetur quotidie videre et audire quae nollet. . . . Vel, 2. ad *ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς*, hoc modo, *Quia justus erat et inter eos habitabat, ut cogereetur illorum scelera videre et audire in dē anima ipsius justa cruciabat.* Vel, 3. ad *ἐβασάνιζεν*, hoc modo; *Justus enim*

*ille, cum habitaret, vel versaretur, inter eos, indies . . . . animam . . . . justam . . . . iniquis, sive sceleratis, illorum factis et vivendo et audiendo . . . . excruciat, Pi[sicatorius], B[eza], E[stius]"\** It may be worth our while to run rapidly over the history of the exegesis of the passage, and then seek to determine what connection was intended by Peter.

The Vulgate version furnishes an example of the first of the connections mentioned by Poole, translating: "aspectu enim et auditu justus erat, habitans apud eos, qui de die in diem animam justam iniquis operibus cruciabant." This, of course, determined the connection for all whose Bible was the Latin version. Thus the Wicliffite Bibles (Purvey) translate: "for in sight and hearynge he was iust and dwellid among hem that fro day in to day turmentiden with wickid werkis a iust soule"; and the Rheims New Testament: "for in sight and hearing he vvas iust: dvelling vvith them vvho from day to day vexed the iust soule with vniust workes."† The construction is not confined, however, to those who made no use of the Greek. Erasmus, for example, follows it: "Graeca nonnihil dissident à Latinis, . . . id est, Aspectu enim et auditu justus inhabitans inter illos cotidie animam justam iniquis operibus excruciat, sive explorabat. Significat enim, illum cum oculos haberet sanctos, et aures sanctas abhorrentes ab omni turpitudine, graviter discruciatum fuisse, quod vivens inter illos cogeretur cotidie videre et audire quae nollet."‡ So also Calmet: "oculos, auresque pudicas habebat inter tot libidinosissima facta, et populum scelestissimum, cujus sermones et actiones illi summopere displicabant, ita ut supplicii loco haberet, vitam tot inter flagitia traducere, eorumque testem esse, quin illa posset avertere."§ It does not occur in any other of the great historical English Bibles, except the Wicliffite and Rheims, although so late a translator as Gilbert Wakefield made an effort to bring it back in 1791, translating: "For that *man* of undefiled eyes and ears, whilst he dwelt among them, was daily tormenting his righteous soul with *their* lawless deeds."||

From the very beginning of renewed study of the Greek Testament, however, the other connections were noted and followed. Thus Luther,¶ in 1522, adopts the second of Poole's possibilities, and Calvin\*\* in 1551 prefers the third. Tyndale's English (1534) is so punctuated as to be ambiguous between these two; †† the ambiguity is removed in the Great Bible ††† (1539) in favor of

\* *Synopsis, etc., Opera Matthaei Poli.* Londini, 1669.

† Both quoted from Bagster's English Hexapla.

‡ *Des. Erasmi Rot. in Novum Testamentum annotationes, etc.,* Basileae (Froben) 1542.

§ *A. R. P. D. Augustini Calmet, etc. Commentarum, etc. Tom. viii.* Augustae Vindelicorum et Graecii, 1735.

|| *A Translation of the New Testament, by Gilbert Wakefield, B.A., from the 2d London ed.* Cambridge [U. S.], 1820.

¶ "Denn dieweil er gerecht war und unter ihnen wohnete, dass er es sehen und hoeren mueste," u. s. w.

\*\* *Ioannis Calvini in Epistolas N. T. Catholicas Commentarii, etc.* Halis Saxonum, 1832. He translates: "Nam oculis et auribus justus ille, quum habitaret inter ipsos, quotidie animam justam iniquis illorum operibus excruciat," and in the notes adopts that explanation.

†† See Bagster's Hexapla, and cf. the Andover reprint of Tyndale's first edition.

††† Bagster's Hexapla.

the former ; but restored in the Geneva Testament (1557)\* and King James' Revision (1611). The Latin versions of Castalio† (1551) and Beza‡ (1556) both side with Calvin, whose interpretation rapidly became the leading one. Beza seems to have been the first to state clearly and forcibly the objections to the old connection of the Vulgate and Erasmus: "Haec [βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ] enim conjunxerunt cum ὁ δίκαιος, quasi dicatur Lot justus fuisse et oculis et auris, id est (ut Erasmus in annotationibus explicat) *oculos et aures habuisse ab omni turpitudine abhorrentes*. Sed ut taceam quòd Vetus interpres constructionem neglexit, nec potuit subaudire ἦν propter articulum adjectum, qui indicat δίκαιος rationem habere subjecti non praedicari (quos errores Erasmus emendavit), ut inquam haec omittam, primùm quæri posset cur non manuum quoque mentionem fecisset? deinde ipsa constructio hanc interpretationem aperte refellit, ostenditque βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ cum verbo ἐβασάνιζεν ita construit opertere ut feci, à doctissimo interprete admonitus. Omnino enim scribendum fuisset ὁ γὰρ βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος ut spero mihi concessuros quicumque vel mediocriter in Graecis literis sunt versati."§

Whether owing to Beza's arguments or to the weight of the example of such interpreters as Calvin, Castalio, and Beza, or to the reasonableness of the view itself, this connection of the words from this time became much the favorite one with all classes of commentators, the most of whom either confessedly rest on Beza or tacitly draw from him. Some of the difficulties which pressed upon his interpretation were, nevertheless, early seen and pointed out. D. Heinsius, for example, in 1639, comments as follows: "Quem versiculum" [i. e., v. 8] "ità vetus reddidit interpres, *Aspectu enim et auditu justus erat, habitans apud eos, qui de die in diem animam justam iniquis operibus cruciabat*; quasi *aspectu et auditu justus* dicatur, cùm non δίκαιος sed ὁ δίκαιος legatur: A quo non longè Erasmus abiit. Ab utroque Recens non immeritò recessit; qui ut ordinem mutavit, ità et nonnihil fortè mentem involvit. Nemo dubitare potest quin praecipui primique sensus corporis sint visus et auditus; qui fenestrae mortis ideo dicuntur: quibus qui imperare didicit immunem magna ex parte à peccato animam, hoc est, se ipse praestat: Quod fecisse Lotum ait; qui cùm visu audituque Sodomitarum in dies flagitia sordèsque usurparet, atque inter illos viveret, ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζε. Quid si ergò mens sit, *Visu enim cùm justus ille inter eos versaretur, quotidie justam animam iniquis eorum cruciabat factis?* Quemadmodem eleganter vir sanctus B. Hieronymus ad Esaiae 55, quòd *cruciaretur anima ipsius, videntis (adde et audientes) nefanda committi, et animae judicium corporis habitudine demonstraret*. Aliud Recentior maluit; quasi nempe haec jugenda essent,

\* Bagster's Hexapla.

† *Biblia, interprete Sabastiano Castalione* Basileae [1554]. "Nam iustus ille inter eos habitans, iustam animam noctes et dies, scelestorum operum et aspectu conciabatur et auditu."

‡ "Justus enim ille, cum habitaret inter eos, indies animam justam sceleratis illorum factis, et vivendo et audiendo excruciabatur."

§ *Jesus Christi Domini Nostri Novum Testamentum, etc., cujus Graeco contextui respondent interpretationes duae: una vetus; altera Theodori Bezae, ejusdem Theod. Bezae annotationes, etc.* Cantabrigiae, 1642.

βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζε; ut si, καὶ βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ ἀνόμων ἔργων dicas. Ità ergò locum reddidit, *Justus enim ille, cum habitaret inter eos, in dies animam justam iniquis illorum factis, et vivendo, et audiendo, exercebat, ut βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, tum ἀνόμοις ἔργοις, eodem referantur, ità ut dixi: aut quasi, ἀνόμοις ἔργοις καὶ βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, legeretur. Quà inversione, et quidè tantà, ordinis, meo quidè animo, opus non sunt. . . .*"\* With Heinsius' preference for the connection with *ἐγκατοικῶν* Gerhard (1641) accords. This was, however, only an eddy; the main stream flowed direct from Beza. This is clear in the case, for instance, of Raphelius, who comments thus: "Nam βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ omnino cum verbo ἐβασάνιζεν conjugenda sunt, non cum ὁ δίκαιος. Alioquin enim usus Graecae linguae postulasset articulum praeponi: ὁ γὰρ βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος: uti jam ostendit Beza. Luculenter Camerarius: *Vivendo et audiendo affigebatur anima ipsius.*"† And equally so in the case of Semler, although he borrows silently: "Mirum omnino est, etiam *Erasmus* hic eo delabi potuisse, ut primam partem jungeret cum ὁ δίκαιος, oculos et aures habuisse Lotum ab omni turpitudine abhorrentes, quum graecae vel mediocriter peritus articulum, ὁ δίκαιος, negligere nullo modo possit."‡ Benson indicates his source: "Many interpreters understand the beginning of this verse thus: *viz.*, that *Lot was righteous in seeing and hearing*, or that he did not take in the vices of *Sodom*, either by his eyes or ears. But *Beza* has well observed that the order of the words in the *Greek* ought to have been different, *viz.*, ὁ γὰρ βλέμματι, etc., instead of ὁ δίκαιος, etc., as it now stands. Our common *English* translation has given the true sense of this verse."§ The same opinion is expressed by Aretius,|| Camerarius, Hammond,¶ Grotius, Osiander,\*\* Piscator,†† Pyle,‡‡ Rosenmueller, §§ Erasmus Schmid, Wetstein,|||

\* *Danielis Heinsii Sacrum Exercitationum ad Novum Testamentum, Libri xx., etc.* Editio secunda, etc. Cantabrigiae, 1640.

† *Georgii Raphelii, etc., Annotationes Philologicae in N. T., etc.* Londini Batavorum 1747.

‡ *D. Jo. Sal. Semleri Paraphrasis in Epist. II. Petri, etc.* Halae, 1784.

§ *A paraphrase and notes on the Seven (commonly called) Catholic Epistles, etc.,* by George Benson, D.D. London, 1749.

|| *Commentarii in omnes epistolas, etc., itemque in apocalypsin, etc.,* à Benedicto Aretio Bensiensi. (Le Preux), 1596.

¶ *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the books of the N. T.* 2d ed. By H. Hammond, D.D. London, 1659, ("was from day to day continually afflicted and tormented to see them do as they did").

\*\* *Sacrum Bibliorum Pars iii., etc.* Lucas Osiander, D. Tubingae, 1592. ("*Aspectu enim et auditu abhominanda et detestanda quotidie oculis et auribus percipiens justus ille et pius vir || erat redundat, habitans apud eos, vehementer afflicto erat.*")

†† *Johan. Piscatoris Commentarii, etc.* Herbonae Nassoviorum, 1658.

‡‡ *A Paraphrase on the Acts . . . and Epp.,* by Thomas Pyle, M.A. 2 vols. New ed. London, 1795.

§§ *D. Jo. Georgii Rosenmuelleri Scholia in N. T., etc.* Norimbergae, 1808.

||| H. ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *Novum Testamentum Graecum, etc.* 2 vols. Amstel-ae-dami, 1752 ("*βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ* intellige Sodomitarum; Lotus vultu eorum meretricio conspectu, et audita fama impudiciae eorum, h. e. injustis eorum operibus torquebatur.")

Wolf,\* among older names, while of late years it is almost universally held by commentators of all ranks, as the following (very imperfect) list will show: Alford, Ash, Barnes, Bloomfield, Buckley, Demarest, Dietlein, Farrar, Fronmueller, Gill, Hofmann, Huther, Lillie, Lumby. Only very occasionally is the decision left hanging, as *e. g.*, by Bowyer.†

This brief sketch of the history of the interpretation is sufficiently full to indicate to us what especial points must be investigated in order to determine the connection which Peter intended when he wrote the words *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ*. We take them to be four: 1. The meaning of *βλέμμα* and *ἀκοῇ*; 2. The article before *δίκαιος*; 3. The chief emphasis in the verse, and 4. The dative *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ*.

1. The great majority of commentators have understood *βλέμμα* and *ἀκοῇ* actively, "seeing and hearing." So, *e. g.*, Alford, Barnes, Beza, Bloomfield, Buckley, Calvin, Castalio, Camerarius, Demarest, Gill, Grimm, Grotius, Fronmueller, Hammond, Huther, Osiander, Piscator, Robinson, E. Schmid, Wolf. Others, such as Aretius, Calmet, Erasmus, have taken them of the senses: "sight and hearing." Wetstein is almost alone in insisting on the passive sense, "what was seen and heard." In accordance with its form *βλέμμα* should bear a passive sense, and consequently express a product or state rather than an act. Its usage, moreover, is most usually to express the passive sense of "the look of a man" from without. It does occur in the sense of a "look" or "glance" (*e. g.* Herodian 4, (5. 17), *βλέμματι δριμῆι ἀφορῶν εἰς τοῦ ἐκείνου φίλου*); and also, especially in the plural, of the "eye" itself (the following passage given in the London Thesaurus from Boissonad. MSS. may perhaps present an instance in the singular: "Ὁραθησόμεθα ὑπὸ τῶν θείου καὶ \*παντεφόρου βλέμματος Agapet. Sch. Reg. 23). But by far most commonly the word is used purely objectively, to express what we mean by "the look" of a man, whether referring more narrowly to his *expression*, passing over into sub-senses of *countenance* and *expressions* (as we say "to make eyes"), or more broadly to his *appearance*. Thus Themistius tells us that when a chaste blush blooms on the face, the *βλέμμα* is full of modesty; Appian that men appear to their enemies *φοβεροὶ ἀπ' τῶν βλεμμάτων*; Lucian that even a laughing *βλέμμα* may be altogether brutal; Aelian of an unmoved, cherry, or gentle *βλέμμα*; Themistius of a frank and noble *βλέμμα*; Libanius of a harsh *βλέμμα*. Themistius balances it now against *προσῶπον*, now against *μειδίαμα*; Libanius now against *χροία*, now against *ρήμα*. Taking the step to "countenance," we read in Theophr. ep. 15, of the *βλέμμα* reddened by anger; or taking the step to "expressions," we read in Philo of men who had had their tongues cut out yet managed to make their meaning clear *νεύμασι καὶ βλέμμασι καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τοῦ σώματος σχέσεσι καὶ κινήσεσιν*. One further step carries us beyond

\* *Jo. Christopheri Wolfii, et. Curæ Philologicae et Criticae in SS. Apostt. Jacobi, Petri, Judae, et Joannis Epp., iuxtaque Apocal.* Hamburgi, 1735. ("Idem est acsi scripsisset Apostolus: ἰδῶν γὰρ καὶ ἀκούων.")

† *Critical conjectures and observations on the N. T.*, by Wm. Bowyer, F.S.A., etc. London, 1812.

the face and facial "expression" to the "appearance" in general, as when Libanius speaks of the βλέμμα of drunkenness or parallels the three words βλέμμα καὶ σχῆμα καὶ φωνήν, which Demosthenes varies to τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ, or when the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs tell us that women διὰ τοῦ βλέμματος τὸν ἰὸν ἐνσπείρουσι in a context which parallels βλέμματος with κοσμήσεως.\* Perhaps also Arrian's κατασταλμένον εἶχον τὸ βλέμμα belongs here.†

It cannot be, indeed, asserted that between such related notions as the objective and subjective "look" an impassable gulf is fixed: but most indubitably every probability weighs in favor of the sense "*appearance*" in a passage like the present. The usage as well as the form of the word points to that sense, and by it we ought to abide. It is the less necessary to enter into an extended discussion of the meaning of ἀκοῆ, in that one of its most current senses, "report," "rumor," "fame" parallels it accurately with βλέμμα in the sense of "appearance" (Cf. Matt. iv. 24, xiv. 1; Mark i. 28, xiii. 7, and *passim* in LXX and classics, early and late). The presumption is certainly very strong that the combined phrase here means "*appearance and report*."

If this be so, however, it cannot be connected with the participle ἐγκατοικῶν, for the definition of that idea supplied by these words would then become incongruous and unmeaning. Neither can we with any propriety follow Wetstein in understanding "Sodomitarum" and connecting with ἐβασάνιζεν. For, not only is the adjunct "Sodomitarum" not naturally suggested by words separated widely from all discourse concerning the Sodomites and hedged in by expressions descriptive of Lot; but also we thus induce a hopeless tautology with ἀνόμοις ἔργοις. If the thing by which Lot vexed his righteous soul had been expressed by βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ with the amount of emphasis required by the Hyperbaton, it would be impossible to repeat it in the weak form, ἀνόμοις ἔργοις. Only if βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ followed ἀνόμοις ἔργοις, as an explanatory addition, could this construction be tolerable; and that the verb ἐβασάνιζεν actually receives its definition on this side in ἀνόμοις ἔργοις excludes the notion that the very emphatic βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ also belongs to it, in the same sense. By as much, then, as it is probable that "appearance and report" is the correct rendering of these words, by so much is it improbable that they are to be connected with either ἐγκατοικῶν or ἐβασάνιζεν. This presumption against those connections appears to us a very strong one. On the other hand, the words fit admirably in this sense with δίκαιος: "righteous in appearance and report,—both in what was seen of him and what was heard concerning him."

2. A glance at the history of the exegesis of this passage will remind us that the standing objection against connecting the words with δίκαιος is the presence of the article before that word. This has been uniformly treated as finally settling the question; and indeed it must be admitted that, in the pres-

\* The word occurs only here (Sinker's ed., p. 132) in the Sub-Apostolic Age except in one passage of Hermas.

† These passages are mostly from Wetstein, which see.

ence of the article, the harshness of this construction is extreme. It cannot be held, however, to be an *impossible* construction, as the parallel case of Col. ii. 14 (see Buttmann's Grammar of the N. T. Greek, Thayer's ed., p. 92,) sufficiently demonstrates. If the article be genuine, therefore, it raises a strong presumption against this connection, but does not set it necessarily aside. Commentators appear to have taken it for granted that it is genuine, and certainly on good apparent grounds. But no reading of B can be lightly dismissed, especially when supported, as is the case here, by the Vulgate Latin,—for, we see no reason to doubt that the construction adopted by the Vulgate is proof of the absence of the article from its exemplar. Especially in the Catholic Epistles where B seems to have no Western element, and where we possess but a scanty array of authorities, the defection of two such as B and the Vulgate must make itself felt. If it be urged that the omission of petty words is characteristic of B, it ought also to be remembered that this reading is not an individualism of B, and that the article is specially liable to be inserted, and in the present case would be likely to be inserted after v. 7. If, thus, on purely external grounds the article be deemed suspicious, the appeal to Paradiplomatic evidence, which is certainly strong for its omission, raises the suspicion to a presumption against it. If, now, the sense of the passage be at all clarified by its omission, and thus the intrinsic evidence be thrown upon that side, we have one of those rather rare cases in which transcriptional and intrinsic evidences coincide, and in which, therefore, internal considerations are peculiarly strong. That, however, this is the case no one can doubt. While, then, it is confessedly difficult to attain certainty in the matter, it is yet clear that the probability is with Lachmann and Westcott and Hort in omitting the article (on the testimony of B Vulg.) here and against Tregelles and Tischendorf in their retention of it (with  $\aleph$ ACKLP 13, 31, etc.). The exact strength of this probability will be estimated differently by different minds: it is certainly strong enough to command our suffrages.

But, again, whatever may be its strength, just so much of probability is raised for the connection of  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  καὶ ἀκοῆ with  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$  rather than with  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$  or  $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu$ . The effect of the omission is not only to sweep away at one blow all the objections to this connection, and so leave the way open for it,—it leaves the way yawning for it and suggests it as the nearest and most natural one. And this presumption is independent of, and therefore cumulative to, that derived from the presumptive meaning of  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha$ .

3. That emphasis falls upon the words  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  καὶ ἀκοῆ is apparent from their position at the head of the sentence. But this emphasis is strong in proportion to the distance of the word with which they are connected. If they be assigned to  $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu$  they receive the chief emphasis of the verse, which then becomes a declaration that it was by what he saw and heard and no<sup>o</sup> otherwise that Lot vexed his soul. That this cannot be the main thought of the verse, however, is clear from the consideration that it would thereby cease to be probative ( $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ) of verse 7. The chief thought of verse 7 is that God delivered Lot because he was righteous, and was consequently distressed by the lascivious life of the Sodomites. Verse 8 ought to justify or explain



(*γαρ*) this or some part of this thought. It ought not, therefore, to emphasize solely or with such strength as to call the attention principally to it, the *way* in which, or *cause* by which, he was vexed: but ought rather to emphasize the righteousness of Lot, or the proof of it in his distress at sin, thus justifying the statement in verse 7 of the fact which was the ground of his deliverance. Now if *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ* be joined to *ἐβασάνιζεν*, a tremendous emphasis is thrown upon the *manner* or *cause* of vexation with the practical effect of subordinating every other thought in the verse, and rendering the *γὰρ* a useless, not to say deceptive, finger-post. This hyperbaton becomes thus, as was early pointed out, a very serious objection to that connection,—and an objection independent of the sense assigned to *βλέμμα* or the presence or absence of the article before *δίκαιος*. On the other hand, no fatal objection, independent of the natural sense of *βλέμμα*, arises, on account of the relation of this verse to verse 7, against the connection with *ἐγκατοιμῶν*, while if it be assumed that the connection is with *δίκαιος*, a sense arises at once so consonant in general with the *γὰρ* and so naturally distributing the various emphases required by the flow of the thought, as to commend itself as probably the true one. “God delivered Lot because he was righteous and hence was distressed by the lascivious life of the wicked, for, dwelling among them in such a way as to approve himself righteous both in all that was seen of him and in all that was heard concerning him, he did vex his righteous soul from day to day with their lawless deeds.” There can hardly be a stronger commendation of an hypothesis of interpretation, than that it thus fits at all points and accounts readily for all the little prominent jags in the flow of thought. Hence, then, arises an independent indication of the propriety of connecting *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ* with *δίκαιος*.

4. It remains only to inquire as to the exact relation expressed by the dative in our passage; and here we are dealing with a question the settlement of which can have no bearing on the connection of the words. For, we imagine that it is scarcely disputable that the dative may be readily explained whichever connection be adopted. We only desire to point out how it is to be understood if attached to *δίκαιος*. It then becomes what Jelf (§ 605. 4) calls the *circumstantial* dative, a variety of the local dative, expressing the sphere in which any moral action or state takes place or operates (Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Col. ii. 14, etc.). Or, as we would prefer to say, we have here an example of that not uncommon New Testament usage by which a narrower limitation of the subject is expressed by the dative rather than by the accusative,—the explanation and illustration of which may be conveniently read in Buttmann's Grammar of N. T. Greek, p. 152 (Thayer's ed.), or Winer's Grammar (Moulton's ed.), p. 288. We translate thus: “righteous in (or with respect to) appearance and report.” The sense would not have been different had the apostle written *βλέμμα καὶ ἀκοῇν δίκαιος*, just as Lucian writes *τὸ βλέμμα ἡμεροῦς*.

If now we sum up the results of the discussion we remark: 1. The modern view of the passage which assigns the words *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ* to *ἐβασάνιζεν* in the sense of “by seeing and hearing,” is wrong, because: (1) it as-

signs a sense to *βλέμμα* not justified by usage and opposed by the known meaning of that word; (2) it assumes a hyperbaton without necessity; (3) in assuming this hyperbaton it emphasizes with great strength an unessential notion and destroys the indicated relation of verse 8 to verse 7 (*γὰρ*). 2. The modification of this view proposed by Wetstein is untenable, because in its effort to escape (1) above, it lays itself open to the destructive objection that it induces a weak and unacceptable tautology between *βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ* and *ἀνόμοις ἔργοις*. 3. The view which would connect the words with *ἐγκατοικῶν* is wrong because (1) it assigns a wrong sense to *βλέμμα*, and (2) it assumes a flat because thoroughly unnecessary and obvious definition of *ἐγκατοικῶν*, and (3) it passes needlessly over a more natural connection. 4. The view of the Vulgate, etc., is right; because (1) the article *ὁ* before *δίκαιος* being probably spurious, it is liable to no linguistic objections; (2) it takes *βλέμμα* in its usual and most natural sense; (3) it gives the verse a sense which justifies its connection with verse 7 and fits its requirements most beautifully, and (4) does all this by taking the words in their own order, in their natural senses and connections, without assuming any trajections, misplacements, or anomalies. We propose, therefore, a return to the old rendering, and recommend the translation which understands the verse thus: "*For in appearance and report righteous, dwelling among them, he vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their lawless deeds.*"

A single word in conclusion seems called for as to the effect which this conclusion has on two of the chief items in a recent labored arraignment of the style of 2 Peter as ignorant, pedantic, senseless, and unworthy. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott\* tells us that 2 Peter "uses the word *βλέμμα* (ii. 8) for the 'sense of sight.' But in ordinary Greek, both in Demosthenes and Aristotle, and even in the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs (p. 132, ed. Sinker) the word means 'glance,' 'look,' 'expression of the eyes.' Also, in the same passage the article is omitted . . . before *δίκαιος*. The omission naturally caused a difficulty to the scribes, some of whom have inserted it: but it is rejected by Westcott and Hort. Yet the word 'just' is obviously intended here for a pronominal epithet; nor has any one (as far as I know) attempted to justify the author's grammar by rendering it adverbially 'dwelling justly.' We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that it is an error, 'just one' being written for 'the just one.'" Driven? See the lamentable effects of mistaking the recent commentators on Peter for Peter's self. Dr. Abbott has not even been at the pains of following the commentators fairly. The necessity of taking *βλέμμα* in an unusual sense arises from the presence of the article: and the omission of the article voids it. With the article omitted there is no meaning in the statement that *δίκαιος* "is obviously intended for a pronominal epithet." Dr. Abbott knows no commentators who have "attempted to justify," etc., only because he knows none who have, with him, omitted the article. What are we to think of a writer who adopts a new reading, and then, because that throws the usual erroneous explanation of a passage into confusion, pro-

\* *The Expositor*, March, 1882.

ceeds to charge the author with bad grammar? In the light of what we have learned as to the natural meaning of Peter's words, Dr. Abbott's remarks serve as a *reductio ad absurdum* at once of the common understanding of this passage and of his own adverse criticisms on 2 Peter's style.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

*Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.*—The second volume of the papers and proceedings of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis is fully equal to the first volume in the ability of the papers and the original research displayed therein. This Society is composed chiefly of the Professors of Biblical Exegesis in the Theological Seminaries of the various churches, and is a bond of union and co-operation in the scientific study of the sacred Scriptures. There are two papers by Dr. Isaac H. Hall, of the *Sunday-School Times*—the one upon the Beirut Syriac Codex, the other upon the Syriac Apocalypse. Both of these enter into the difficult field of the ancient Syriac Versions, where Dr. Hall proves himself to be at home, a specialist in this department, of whom the American churches may be proud. Dr. Monbert, of Paterson, N. J., gives a study of the important passage (Job xix. 25–27) especially valuable for a comparison of the *Versions*, ancient and modern, in their renderings of this classic passage. Rev. Henry Ferguson, of Hartford, gives a detailed examination of the use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew. Basing himself upon the work already done by Ewald and Driver, he gives a classification of all the phases of the Hebrew syntax in this department. This is the most complete discussion of the subject that can be found anywhere, and no Hebrew scholar can afford to do without it. The principles are correct and the method admirable. The examples are very complete. We think that the author has overlooked, however, not a few examples of conditional clauses with  $\gamma$  consec. in both members. It is true these are otherwise rendered in the Versions generally, owing to a lack of knowledge of the structure of conditional clauses by the authors of these versions, and it is possible to render many of them otherwise, yet we would greatly increase his list under that head. Prof. Bernard Pick, the Rabbinical scholar, of Allegheny, Pa., gives a brief sketch of some lost Hebrew MSS., especially the Codd, Hillelis, Sanbuki, Sinai, and Ben-Naphtali. We wish that he had gone deeper into the subject and given a more complete investigation. Prof. W. J. Beecher, of Auburn, gives a study of  $\text{ברא}$  in Josh. xvii. 15, 18, and Ezek. xxi. 24; xxiii. 47. The most important paper is the one by Prof. Francis Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, on the New Testament Witness to the Authorship of Old Testament Books. This investigation was greatly needed. Prof. Brown has, for the first time, accomplished it. The results are somewhat different from the views that have prevailed, based merely upon a superficial study of particular passages. Prof. Brown examines and classifies all the New Testament passages bearing upon this subject. He compares them and shows just how far they give evidence and where the evidence stops. He shows that of the thirty-nine Old Testament books only twenty-six are cited in the New Testament, and of these only ten in connection with the