

The Bible Student and Teacher

Volume VIII.

FEBRUARY, 1908.

Number 2

Notes Editorial and Critical

Rev. Charles Inglis, the Evangelist, now in this country, is responsible for an interesting incident concerning the late Lord Kelvin, that casts light upon his practical attitude towards Christianity and vital religion. Not long before his death some one asked him: Lord Kelvin, what do you consider the greatest discovery you ever made? After some moments of thought he replied: "My greatest discovery is, that 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief' ". Such an answer leaves no room for doubting that he accepted the Evangelical faith in its profoundest implications.

* * * * *

A century ago, Samuel Taylor Coleridge wrote, in his "Biographia Literaria":

"Of all trades, literature at present demands the least talent or information; and, of all modes of literature, the manufacturing of poems. The difference, indeed, between these and the works of genius, is not less than between an egg and an egg-shell; yet at a distance they both look alike".

There has never been an age in which this criticism of Coleridge was so applicable to the so-called "literature" as it is at the present time. We seem to look in vain in the domain of poetry or prose, in the line of belle lettres,
(Vol. viii—7)

history, romance, philosophy, theology, for anything that measures up to the standard of genuine literature. Dreary trash most of it; not even rising to the common-place in matter, intellectual grasp or style!

Why it is that men *can not think*? Is it, as President Wilson, of Princeton University, affirms, because the Schools and Colleges are not "educating" any one; not training any one to think? Or, is it a case, not of *can not*, but of *will not*, i. e., because the atmosphere of our civilization is lacking in the moral and spiritual ozone that inspires men and ages to grapple with the great social and religious problems that are always with us and clamoring for solution? Most assuredly there is need that we bestir ourselves.

* * * * *

So much has been said, written and wired across the country about the latest Oxyrhynchus "finds" that they have come to loom very large in the popular vision. What is undoubtedly a sober and, in the main, an accurate estimate of their value, appeared in the New York Times, for January 4, in the Saturday Review of Books. Here is what is said:

The text of the most lately discovered Oxyrhynchus fragment, as supplied The New York Times by its London correspondent, shows it to be a scrap from an uncanonical and hitherto unknown

Another
"Scrap"

accident, or rather the Will of God, had made him Bishop and a Father in the Vatican Council”.

In this sketch we see the argument which was the last rivet in the chain that the Archbishop, soon a Cardinal, bound around the Papal Hierarchy. On Monday, the 18th of July, 1870, he triumphed in the passage of the decree almost unanimously. Before the final vote opposers fled. It was proclaimed:

I. That the Pope was Supreme Pastor of Christendom.

II. That the Pope was infallible in all decisions of Faith and morals.

III. That all who did not accept this belief in the Pope were *Anathema*.

What means this fearful word? Than it the Greek language furnishes not one more terrific. It signifies *accursed* from God and *damned* forever!

Heaven and earth seemed stirred against the Vatican Decree. It was delivered amid a glare of lightnings. St. Peter's shook with thunders. Quick, dazzling flashes illuminated a midnight gloom, which, from vault to dome, filled the vast cathedral. Then what a rush of events! Revolutions in Church and State more impressive than physical phenomena! Napoleon captured in battle and his dynasty wrecked! The pontifical City seized by its enemies! Pio Nono on his knees climbing the Lateran Stairs and flying from the Quirinal to pine in the Vatican! A united Italy! An imperial Germany! A republican France! The map of Europe changed! A new era for Christendom! And old England! Protestant as ever! The Pope can no more recover her than he can roll over her

the Atlantic Ocean. In our own Republic heaviest the millstone Manning hung upon the Papacy. All know the amiable disposition and courteous address of our American Cardinal. We could have no more pleasing and popular representative of the Holy Father and his Vatican Decree. But a mountain has been placed in the way of the Roman conquest of our country. Battle is harder than manipulations of history. Our Cardinal meets our President! How cordial the grasp of hands! What smiles beam! Yet how has Manning's triumph in the Vatican Council embarrassed the relations of two excellent and estimable men! The President is loved by the Cardinal and cursed by the Cardinal. For the creed of the Cardinal damns members of the family of our chief magistrate; damns members of his cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of Congress; damns eighty millions of American citizens. Crossing the Atlantic it damns the English King and his Protestant Empire; damns the German Kaiser and his Lutheran Christians; damns the Russian Czar and his Greek peoples. Leaving Europe, Asia and Africa feel its blasting breath. Outside the Catholic Church on our humanity it writes its doom. It makes the Pope the sole door to Christ. Deny the Pope and you are excluded by Christ. The Pope is placed on the throne of Christ. *Pope or Anathema* sums the Vatican Creed. You may be saintly or orthodox as Pius X., yet, rejecting his pastoral sovereignty and papal infallibility, you are accursed by a communion whose head was once a Borgias! Such an Evangel will never convert America and conquer our world;

The Meaning of “Adam” in the Old Testament Hebrew*

PROFESSOR BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

* This paper is reprinted from “The Bible Student” for July, 1903. The study is a most careful and thorough one of a subject of vital importance. This critical discussion by Professor Warfield—like that of Professor McPheeters on “Bara” reprinted in the November number—can scarcely fail to clear up the questions involved.—*Editor*.

The word “Adam” is in Hebrew both an appellative noun meaning *Hosea. vi. 7:* “man”, and the proper *Adam or Man?* name of the first man, much as if we in English should denominate the first man simply

"Man". It is a natural consequence that in some of the passages where it occurs the word is capable of either sense, and the commentators are puzzled in which way to interpret it. One of the most famous of these passages is Hosea vi. 7. In our so-called Authorized English Version, this verse is given thus: "But they like men" (mg. "or, like Adam") "have transgressed the covenant: there have they dwelt treacherously against me." In the Revised Version, on the other hand, it reads: "But they like Adam" (mg. "or men") "have transgressed the covenant: there have they dealt treacherously against me." Still another rendering is suggested in the margin of the Revised Version, viz: "But they are as men that have transgressed a covenant: there have they dealt treacherously against me". The main fact is that the two versions differ in their reading of the word "adam", the Authorized Version taking it as a common noun and the Revised as a proper name. But the margin of the Revised Version suggests two ways of translating the verse, if the word be deemed a common noun.

The difference of opinion thus represented by our English versions is not of modern origin. It goes back to the very earliest times, and indeed gave rise to divergent traditions of interpretations between the Eastern and the Western Churches. The early versions of the Eastern Churches,—the Septuagint Greek and the Syriac,—followed by the Arabic, took the word as a common noun. Jerome, on the contrary, in his Latin version, which has since his day occupied the position of the Vulgate Version of the West, renders it as a proper name. Appeal to the underlying Hebrew was rare in the Patristic age, and became ever rarer as the centuries sped away. So that we may be sure that to the Christians of the East this verse for ages spoke of a man's covenant, while to the Christians of the West it spoke of a covenant of God with Adam. Occasion for citing the verse did not often arise in the Patristic and Mediæval times, and we can trace the matter very little in the extant literature. When the verse is quoted, however, it is commonly quoted by each section of the

Church after the fashion in which it read it in its Bible. The Syriac tradition is indicated for us, for example, in the comments on the Minor Prophets by ISHODADH (or JESHUDAD), a Nestorian Bishop of Merv in the ninth century, whose work seems to have been much used by subsequent commentators. "Like a man they have transgressed my covenant", he translates; and interprets: "i. e., like one who transgresses the command of a fellow man (as if they were of equal degree)".¹ In this comment BARHEBRAEUS accords. It is all the more striking to observe that CYRIL of Alexandria, though of the Eastern tradition, does revert to the Hebrew and derives from the Hebrew the other sense. "Like Adam transgressing the covenant", he translates; and he explains that the conduct of the Israelites resembled that of Adam who, though he might have had communion with God and attained immortality and enjoyed the delights of paradise, yet neglected the divine command and fell from his pristine glory.²

Meanwhile the Jews, having the Hebrew text before them, interpreted it variously. The *Jewish Opinions* Targum introduces a plural form: "They like the primitive generations have transgressed my covenant". After GROTIUS this has usually been understood as a reference to the breach of God's commandment involved in the marriage of the sons of men with the daughters of God (Gen. vi. 4), by which the flood was precipitated. But HUSEN, in his annotations on ABARBANEL considers the reference to be Adam and Eve. Certainly the best Jewish comment gives the preference to the reference of HOSEA to Adam. "The meaning is" says ABARBANEL himself,³ "that they have acted like Adam, or the first man, whom I put in the Garden of Eden and he transgressed my covenant". The great name of RASHI may be quoted for the same view. KIMCHI on the other hand reads the word as a common noun: "As a man who conducts himself faithlessly

1. See ed. of G. DIETRICH (Giessen, 1902), p. 24.

2. MIGNÉ, *Pat. Græc.* LXXI. (IV. of Cyril's works), Col. 170.

3. Ed. HUSEN (Leyden, 1686), p. 270. HUSEN'S Annotations may be found on p. 282.

towards his companion and transgresses his covenant, so God is belittled in their eyes and they conduct themselves faithlessly towards him and transgress his covenant”.

It was not until after the revival of learning, when men's minds

The Reformation Age were brought back to the original texts of Scripture, that diversity of opinion

on this passage began to show itself among Christian scholars. In the Reformation age such translators as PAGNINUS, VATABLUS, JUNIUS and TREMELLIUS, MUNSTER and PISCATOR preferred to take the word as a common noun; and to this party CALVIN lent the great authority of his approval. The difficulties of exposition on this supposition showed themselves from the beginning, however, in the different constructions proposed. Some (like MUNSTER, LIVELEIUS and PISCATOR, and CALVIN himself) translated simply, “Like men”, “as men are wont to do”. CALVIN explains that there is an implied contrast with God, and that the meaning is that they showed themselves to be men in violating the covenant: “they have been men towards me; there has been in them nothing but levity and inconstancy”. Already in this comment we perceive a tendency to read into the simple term “men” some sinister connotation such as will give point to the comparison of the Israelites in their covenant breaking with “men”. This is often given expression in a strengthened form, as for example by DRUSIUS, who comments: “‘Like men’, who are naturally light and vain, not to say covenant breakers”. DRUSIUS is even ready with a further supposition. The term “men” here, he suggests, may be used in a depreciatory sense, as equivalent to “common men” in contrast with those in high place; so that the Israelites would be accused of acting like the vile among mankind instead of the noble. Other expounders, feeling the insufficiency of any of these interpretations, proposed to translate rather, “as if it were a man's covenant”,—accusing the Israelites of dealing with God as if he were no more worthy of reverence than one of their fellow men. This is the explanation given by VATABLUS, TREMELLIUS, JUNIUS, PAGNINUS, and others; but is rightly objected to by DRUSIUS and CALVIN, as involving too forced a construction.

They do not add, however (what one would think worth adding), that it would seem to involve also a rather low view of how covenant engagements between mere men were wont to be looked upon. In the face of this diversity of exposition one can not be surprised to note that many of the best translators and expositors of the first age of Protestantism preferred to retain the familiar, “Like Adam”. There were included in this party, LUTHER, LEO JUDA, ARIUS MONTANUS, CASTALIO, CLARIUS and HUGO GROTIUS.

During the earlier period of Protestant scholarship, debate on the *The Federalistic School* proper interpretation of our passage had no more than a philological interest. In

the seventeenth century a dogmatic interest in the passage was added, by the rise into prominence of the “covenant theology”. In the translation, “They, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant”, the passage offers itself to the Federalists as a proof text for the “covenant of works”. The Federalists as a class must be acquitted, however, of any undue zeal to make much of this interpretation. No doubt a number of them do—as was natural—adopt it and defend it with conviction as well as with force and skill. Such thorough defences of it may be read for example in BRAKEL'S *Redelijke Godtsdienst* (8th ed. 1767, I. 297-9); or in JOHN MARCK'S *Compendium Theolog. Christ.* (xxiv., xiv., cf. also his *Hist. Parad.* II. 6, 7), and his commentator, BERNHARD DE MOOR'S great treatise (III. 52-56). Others of them simply cite the passage in this sense without further remark (so, e. g., BURMANN, *Synop. Theol.* I. 394; BRAUN, *Systema Theol.*, p. 250); and indeed sometimes do less than that, referring to it only in the most passing manner (e. g., WITSIUS, *Divine Oecon.* E. T. I., 183). There are others who can scarcely be said to adopt this explanation, and certainly can not be said to exploit it. COCCIEIUS himself deals with it very cavalierly: “As Adam. Possibly the term is employed as a proper name. Equally possibly it is to be taken thus: as a man; that is, as any other man. They have not revered the holy name that has been named on them: as that of Christians, Evangeli-

als, Reformed. I do not understand it as a genitive: *as a man's*. For the covenant is not a man's but God's; who is invoked as a witness in covenant making. Unless, possibly, thus: as if it were a man whom they invoked as a witness and they were able to shut his eyes as if they were holy".⁴ More clearly, PICTER⁵ says: "The Scriptures do not speak formally of the covenant of works, unless we wish to cite for this the passage Hosea vi. 7; and it is necessary to admit that the prophet can be otherwise explained". VAN MASTRICHT⁶ is a little more exigent: The Covenant of Works "is expressly mentioned in Hos. vi. 7—'And these like Adam have transgressed the covenant; they have dealt treacherously with me there,' compare Job xxx. 33. Here *k'adhām* is taken by the best interpreters, the Vulgate, TIGURINUS, PAGNINUS, CASTALIO, the Dutch translators and others, not as an appellative but as a proper noun, though I confess there are not lacking others who prefer to take it appellatively".

Perhaps, the general tone of the Federalistic interpreters may be said to be fairly represented by the calm treatment accorded the passage by TURRETINE.⁷ That there is a covenant of works, he says, "seems to be intimated not obscurely by Hosea vi. 7 where the Israelites are said to have transgressed the covenant like Adam: 'And they like Adam have violated the covenant'. For although these words are capable of being expounded of the inconstancy of men, so that they should be said to have transgressed the covenant as is wont to be done by men, who are naturally light and vain and often break faith; yet there is no reason why they may not rather be referred to Adam, so that they may be said to have violated the covenant after the example of Adam, our first father, who miserably broke the covenant made with him by God. A not dissimilar passage occurs at Job xxxi. 33: 'If I have hidden', it says, 'my iniquities, like Adam'; where there is a manifest ref-

erence to Adam's attempt to excuse and hide his sin (Gen. iii. 12)". The general attitude of freedom towards this passage characteristic of the Federalist divines, has come down to our own day and may be very well illustrated by the example of the HODGES, father and son. Dr. A. A. HODGE adduces it simply and without comment as a proof-text for the covenant of works, indeed, but only after having shown apart from it that the transaction of God with Adam exhibits all the elements of a covenant.⁸ Dr. CHARLES HODGE does not appeal to it at all, and even intimates that there is no express declaration of Scripture to the effect that God entered into a covenant with Adam.⁹ It must certainly be allowed that the Federalists, though naturally predisposed to understand the passage in harmony with what they have gathered from Scripture as to the relation in which God placed himself with Adam, have not been as a class, zealous to press it unduly.

No further new point of view affecting the exposition of our passage, has arisen until very recently. Meanwhile, all the old interpretations have found adherents. The translation, "Like Adam", has continued to demand the suffrages of perhaps the majority of interpreters. The translation, "Like men" has been advocated by such scholars as HIRZEL, DE WETTE, EWALD, REUSS, NOWACK (1880), and G. A. SMITH. The Septuagint rendering, "They are like men that break covenant", i. e., like specifically covenant-breaking men, has been defended by such as HENDERSON, DILLMANN, SCHULTZ. MAURER and SIMSON think the implication is that they are showing themselves in their breach of covenant, men of a low stamp, the mere common people of the land as distinguished from say, the priests, which is SIMSON'S view. A new turn is given to the passage by such scholars as SCHEGG, ANTON SCHOLTZ and GUTHE, who think that by "men" here are meant specifically the heathen. GUTHE¹⁰ even translates: "These, however, have trans-

4. Works. IV., 48.

5. *La Theolog. Chret.*, Geneva, 1708, I., 339; or *Theologia Christiana*, Leyden, 1734, I., 198.

6. *Theoretico-practica Theologia*, new ed., 1724, p. 420.

7. *Locus VIII.*, q. 3, § 8.

8. *Outlines*, ed. 2, p. 309.

9. *System. Theol.*, II., p. 117.

10. In KAUTZSCH'S *Die Heilige Schrift des A. T.*, p. 631.

gressed (my) covenant as if they were heathen". The heathen, explains SCHOLZ, had broken the Noachic covenant and the law of nature; Israel in its dealings with Jehovah were manifesting themselves as no better than they. MICHAËLIS had arrived earlier at a somewhat similar view by conjecturally repointing the Hebrew so as to make it read, "Like Edom" instead of "Like Adam".¹¹ It is the Abrahamic covenant that is in view, he explains, not an Adamic covenant of which the Scriptures knew nothing. Now among the children of Abraham the Edomites were marked by this very thing, that they did not retain the covenant of Jehovah; and the Israelites were now imitating their covenant-breaking brethren. MICHAËLIS goes so far in his confidence in his conjecture that he introduces the words, "Like the Edomites", into his translation, and in the notes expresses surprise that the emendation had attracted no adherents. Comparatively few moderns have been able to accept the interpretation so popular at an earlier period, which reads into the passage a genitive: "Like a man's covenant". We have happened to note at any rate only THEINER (1828) as so taking it.

A really novel line of interpretation was suggested late in the seventeenth century in an anonymous Dutch work called *Een Bundel van godtgeleerde Oeffennigen*,¹² which merits mention because of its revival in quite recent times. This turned on the proposal to take the word "Adam" as a proper name, indeed, but as the name of a place rather than of a man. A city of this name is referred to in Joshua iii. 16; and the transaction recorded in Numbers xxv. was somewhat arbitrarily assigned by the author of the work in question to this place. He therefore proposed to translate, "They (that is Israel and Judah) have transgressed (my) precept after the example of Adam, i. e., as they did in Adam",—this sin at Adam (Numbers xxv.) being conceived as the beginning of the sins of Ephraim and Judah. At about the same time the great German Orientalist, A. PFEIFFER,

sought the same general end by an emendation of the text, proposing to read instead of *ke'adhām* rather *ba'adāmāh*, that is to say, "in the (i. e., this) land" i. e., in Judah: as Adam though placed in Eden, so Israel though placed in Canaan, even *there* broke the covenant! These suggestions bore no fruit at the time. Of late years, however, the idea that a place must be meant here has been returned to, and a number of critics have sought in one way or another to provide for such a reading of the text.

Thus the Dutch critic OORT¹³ writes: "In verse 7 *ke'adhām* must probably be corrected to *be'adāmāh*, since the following 'there' demands a precedent place-name and Admah occurs also in xi. 8". VALETON (*ZatW.* xiii., 246) quotes this note of OORT approvingly; and WELLHAUSEN¹⁴ improves on it by remarking: "Read *be'adhām* on account of the following 'there' and on account of the localization of the sins in the connected verses also. A place of worship is named and a reference made to an occurrence there which is unknown to us". NOWACK¹⁵ reverts to the form of emendation suggested by OORT, but finds the passage even more corrupt than WELLHAUSEN does. "The first half of verse 7", he remarks, "cannot be in its right position, for 'there' in the second clause leads us to look for a designation of place in it, which probably stood in the position occupied by *be'adhām*, which yields no proper sense". Similarly GUTHE¹⁶ says, "The reference of 'there', since the prophet is scarcely to be thought of as outside the land, is obscure, and the text is scarcely correctly transmitted". KRAETZSCHMAR,¹⁷ while translating the text as it stands: "They (supply 'the Israelites') are like Adam; they have broken covenant; there they have proved treacherous to me", yet comments further: "The text is undoubtedly corrupt. If we take Adam either as 'Adam' or as 'man' or as 'heathen', the 'there' hangs completely in the air. The

11. *Orient. Bible Th.*, 19, p. 174.

12. See DE MOOR on MARCK. III., p. 55.

13. *Theolog. Tijds.*, 1890, XXIV., 486.

14. *Klein. Proph.*, 1892.

15. *Handkom.*, 1897.

16. KAUTSCH'S *Heilig. S. des A. T.*, p. 631.

17. *Die Brudersvorstellung im A. T.*, 1896, p. 106.

corruption seems hopeless". The whole case is stated, finally with admirable clearness either by Professor CHEYNE or by one of his successful imitators (the article is unsigned):¹⁸ "The second mention of a place of this name"—i. e., of the name of Adam mentioned in Joshua ii. 16—"is in Hosea vi. 7, where for *ke'adhām* (R. V. 'like Adam', R. V. mg. 'like men'; *ὡς ἄνθρωπος*), we must at any rate read *be'adhām*—i. e., 'at Adam'—to suit 'there' in the next clause, and to correspond to the localization of Israel's sin in v. 8 (so in the main WELLHAUSEN). 'There' the Israelites 'were traitors to Yahve' and 'broke his covenant'. Of course there may be a doubt which of the places called Adam or Adamah is meant, and it may even be surmised that the letters ADM are incorrect. The fact, however, that the ford of *Dāmīeh* is on the direct route (so we must believe) to the place called Gilead in v. 8 suggests that the 'city Adam' of Joshua iii. 16 is intended. The confluence of two important streams may well have been marked by a sanctuary".

To the antepenultimate sentence a note is attached suggesting that instead of Adam, "Dumah" might be conjecturally read—the "Eduma" of the *Onomastica Sacra*: but as it is immediately allowed that "this is obviously not the 'city' intended in Joshua iii. 16", and also that "it is also not very likely to be meant by Hosea", the suggestion may be passed over here as not advancing the matter.

It may be quite frankly confessed that the suggestion that a place-name should stand here is very attractive. It is quite true that the "there" of the second clause presents exegetical difficulties which would be avoided if a place had been mentioned in the former clause: and this consideration is certainly supported by the allusions to places in the immediately subsequent context. But it must be admitted that it is impossible to expound the text as it stands as referring to a place. Of course if we judged the text of the Old Testament in general, and the text of Hosea in particular, to be

as corrupt as the scholars we have just been quoting do, this fact would be of little moment; we should in that case be swift like them to adjust the corrupt text to any theory of interpretation we happened to have in mind. But we cannot for ourselves sit so loosely to the transmitted text on the one hand; nor on the other can we cherish such preponderant trust in our power of critical divination, as distinguished from exegetical processes, as so lightly to take refuge in conjectural emendations of the text in order to ease our task whenever we find ourselves faced by a difficult piece of exegesis. All experience, not only in the Biblical but also in the extra-Biblical texts, cries out against such a facile method of dealing with an author, as issuing merely in a systematic corrupting of his text. In the present case, it is to be admitted that the emendation, as proposed by WELLHAUSEN at least, is a very easy one, involving only a change in a single letter, k into b—these two letters moreover being letters very easily confused (כ and ב). Indeed, one of Dr Ross's MSS. has actually made a change for us, reading *be'adhām* instead of *ke'adhām*. But this very circumstance, in indicating the ease with which the corruption assumed could have taken place, indicates also another fact, viz., the care with which the text has been transmitted in its present form. Throughout its whole transmission open to our inspection, the text has preserved the *ke'adhām* intact. Neither the MSS. nor the versions nor the quotations made from it suggest the currency, at any time accessible to our observation, of any other reading. In these circumstances we decline to go behind the written text save under a pressure indefinitely stronger than the exegetical difficulties which here face us. The passage is a difficult one; but we cannot consent to cut the knot because we find it somewhat hard to untie it; and we must be permitted to suggest with reference to the textual question raised, that this seems to us a very suitable place to apply the sound textual canon—*proclivi scriptioni prestat ardua*.

A further remark seems here in place. The resort of the later critics to the emendation of the text, may not unfairly

18. See the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, I., p. 58. (Vol. viii—10)

Bias of the Critics be taken as an indication of bias. Speaking broadly, these critics are agreed that an allusion to Adam's sin in Hosea would be too unexpected to be admitted. And one may without impropriety suspect that it is unwillingness to find such an allusion in Hosea—founded as it is, on their inductions as to the history of religious thought in Israel—that constitutes a large part of the difficulty of the passage to them. The very name of Adam we are told occurs very seldom in the Old Testament, and only in certain later strata of its formation; his sin is not emphasized and the sinfulness of man is not traced back to it; least of all is the transaction between God and Adam in the Old Testament called, or thought of as, a covenant. "It is noteworthy", says SCHULTZ,¹⁹ "that Adam and his history are nowhere adverted to in the later literature as Abraham's is or Jacob's or Noah's. Job xxxi. 33 does not mean: 'if I hide my sin like Adam,' for this was assuredly not characteristic of Adam's action according to the narrative of Genesis: but 'if I conceal my sin after the manner of men' (cf. Ps. xvii. 4, 'according to man'). If the text is correct, Hos. vi. 7 should be translated, as is clear from iv. 4; v. 10, 'They are like men who break covenant', i. e., entirely untrustworthy, false men. In Isaiah xliii. 27, finally, Israel's 'first father' who has already 'sinned' is, according to the context, not Adam, since the subject is Israel in its contrast with other nations. It is rather Jacob-Israel that is meant, the real ancestor and true type of the race. Only in the Apocrypha do we meet with literary references to Adam's fall (Wisdom ii. 20f.)."

Similarly CLEMENT²⁰ contends that there are no echoes in the Old Testament of the narrative *Further Illustration of Critical Bias* in the second chapter of Genesis, except in such writings as stand under Babylonian influence. "For Hos. vi. 7, and Job xxx. 33", he adds, "belong here as little as Is. xliii. 27. Although it was taken so by the Federal theologians, yet the passage

Hos. vi. 7 cannot be translated: 'Like Adam they have transgressed my covenant' (for *berith* is always elsewhere the covenant with Israel): rather must *ke'adhām* be taken absolutely and rendered 'After the fashion of men', or else '*abherū berith* be adjoined to it so as to be translated, as the LXX already does, 'These, however, are like a man that breaks covenant'. If we could with WELHAUSEN read *be'adhām* and understand a place of worship by it, then there would be entirely excluded any reference to Gen. iii. Similarly in Job xxxi. 33 it is not, 'If I like Adam hid my sin' (for this is certainly not, according to the narrative in Genesis, especially significant of his action), but, 'If I conceal any sin after the manner of men'. To take but one other example and this time from a dogmatician of the same school, HÖRSTRA²¹ writes: "Nowhere (in the Old Testament) do we find even a distant allusion to the fall in paradise, unless we translate *ke'adhām* (in Job xxxi. 33; Hos. vi. 7; Ps. lxxxiii. 7; xvii. 4) with FRED HITZIG (1807-1875), 'Like Adam'; but the rendering of LUDW. HIRZEL (1801-1841) and others, 'As men do', seems to me more satisfactory. If this judgment of mine is right then it is only by Sirach xxv. 24 and Wisd. ii. 23ff. that the transactions in paradise and the fall are referred to, though both are so alluded to often in the New Testament".

Two things appear to result from a survey of such passages. One is that these critics are precommitted by their critical theories of the development of religious thought in Israel and the relation of the literary remains to this development, not to find an allusion to Adam, and especially not to Adam's sin, and more especially still not to a covenant with Adam, in Hosea. The other is that on these grounds not wishing to explain the passage of Adam's sin, they do not discover in the other explanations that have been offered a satisfactory exposition of it. We cannot, then, accord to the rejection by them, of the interpretation, 'Like Adam' any great independent value. On the other hand, however, their desertion of the various interpretations which take the word as a com-

19. *Alt. Test. Theologie.*, 5th ed., p. 506-7.

20. *Die Christl. Lehre von d. Suende*, p. 163.

21. *Christelijke Geloofsleer*, 1898, I., p. 292.

mon noun, may fairly be read as an indication that those interpretations scarcely satisfy the mind of the candid enquirer.

This judgment would in any event seem to be inevitable, when these interpretations are examined on their own merits. The translation "They have transgressed as if a man's covenant" may be pronounced at once impossible, because forcing a construction upon the Hebrew which it cannot fairly be made to bear. But on the other hand the translation, "They have like men transgressed the covenant" remains vapid and meaningless until a sense beyond the suggestion of the words themselves is forced upon it. The simple 'men' must be made in some way to bear a pregnant sense—either as mere men, as opposed to God, or as common men as opposed to the noble or the priestly, or as heathen as opposed to the Israelites—to none of which does it seem naturally to lend itself here,—before a significance equal to the demands of its context is given it. Almost as little can be said for the version as old as the LXX, "They (are) like a man that has broken a covenant". This rendering certainly involves a forcing of the words out of their natural sense.

No such exegetical objections lie against the rendering, 'Like *Naturalness of Adam*'. Any difficulties *The Comparison that may be brought With Adam* against it, indeed, are imported from without the clause itself. In itself the rendering is wholly natural. Nor is it without positive commendations of force. The transgressing of Adam, as the great normative act of covenant-breaking, offered itself naturally as the fit standard over against which the heinousness of the covenant-breaking of Israel could be thrown out. And Hosea, who practically loves allusions to the earlier history of Israel (cf. ii. 3; ix. 10; xi. 8; xiii. 4), was the very prophet to think here of the sin of our first father. We shall let DELITZSCH, however, outline for us the considerations which commend this interpretation; and to his remarks we shall append the discussion of Prof. GIVEN, as a specimen of the comments which are conceived in a more practical vein.

Says DELITZSCH (on Job. xxxi 33):

"Most expositors have taken *ke'adhām* (in Job. xxxi. 33) 'after the manner of man'; but appropriate as this meaning of the expression is in Ps. lxxxii. 7, in accordance with the antithesis and the parallelism (which see), it would be as tame here, and altogether expressionless in the parallel passage, Hos. vi. 7—the passage which comes mainly into consideration here—since the force of the prophetic utterances: 'They have *ke'adhām* transgressed the covenant', consists in this 'that Israel is accused of a transgression which is only to be compared to that of the first man created: here as there, a like transgression of the expressed will of God'²², as also according to Rom. v. 14 Israel's transgression, is, that fact in the historical development of redemption which stands by the side of Adam's transgression. And the mention of Adam in Hosea cannot surprise one, since he also shows himself in other respects to be familiar with the contents of Genesis and to refer back to it (*vid. Genesis*, pp. 11-13)".

Says Prof. GIVEN:²³

"*They like Adam have transgressed the covenant*: this rendering, supported by the Vulgate, CYRIL, LUTHER, ROSENMÜLLER and WÜNSCHE, is decidedly preferable and yields a suitable sense. God in his great goodness had planted Adam in Paradise, but Adam violated the commandment which prohibited his eating of the tree of knowledge, and thereby transgressed the covenant of his God. Loss of fellowship and expulsion from Eden were the penal consequences that immediately followed. Israel like Adam had been settled by God in Palestine, the glory of all lands; but ungrateful for God's great bounty and gracious gift, they broke the commandment of their God, the condition of which, as in the case of the Adamic covenant, was obedience. Thus the comparison projects the shadow of the coming event, when Israel would leave the land of promise".

Still more practical remarks on the essential sense of the comparison may be found in the same volume, from the hands of the REV. C. JERDAN and of Prof. JAMES ORR.

²². VON HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweis*, I., 412. .
²³. *The Pulpit Commentary in loc.*

We do not think we should err therefore, if we adopted the translation, "Like Adam".

Widespread Acceptance of This Rendering But if we should err, we should err in a great and goodly company. It is difficult to estimate the numbers of Commentators who take this side or the other in a question like this. The standard of judgment by which the admission of commentators even into the poll is governed is so varied that the terms "most expositors", "the majority of interpreters" can have little but a subjective value. Nor have we been careful to accumulate names; much less have we sought to gather together the names of all those who have advocated this particular opinion. Nevertheless a considerable list of such names has come unsought to our hands as we have searched

for light on the passage; and it cannot be otherwise than interesting to call over the roll that thus lies by us. The following expositors of the passage at least, then, have found it to read, 'Like Adam: CYRIL of ALEX., JEROME, RASEI, ABRABANEL; LUTHER, MONTANUS, CASTALIO, CLARIUS, TARNOVIUS, TURRETINE, BURMANN, BRAUN, BRAKEL, MARCK, DE MOOR, WITSIUS, VAN MASTRICHT, EDWARDS (II. 457), TINGSTADIUS, MAUGER, NEWCOMBE, ROSEN-MÜLLER, HESSELBERG, SCHRÖDER, ACKER-MANN, PREISWERK, BOOTHROYD, STUCK, DRAKE, UMBRETT, HITZIG, VILMAR, KURTZ, KEIL, DELITZSCH (on Job xxxi. 33), HOFFMANN (*Schriftbeweis*), PUSEY, COWLES, WÜNSCHE, OEHLER, SCHMOLLER, McCURDY, ORELLI, GIVEN, ORR, A. A. HODGE, BAVINCK, VOS, KNABENBAUER.

A Hittite Record Office

PROF. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D.

A discovery made last year by Professor Winckler of Berlin is likely to produce as great a revolution in our conceptions of ancient oriental history as did the discovery of the famous cuneiform tablets of Tel el-Amarna. Professor Winckler was commissioned by the German government to excavate at Boghaz Keni in Cappadocia, which I had long ago indicated as the capital of the Hittite Empire, and where fragments of cuneiform tablets had already been found inscribed in a language which I had concluded to be Hittite. Though his excavations extended over only a few weeks, the results of them have far surpassed all expectations. He brought back with him about 2,500 tablets or fragments of tablets, most of which were obtained from the same spot. When he returns to the site this year it is probable that the number of tablets will be more than doubled. Some of them are large size, more especially those which were found near the surface of the ground, and which probably belong to a later period of time than the tablets disinterred from the lower part of the ruins.

The larger proportion of the tablets is in the native Hittite language, though the characters in which they are inscribed are the cuneiform characters of Babylonia. But there are many which are in Assyrian, which was at the time the language of di-

plomacy as well as trade. Numerous Assyrian words are introduced, even into those which are in the native language, a fact which will be of material assistance in the decipherment of the latter. It would seem that while foreign correspondence and international business were conducted in Assyrian, the Hittite language was used where Asia Minor was alone concerned.

It will be long before the tablets can be fully copied and deciphered. But already sufficient has been made out to show that the views advocated for the last twenty-five years were fully justified—that there was a Hittite empire in the age of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty which extended from the Greek seas to the borders of Egypt and had its center at Boghaz Keni. Boghaz Keni itself was known as "the Hittite City," and the kingdom of Ardawa, with which, as we learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, the Egyptian kings corresponded, was not far distant from it. Among the tablets discovered by Professor Winckler are letters to and from Egypt, as well as a copy in the Assyrian language of the treaty between Ramses II. of Egypt and "the great king of the Hittites." The name of Ramses Miamon is written Rai-masesa-mai-Amana, and the text agrees with the Egyptian copy of it in stating that the copy in Hittite characters was written "on a silver tablet."