

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 35—July, 1898.

I.

THE PLACE OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY IN MODERN HISTORY.*

THE work done by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, in one aspect of it, is "the ablest and ripest product" of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. But, in another view, it is the starting point of that splendid religious and political development of the English-speaking peoples, which, on its religious side, is marked by the evangelical revival and the modern Christian propaganda at home and abroad; and, on its political side, is marked by the enfranchisement of the peoples of the United Kingdom, the building up of autonomous colonies within the British empire, and the planting of the continental republic of the United States. Of course, every work done by man, just because it has place in the organic historical movement, has roots in the past and bears fruit in the future. Of the most of these works, we are entitled to say that each of them is one of a vast number of equally important steps which men are always taking in the march of humanity to its predestined goal.

But we shall fall into a grave historical error if we assign to the finished work of the Westminster Assembly a function in the history of the English-speaking peoples of any other than the highest and most critical import. The waters of the great Lakes move continuously through the St. Lawrence basin to the Atlantic Ocean. At no point is the movement uninteresting or without

* An address delivered at the celebration, by Princeton Theological Seminary, of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Westminster Standards.

Introduction to the Talmud. By M. Mielziner, Ph.D., Professor of Talmud in the Hebrew Union College. (Cincinnati and Chicago: The American Hebrew Publishing House, 1894.) This is the "first comprehensive work of its kind in the English language," and for its purpose it is doubtless the best in any language, unless we except Prof. Strack's *Einleitung in den Talmud*. The first part, which is called "Historical and Critical Introduction," is the most interesting to the general reader. Indeed, few ministers of the Gospel or even students of literature or history can read it without profit and pleasure. It is the clearest exposition of the intricate questions with which it deals, in our judgment, that is to be found. Besides, it is comprehensive. It treats of the Mishna and works kindred to it, and then gives the authorities and expounders of the same. Then, taking up the Gemara, it classifies its contents and divisions; next, passes to its apocryphal appendices; then treats of the commentaries on the Babylonian and on the Palestinian Talmuds, and of those which are exclusively on the Mishna; it then mentions the epitomes, codifications and collections of all the Talmud or of parts thereof, and in chap. ix. passes into a discussion of the manuscripts and printed editions. But that nothing may be wanting to the student, the author gives in chap. x a classified list of works auxiliary to the study of the Talmud, which is supplemented by a chapter on the translations of the Talmud and one on the general bibliography of the subject, which is especially valuable for American readers, because of the mention of all English and American publications of note. In the conclusion of his Introduction, the author gives the opinions of such men as Buxtorf, Delitzsch, Alexander and Graetz on the value of the Talmud. The opinion of Delitzsch may be in part quoted here with appropriateness: "Just imagine about ten thousand decrees concerning Jewish life classified according to the spheres of life, and in addition to these about five hundred scribes and lawyers, mostly from Palestine and Babylon, taking up one after another of these decrees as the topic of examination and debate, and discussing with hair-splitting acuteness every shade of meaning and practical application; and imagine, further, that the fine spun thread of this interpretation of decrees is frequently lost in digressions, and that, after having traversed long distances of this desert sand, you find here and there an oasis, consisting of sayings and accounts of more general interest. Then you may have some slight idea of this vast, and of its kind unique, juridic codex, compared with whose compass all the law books of other nations are but Lilliputians, and beside whose variegated, buzzing market-din, they represent but quiet study chambers." The second part of this volume is taken up with a discussion of the legal hermeneutics of the Talmud. This portion of the book will be of invaluable service to those who desire to understand the manner in which Paul and the other apostles interpreted and expounded the Scriptures of the Old Testament. A full literature of the subject of the hermeneutical rules of the rabbis is given. Unfortunately, all but two of these works are in Hebrew, and the two exceptions are in German; so that while we can derive little benefit from most of them, we can see how necessary such a treatise as Dr. Mielziner's is for that numerous body of Jews and Christians who are not well enough acquainted with the language of the Rabbins, nor even with German, to gather knowledge of this important subject from these sources, and yet who may be and who ought to be desirous of gaining such a knowledge. After stating the various rules given by Hillel, Nahum, Akiba and Ishmael, the author proceeds to an exposition of the rules of the last named. For example, in the exposition of *Kalvechomer* he gives, first, the definition; next, the principle; then the Biblical prototype; then the Talmudic terms and the logi-

cal and formal arrangement; and this is followed by illustrations of the application and of the refutation of the rule and by a statement and examples of sophistical inferences. The other twelve rules of R. Ishmael are treated in a similar manner, though not generally at such length. The last chapter of the hermeneutics treats of additional rules, such as juxtaposition, analogy, extension and limitation. Dr. Mielziner's closing remark is worth quoting in full: "We must remind the student that this system of artificial interpretation was mainly calculated to offer the means of ingrafting the tradition on the stem of Scripture, or harmonizing the *oral* with the *written* law. Modern scientific exegesis, having no other object than to determine the exact and natural sense of each passage in Scripture, must resort to hermeneutic rules fitted to that purpose, and can derive but little benefit from that artificial system. Thus already the great Jewish Bible-commentators in the Middle Ages, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi and others, who are justly regarded as the fathers of that thoroughly sound and scientific system of exegesis that prevails in modern times, remained in their interpretation of the Bible entirely independent of the hermeneutic rules of Hillel, R. Ishmael and R. Akiba. Nevertheless, this system deserves our attention, since it forms a very essential part of the groundwork on which the mental structure of the Talmud is reared. It must be known even in its details, if the Talmudic discussions, which often turn on some nice point of the rules of that system, are to be thoroughly understood." Part third, on the Terminology and Methodology of the Talmud, is almost entirely technical, giving definitions, explanations and illustrations of the terms and methods of discussion and argument which are used in the Talmud. While this is intended for students and designed for their guidance in the reading of the Talmud, it will well repay a careful reading to all who desire even to catch but a glimpse into the methods of these greatest of traditionalists and most patient of debaters. The method of procedure in debate is illustrated by a synopsis of one which occurred between Rabba and Rab Joseph. The fourth part of the volume gives an outline of Talmudical ethics. It seems to be scrappy and hardly worthy of a place within the same covers with the rest of the book. It is "essentially the contents of a paper read at the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago." It can lay no claim to the thoroughness which characterizes the three parts reviewed above, and ought not to have been put nor to be mentioned in the same category. The Tables of Contents and Indexes of persons, terms and phrases, mentioned or explained, are full and satisfactory. The paper is good, but the printing and the spelling of English words are inexcusably poor. The author is probably not to be held responsible for these defects, but the publishers or printers are. Perhaps, Dr. Mielziner is not to be blamed either for an occasional lapse in the use of correct English; for we infer from the fact that the volume is dedicated to a brother late of Thorn, Germany, that German is his native speech.—*Hebräische Relativsätze. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Syntax der Semitischen Sprachen*, von Dr. Victor Baumann. (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1894.) This inaugural dissertation is superior of its kind. It is well worth reading and study. The veiled hand of Prof. Socin may be discerned at times. The author attempts to prove from the use in the Hebrew Scriptures and from similar constructions in the other Semitic languages, that the so-called relative particle is really a demonstrative pronoun. While the idea is not new, the marshaling of the analogies in the cognate languages and the discussion of the *usus scribendi* in the Hebrew is comprehensive, fresh and almost convincing. If *asher* was originally a demonstrative pronoun, as Dr. Baumann contends, this demonstrative character must have passed away from the consciousness of the people before

the books of the Bible were written, or it seems hard to believe that there would have been so many cases where we meet with an indefinite antecedent followed by *asher*. Where this antecedent has an inseparable preposition, the anomaly may be laid at the door of the Massoretic pointing; but how about the numerous other cases? But if the consciousness of the demonstrative character of *asher* had ceased at an early date and before the Hebrew canonical books were written, one might be excused for asking, What practical benefit is to be derived from proving that it must have been originally demonstrative? Still, it would be a satisfaction to our thought and would help to solve a problem of comparative Semitic syntax. It is a pity that the origin of the Hebrew word *asher*, is still in doubt. The author does not mention the Assyrian *asru*, along with the various words in the cognate languages which have been supposed by some to throw light upon it. We hope to hear again from the young doctor, whose first publication is so full of promise.—*Deuterographs*. Duplicate Passages in the Old Testament: Their Bearing on the Text and Compilation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Arranged and Annotated by Robert B. Girdlestone, M.A. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1894.) It is seldom that we have been so disappointed in a book as we were in this one. The title is taking. The presentation of the deuterographs of the Old Testament in parallel columns, so that one can see readily the agreements and variations thereof, is a work which should be done—if well done. But in this case it has not been well done, because it has been done neither clearly, thoroughly nor consistently. If the book had been intended especially for readers who did not understand Hebrew, three things at least should have been clearly marked, to wit: All cases where the same Hebrew word occurring in the parallel texts was translated by different English words, and all cases where different Hebrew words were rendered by the same English word, and all cases where a variation in the original is denoted by a similar or equal variation in the version. Additions and omissions might also have been marked by appropriate signs. With regard to these last, the work has been generally well done. On p. 2, however, it is not right to mark *away* as an addition, since it is involved in the meaning of the Hebrew verb. With regard to the different English renderings of the same Hebrew original, this might have been denoted well enough by italics, had italics been used always for this purpose and never for any other purpose. Now, the author does generally designate thus a common Hebrew original, *e. g.*, 2 Kgs. xiv. 5 and 2 Chron. xxv. 3; but not always, *e. g.*, 2 Sam. v. 23 and 1 Chron. xiv. 14. But he uses italics, also, where both original and version are different, *e. g.*, 2 Sam. v. 24 and 1 Chron. xiv. 15; but not always, *e. g.*, 2 Sam. v. 9 and 1 Chron. xi. 7. Furthermore, the author is not clear in all of his notes. What does he mean by saying that where we find one Hebrew word in A and another in B, we have “probably” or “possibly a various reading?” See on pp. 52, 53, 63 *et al.* We judge, since he believes that the writer of Chronicles took his deuterographs from the books of Kings, that he means that the later writer found already in his time variant readings in the different MSS. of Kings, and that he selected the one we find in the present book of Chronicles; but he does not explain what he means. Again, to be consistent, he should call note *d* on p. 115 and note *b* on p. 125 and others by the same designation. Also, we think there is no more uncertainty about the examples given on pp. 2, 13, 85, 87, 109, 113, 125 and 130 as variant readings than about those preceded by a “possibly” or “probably.” Moreover, we cannot understand what the author means exactly, when he says that such readings as he mentions on pp. 13, 74 and 86, “may easily have grown out of” the other. For example, how could *kmsht* have grown easily out of *bmbhw*? We find fault, also, with the author for not in-

dicating always in his notes when there is an important variation in the originals of the two texts. He might lead one to suppose that he did mention all, if one did not look up the original for himself. On p. 92, for example, why does he not give us the Hebrew for *smote* and *slew* and for *slain* and *killed* and *murderers*? For the first two, we have synonyms; for the last three, we have the same original. But we must find this out for ourselves! Again, on p. 89, the author notes that one text has *high* and the other *chief*, and he gives the Hebrew for each, while he omits to note the more important variation between *came up* and *came* and between *put up in bags* and *emptied*. Moreover, we are not satisfied with the author's use of the Septuagint. He should have referred always to the readings of the LXX. This work is, in a measure, a textual criticism, and as such it should present all the data at the author's disposal, that he and his readers may form as accurate a judgment as possible with all the facts before them. Those who have ability and time to investigate the original texts and data for themselves will not depend on this collation of facts, because it is not sufficiently full, nor certain, nor consistent. It lacks plan and completeness. The author gives one note on a *rare* word—rare, because it occurs only four times in the Scripture. Why not mention all rare words then? Or why mention any, unless the mentioning have a bearing on the subject? He has a note speaking of one word as a *late* word. Why not call attention to all late words, if to any? Further, we cannot see why there should be no notes on the parallel texts given in the twenty-eight pages of the Appendix; nor why we should have specimens, covering one page only, of the grammatical and idiomatic changes to be found on comparing A and B, instead of a complete list of all the variations, orthographical, grammatical and of all kinds. We call attention to a few oversights and typographical errors. On p. 91, note *e*, first sentence, read *A* instead of *B*; on p. 104, note *b*, read *Wau* instead of *Yodh*; p. 102, note, read *Aleph* instead of *Ayin*; on p. 25, note *r*, read *Gimel* for *Num*, and lastly, we deem it an oversight that the author has no way of indicating when he has departed from the Revised Version. With due attention to such suggestions and corrections, we are sure that a new edition of the *Deuterographs* will make a most useful, because a most necessary, addition to the equipment of the scholarly student of the Bible.

Allegheny.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

VI.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

CROMWELL'S PLACE IN HISTORY. Founded on Six Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford by SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, D.C.L. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. 8vo, pp. 120.

There is no living historian of the English race who enjoys the respect of scholars to a higher degree than Samuel Rawson Gardiner. But it is to be doubted if he has reached a very large audience on either side of the Atlantic. This is largely due to the immoderate length of his great history of Puritan England. No doubt it has been partly due to the unfortunate English way of publishing books of solid merit at a price more commensurate with their value than the purchasing ability of the reading public. Certainly most American buyers think twice before they pay seven dollars and fifty cents a volume for even the most exceptional works; and having thought a second time, they usually decide to wait until the reasonably expected cheaper edition is published. When that appears, as it has appeared in Prof. Gardiner's case to the extent of fourteen volumes, the effect is certainly staggering.