

# THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 16—October, 1893.

## I.

### DR. BRIGGS' HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE HEXATEUCH EXAMINED.

IN the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1883, Dr. Briggs published "A Critical Study of the History of the Higher Criticism with Special Reference to the Pentateuch." This is now reprinted in a volume, with a few additions and such verbal corrections as his subsequent change of attitude has rendered necessary, under the title of *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*.\* In this amended form it may consequently be regarded as presenting the carefully considered views of the author corrected up to date.

There is an obvious distinction between the Higher Criticism *de jure* and the Higher Criticism *de facto*; and these may differ widely from each other. Critical investigations may be rightly conducted and lead to correct conclusions; or they may be based on wrong principles, follow wrong methods, and lead to false conclusions. Dr. Briggs tells us (*Presbyterian Review* for 1881, p. 578) that "Biblical criticism is represented by two antagonistic parties—evangelical critics and rationalistic critics." And he claims to have shown (*Presbyterian Review* for, 1883, p. 70) that "evangelical Biblical criticism was based on the formal principle of Protestantism, the divine authority of the Scriptures, over against ecclesiastical

\* *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D. 8vo, pp. 259. The Preface states that "ten years ago the author undertook to write a little book upon the Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, and at that time he advanced some distance in its preparation. But on reflection he turned aside from it, with the opinion that the times were not yet ripe for it." Now "he presents to the public the result of his studies so far as they have gone."

is insisted on, but his name is withheld. And when Paul, with such tenderness and delicacy, gives direction, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (ii. 5-10), that the penitent offender should be restored to the fellowship of the Church, he still avoids the mention of his name. The language of reprobation is, indeed, applied to one who has the name of Jezebel given to her in the Epistle to the angel of the Church of Thyatira (Rev. ii. 20). But this name is manifestly a symbolical, not a real, one.

This characteristic, which we have indicated, makes it clear that the Epistles addressed to individuals were intended solely for those who received them, and were not to be read in public. Who, indeed, could suppose Titus reading aloud to a congregation in Crete such a statement as we find in Titus i. 12, 13?

The point which I have made is not without apologetic value. It helps us to see the character of naturalness and reality which belongs to the Epistles of the New Testament. If a forger could think of imparting such an appearance to fictitious letters, it would be necessary for the success of his trick that these marks of naturalness should readily strike the reader, and not escape the notice of the world for ages.

Pascal, after expressing his admiration for this peculiarity in the style of the Gospel, that there is not a single invective indulged in by the historians against Judas or Pilate, or any of the enemies or murderers of Jesus Christ, makes the following reflections: "Had this delicacy on the part of the evangelical historians been only assumed, together with the other features of their amiable character, and had they only assumed it that it might be observed, then, even though they had not dared in some way or other to call attention to it themselves, they could not have failed to procure some friend to notice it to their advantage. But, as they were quite unaffected and disinterested, they never provided any one to make such a comment. In fact, I know not that the remark was ever made till now, and this is a strong proof of the simplicity of their conduct."

The application of these reflections of Pascal, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present case is obvious.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

DUNLOP MOORE.

#### ON ΚΑΘΉΜΕΝΟΣ IN MATT. IV. 16.

MUST καθήμενος, in Matt. iv. 16, be translated by "sitting?" The corresponding word in the Hebrew original of Isa. ix. 1, from which Matt. iv. 16 is a citation, is *hol'khim*, "going." That this is the correct reading of the Hebrew is confirmed, not merely by the unanimity of the Hebrew manuscripts, but also by the unanimity of the versions, all of which, with the apparent exception of the manuscript A of the Septuagint, render by a word meaning "going." The

manuscripts **N** and **B** of the Septuagint have *πορευόμενος*; the Coptic version of the LXX. has *nêetmoshî*, "those who go;" and the Hexaplar Syriac version has *damehallelkh*, "who were going." The Syriac Peshito version has *damehallelkhin*, "who were going." The Vulgate has "qui ambulabat." The Chaldee Targum has *יְהוֹ מְהַלְכִין*, "who were going."

Since there can be no dispute about the correctness of the Hebrew text, and since *halakh* cannot mean "to sit," the whole question is thrown back upon *καθήμενος*. It must, if it mean "sitting," be an adaptation or gloss of the sense of the original, due to a change of metaphor similar to that which we meet with in Jonah i. 4, where *helûl rûahh*, "he cast a wind," is rendered by *ἐξήγειρεν πνεῦμα*, "he stirred up a wind" (see for other examples of this change Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 17). The latter part of the verse may have influenced such a change in Isa. ix. 1. But such a change of metaphor is not required here either by the Greek idiom or by the other Greek manuscripts of the LXX. Can *καθήμενος*, then, by any possibility, have been intended, as it stands, or in the form from which it has been corrupted, to mean "going," and hence be a translation of *halakh*? In the Æolic and Doric dialects Eta was used instead of Epsilon Iota (Kühner, § 201, 2). In the Alexandrian dialect Eta was frequently confounded with Epsilon Iota (Winer, *New Testament Grammar*, § 5; Scrivener's *Introduction*, p. 159; Tischendorf's *Prolegomena*, § 28). If this were the case here, we would have *καθήμενος* used dialectically for *καθειμένος* from *καθίημι*, "to march down," as in Æschylus' *Theb.*, 79, or "to set oneself in motion," as in Herodotus vii. 138 (see Liddell and Scott, *in loc.*). Or *καθήμενος* may be a dialectic form for *καθέμενος*, second Aorist Middle participle from *καθίημι*. In the decline of the Greek language Eta and Epsilon were confounded (Sophocles' *Dictionary*, under "Eta"). This was a characteristic of Alexandrian Greek also (see Scrivener, *Introduction*, p. 14, and Winer's *Grammar*, § 5).

But if it be not admissible that *καθήμενος* is a dialectic form of writing, it may be a scribal error, arising from dictation, or, perhaps, a willful mistake of a copyist. Both of these errors were very common (see Reuss' *History of the New Testament*, Vol. ii, § 364).

The ease with which forms from *κάθημαι* and forms from *καθίημι* may be confounded and changed by copyists is manifest in the LXX. Forms from the latter verb occur five times in the Vatican manuscript of the LXX. One of these times it is a translation of the verb *haya*, "to be," and another time of *yashabh*, "to sit" (see Jer. xxxii. 5, Zech. vi. 13). In Jer. xxxii. 5, **B** reads *καθίσται*; **A**, *ἀποθάνειται*; **S** (or **N**), not found; the Coptic has *ephehemsî*, "he shall dwell." In Zech. vi. 13, **B** reads *καθίσται* (?); **S** (or **N**), *καθίσται*; **A**, *καθιεύται*; the Coptic has *ephehemsî*, "he shall sit;" the Hexaplar Syriac has *nettebh*, "he shall sit." Since, in Ex. xxiv. 18, **A** has *κάθημαι* as a rendering of *haya*, a rendering which is confirmed by the Ethiopic *nabara*, "he

dwelt" or "stayed," there can be no doubt that *haya* could at times be rendered by *καθήμεαι*; and, if so, it follows that in Jer. xxxii. 5, as well as in Zech. vi. 13, the translators had used *καθήμεαι*, and that copyists had afterwards corrupted the text into *καθίημι*.

Do not the above facts afford some basis for the conjecture that the composer of the Greek of Matthew may not have written "sitting" for "going," but that we have here either an erroneous spelling or a dialectic form of a second Aorist or Perfect participle from *καθίημι*, making an unparalleled but perfectly allowable rendering of *halakh*, "to go?"

ALLEGHENY.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

PROF. CHEYNE'S IDEA OF INSPIRATION.

MR. ALFRED W. BENN, a theologian who occupies, as he tells us, a "slightly more advanced position" than Prof. Cheyne, and who, therefore, is certainly not moved by "apologetical rancor," points out in a notice of Prof. Cheyne's last book, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, the confusing way in which he uses the term "Inspiration." After animadverting on the frequency with which the words "reverent" and "devout" meet us in Prof. Cheyne's pages, and somewhat dryly remarking that Prof. Cheyne's "reverential attitude" towards the Biblical narratives is one which "carries with it not the slightest concession to its historical authority, where that has been impeached, as he thinks successfully, by a criticism which reverences nothing but scientific truth," Mr. Benn makes the following interesting observations upon Prof. Cheyne's attitude towards inspiration:

"The delicate question of inspiration is one the decision of which cannot fail largely to affect the general attitude of theologians in these controversies; and here Prof. Cheyne's view seems to differ intrinsically from that of his friend. According to Prof. Driver, the Elihu speeches, although by a different and later poet, are just as much inspired as the rest of Job. Our author on the other hand holds that though 'of course inspired,' they are not inspired in the same degree as the rest of the book, nor 'must we force ourselves to reverence these two poets in an equal degree' (pp. 348, 349). The Chronicles are also 'of course inspired,' but only 'as even a sermon might be called inspired, *i.e.*, touched in a high degree with the best spiritual influences of the time.' The Chronicler is only guided by inspiration 'with those limitations subject to which the same thing could be said of any conscientious and humble-minded preacher of the Christian Church' (p. 362). We knew on the authority of Keble that all sermons were good, but we did not know before how many of them were inspired. At any rate it is to be hoped that few preachers would now deliberately falsify history to the same extent as the Chronicler. There are, however, three books which Prof. Cheyne cannot bring himself to place even on the level of a tolerable sermon. The Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and Esther are not inspired at all; at any rate they 'are not for us Christians, in the truest sense of the word, canonical' (p. 349). Nevertheless all three deserve 'reverent study.' I confess I do not understand the constitution of a mind that can study with any feeling but one of utter disgust such a glorification of cold-blooded and sanguinary vindictiveness as the Book of Esther" (*The Academy*, for August 19, 1893).