
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXV.

JANUARY, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

PRESENT STATE OF BIBLICAL SCIENCE.

By B. B. Edwards, Professor at Andover.

It may not be altogether inopportune at the commencement of another year of our labors, and at the beginning of 1850, to refer briefly to the existing position of Biblical Science, or to survey, cursorily though it may be, a part of the field which we attempt to occupy. Such a survey, also, has been suggested by the recent decease of Dr. De Wette, the patriarch of biblical critics and commentators. His life, though passed, for the most part, in the retirement of the study, is not without impressive lessons. The passing away of a man so active who, for twenty or thirty years, has been a leader in certain great departments of knowledge, constitutes a kind of epoch in the career of all who are devoted to similar pursuits.

We speak of biblical science. Perhaps the propriety of the term may be doubted. In the view of some it can hardly lay claim to an appellation so dignified. In every part of Christendom, where there is any freedom of investigation, views are propounded and methods of interpretation practised which are indicative of anything but science. We meet with heterogeneous or contradictory expositions, the use of the same texts to support perhaps a score of conflicting opinions, and even a want of agreement in regard to the most simple and fundamental rules of interpretation. In the country where there has been the most pretension to rigid science in the pursuit of biblical studies, there has often been a sad deficiency of truly liberal and comprehensive views. A criticism has had wide currency, which has been rightly named de-

structive, which substitutes theory for judicious investigation, which violently dislocates ancient history, and attempts to reconstruct it by an arbitrary subjective opinion; which has, in short, adopted a method of handling the Scriptures which, if carried out, would annihilate all ancient history, and render anything like rules of evidence impossible. A criticism may well be called destructive that refuses to receive a document as true which would be admitted without gainsaying, on one half of the evidence which it offers, in any court of justice on earth.[1] We do not here refer to such men as Strauss and the later Tübingen school, but to professed defenders of biblical truth, to those who would possibly shrink from being named skeptics.

Again, there may seem to be little of true science in a department which appears to run counter so often with the discoveries of the naturalist. That should seem to have poor claims to a settled interpretation which is liable to be jostled or overturned at any moment by the revelations of the natural philosopher or antiquarian. The positive declarations of the Bible come into direct collision with the unimpeachable testimony of sienite or the colored walls of a tomb. Either Ethnography or Moses must be mistaken. But the evidence of visible and tangible forms cannot be set aside, it is said, by a few dusky characters in a dead language, copied, it may be, no one knows when, from a monkish, mouldering parchment. What is written on hard granite, or is dug up from a mummy chest must be true, however it may fare with a Jewish historian. At least, we must wait till science has unfolded all her mysteries, before we can affirm that sacred philology has fixed and established laws. In other words, the test of the truth of a written revelation is to be found in nature.

It may be thought preposterous, also, to speak of biblical science, when there is so little agreement, or rather so wide a disagreement in respect to the exposition of the prophetical and symbolical portions of the Scriptures. Many in this department run to and fro, but knowledge is not increased. Arbitrary systems of rules are laid down as if they were the axioms of geometry. All preceding interpreters have totally mistaken their vocation, and darkened the counsel of Jehovah by words without knowledge. Events, which an indefinite futurity only can disclose, are laid off and marked out with the precision of a chart. A position is first confidently assumed, and then the innocent text is interpreted or wrested so as to sustain it. It is sad to know that many excellent men, especially in Great Britain, are poring over the prophetic Scriptures with a zeal which is not according to knowledge,

[1] See Prof. Greenleaf's Examination of the Four Evangelists.

with a labor which satisfieth not. They take no warning by the fate of many analogous theories, and indulge in empty dreams, to which almost every preceding century of the Christian era has given birth. How can science dwell in such confusion? How can we speak of fundamental principles, methodical arrangement, systems of rules, when so many prophetical theories, alike unsatisfactory, and often mutually destructive, abound?

Still, notwithstanding this diversity and apparent confusion of views, there are certain fixed principles which are now generally acknowledged among the biblical students of all Protestant countries. There are rules of procedure, methods of interpretation, which command the confidence of most if not all intelligent students of the Scriptures. Let us name some of them.

1. One of these leading principles is, that all true interpretation is founded on grammar and lexicography. We use a lexicon to ascertain the meaning of single words, and a grammar to ascertain their meaning when combined in sentences. An honest and careful use of a good dictionary and grammar of the Greek and Hebrew languages lies at the foundation of biblical study. The Greek of the New Testament is to be subjected to the same processes precisely as that of the classical dialects. It claims no exemption from the same rigid, scientific analysis. The sacred character of the Hebrew does not take it out of the category of languages. The laws of syntax are no more to be violated in Isaiah than they are in Arabic. We are to support a doctrine of the gospel, if at all, by the strictest grammatical exposition of a text. If the divinity of the Logos, in the first verse of John's Gospel, can be defended only by a violation of the laws of Greek grammar, then it cannot be defended at all, so far as relates to the testimony of that passage.

Adherence to this method of interpretation implies, first, the avoidance of conjectural emendations of the text. We are to take the text as it is, except as emendations are borne out by the adequate testimony of manuscripts. We are to leave a difficulty unsolved, rather than to cut the knot by doing violence to the text. The harsh method pursued by Lowth in Isaiah in this respect, would find few advocates now. It is evidence of the weakness, mistaken ingenuity, or erroneous views of an interpreter, to tamper with that which he is simply called upon to explain. This rule implies, secondly, that the main source of explanation is the language itself. It furnishes its own definitions, reveals its own laws; its usages are to be learned from its own literature. Recourse is to be had even to a kindred speech only in cases of clear necessity. We are not to seek the aid of the Arabic or Syriac, or of classical Greek, while there remain sources of comparison in the language itself.

Only a spare and cautious use of kindred dialects would now be recommended. No one would be disposed to repeat the experiments to which Albert Schultens subjected the book of Job. The rule, in the third place, would dispense with all the ambiguities and trifling of the double sense. Grammars and lexicons would be of little use, were there one simple and another occult meaning to be attached to a narrative or the statement of a doctrine. The Bible is by eminence a book addressed to the common apprehension, to the rules and laws of popular discourse. It is not a collection of enigmas. Its aims are too serious for that. It may prefigure and foreshadow. Events, usages, ceremonies may point to some great fulfilling hour in the distant future, but its words have one and but one signification.

It may be here proper to allude to the apparatus which is now furnished for the grammatical and lexical study of the Bible. Perhaps it is not too much to affirm that neither of the classical languages is better, if it is so well furnished, as yet, with helps of this nature. We have the New Testament Grammar of Winer, which, especially in the last edition, is marked by a clear analysis of the more difficult texts in illustration of various principles, by a thorough digest and application of the most recent and able investigations in Greek syntax, by a fine grammatical tact, by a wary and sound judgment, and by copious stores of knowledge. We have also the prospect of soon possessing a New Testament Lexicon, worthy of the present advanced state of knowledge. In Hebrew we have the copious and philosophical grammar of Nordheimer, the original, ingenious, and often profound discussions of Ewald, especially in his "Copious Manual" of 1844, the long known and standard grammatical work of Gesenius, enriched by the remarks of Rödiger, and the Lexicon of the same prince of Hebraists, which it would be superfluous to praise. So admirable are these various helps, that professed commentaries come to be of quite secondary importance.

2. Biblical Science recognizes the fundamental importance of historical interpretation. The value of history as a means of ascertaining the sense of the biblical records, has indeed ever been more or less acknowledged. At the same time, history has not unfrequently been made, in fact, to yield to abstract reasoning or to logical deductions. Systems of divinity have been constructed, to a large extent, from passages of Scripture perverted or forced out of their historical and obvious meaning. But it is now practically acknowledged, to a greater extent than ever before, that the Bible is, for the most part, a series of detached historical records, notices of God's dealings with men, statements, more or less connected, of their conduct in relation to Him and to one another. What an enigma would the Epistle to the Hebrews be with-

out the historical records of the Old Testament! How dark would be many passages in Paul's doctrinal epistles, were it not for the history by Luke! How vitally connected is every part of the Bible with the Pentateuch! In how many hundreds of instances is the historical truth of those five books taken for granted in the subsequent narratives! To dislodge them from their present form, or to reduce them to the category of myths, would make the Bible a great Torso fragment, an enormous trunk without its head. To interpret the prophecies successfully, how indispensable is a minute acquaintance with the historical records of the earlier portions of the Bible and of contemporary profane accounts. History is the key to all fulfilled prophecy, and it supplies essential rules for the comprehension of those portions that remain unaccomplished. A searching examination into the remains of antiquity, and a luminous exhibition of the results are indispensable for one who would be a truly able interpreter of the prophets. In this field the Germans have labored with distinguished success. One leading excellence of the Commentary on Isaiah by Gesenius, is the fresh and clear light which his accurate historical researches throw upon the sacred page. The same is true, perhaps in a higher degree, of the work of Knobel. "The prophets of the Old Covenant," he truly remarks, "have to do, not so much with general ideas which as teachers they follow, as rather and predominantly with the special relations of the times and of the people for whom as practical orators they point out and inculcate the right course of conduct; by these relations were their prophecies occasioned, and to these were they specially directed. Therefore is it a main point in the interpretation of the prophets to unfold, as fundamentally as possible, all the contemporary relations of which they treat, and to define them exactly, in order to make the reader at home in the field on which they move. Without this knowledge, which must be obtained, partly from the historical books, partly by the combination of the historical notices contained in the prophetic writings, a sure and full understanding of the prophets in general, or a thorough acquaintance with particulars, is not possible."

In connection with the historical is what may be called the antiquarian interpretation, i. e. an employment of the stores of information furnished by modern researches into Oriental life, manners, and antiquities. It is but recently that the Oriental world has been laid fairly open. We had, indeed, the accurate and conscientious explorations of Niebuhr and Burckhardt. But they were limited to some portions of the East, and their reports of some districts which they visited were necessarily hurried and imperfect. But within the last few years, the number of able and accomplished travellers has been greatly increased. In

Western Asia the incidental labors of American missionaries have contributed largely to the stores of biblical science. To their other facilities they have added an accurate acquaintance with the languages spoken in the countries where they sojourn. The names of Smith, Dwight, Perkins, Thomson, Van Dyck and others, will readily occur. The Researches of Dr. Robinson has become a classical work throughout Protestant Christendom. In Egypt the investigations of Rosellini, Wilkinson, Lane and others, have enabled the inquirer to reap a rich harvest. The indefatigable labors of Lieut. Lynch have given us exact information in respect to the Jordan and the Dead Sea. At the same time, Layard and others are unveiling the long buried secrets of the Mesopotamian Plain, and throwing new light on the Mosaic and prophetic records.

These antiquarian treasures which serve to illustrate so many obscure passages in the Scriptures, are characterized, first, by their extraordinary amount; secondly, by their comprehending all, or nearly all, the countries to which much reference is made in the Scriptures; thirdly, by, in general, exactness of investigation and scientific accuracy in statement; and fourthly, by their vivid presentation to the eye through the admirable maps, fac-similes, drawings, or actual specimens of various objects. The result is, accordingly, not the mere correction of errors and mistranslations, but the ability which one acquires to look at the whole Bible in a new light. We can see all objects, in a measure, under an oriental sky. It requires less effort of imagination than formerly to transport ourselves to the East. We are enabled by clear descriptions and exact drawings to gain an accurate conception of an oriental city, of the dress and manners of the people, of life in the desert, and thus we may mingle more familiarly with the patriarchs as they wandered, "seeking a better country," or with kings and prophets in the "city beautiful for situation," or with that great Teacher whose footsteps made it indeed the Holy Land.

3. Another principle of biblical interpretation relates to the harmony of the Scriptures with the discoveries of natural science. Such propositions as the following would now be undisputed: There can never exist any absolute discordancy between a law of nature and a disclosure of Divine Revelation, because the same Being is the author of both. If there seems to be a real discrepancy, it is owing either to the misinterpretation of the written record, or to the fact that the alleged scientific discovery has no foundation. It is a hasty generalization, or a position assumed without sufficient evidence, or in the progress of discovery it will admit of an explanation which is consistent with the law of philology. A natural science, while in its infancy, when but par-

tially developed, while some of its main features are still under discussion, is not to be placed on the same footing with sciences whose laws have been long established. Its earliest revelations, though seemingly adverse to biblical truth, need not occasion alarm or anxiety. The laws of philology are to be admitted as unhesitatingly as those of any physical science. There is the same certainty that the Bible came from God as that the solar system did. It would be no greater mark of folly to reject the evidence on which the facts of the material sciences rest, than that by which spiritual truth is supported. The laws of language, the principles of philology, are not to be summarily set aside when they come into apparent conflict with the discoveries of nature, as if less confidence were necessarily to be placed in them. Skepticism may be as really produced by the representation that the principles of language, or of intellectual science, are shifting and uncertain, as by making the same representation in regard to chemistry or geology. The laws of human belief, the usages of language, the records of history may come to us with testimony irresistible and unimpeachable. One thing is certain; no absolute contradiction between physical and biblical truth has yet been pointed out. The monuments of Egypt do not convict Moses of falsehood. The valley of the Nile has not yet converted the Pentateuch into a myth. Ethnology still leaves the doctrine of the unity of the human race intact. The various configurations of the skull, or the various colors of the hair upon it, as found four thousand years ago, have not thus far been proved to require a plurality of the original race, or an indefinite extension of the life of man on earth. Geology rather testifies to the comparatively recent creation of man. With such propositions, we suppose the most intelligent biblical philologists would accord. While ready to welcome truth in all the realms of physical nature, and by whomsoever brought to light, while entertaining the most enlarged conceptions of the glory of the Creator in the material universe, they are not disposed to lower the claims of their own science, or to be in haste to explain away a biblical truth, lest it may come into collision with a material phenomenon. Miracles, a supernatural revelation, may be supported by a weight of evidence so convincing, that not to believe in them, would be the greatest miracle of all.

4. Again, the Bible is to be interpreted in perfect consistency with the laws of the human constitution. This complete harmony has never, perhaps, been acknowledged so fully as it is now. The law of the Sabbath, e. g., is not merely Jewish or Christian. It seems to be the law of man's physical and moral nature. It appears to be made out by experience, or by a sufficient number of facts, that man needs a

stated portion of the week for rest, by virtue of the same natural laws that enforce upon him the repose of night. If so, we need not hesitate to give the widest extension to our exposition of the Sabbath law announced at the creation.

When a comment does not receive its justification from man's universal nature, it still may be vindicated from the human constitution as modified by climate, and physical and mental peculiarities. Hence, the main internal objection to the reception of the Canticles into the Canon, is removed. The book is precisely fitted to the eastern taste. Its method of instruction is indigenous in Arabia and Persia. Metaphorical language in all its forms is the language of every day life there. Provision is made by the enticing forms of parable and allegory for the spiritual sustenance of half, it may be, of the human race. There is no more objection to the spiritual interpretation of this book in principle, especially as it appears in the original, than there is to that of the forty-fifth Psalm, or to the allegory which Paul adduces in the Epistle to the Galatians. Our refined and fastidious taste is not to be the rule for the millions of Asiatics. They have the same necessity as the polished European that the Scriptures should be adapted to their idiosyncracies. The recognition of this fitness of the Bible to the nature and intellectual cultivation of the nations to whom it was first addressed, removes many difficulties, and justifies the Divine procedure, on points where it has been often impugned.

Another illustration may be found in the interpretation of the poetic and prophetic Scriptures. Here it is eminently necessary to study the laws of the imagination. The interpreter is ill fitted for his vocation who has not quick and delicate sensibilities, a true taste, some power of imagination, who has not thoroughly studied the laws and recorded operations of this part of man's nature. In the Hebrew poets and prophets, there are not a few passages which, so far as grammar, the context, the scope, etc., are concerned, will admit of two or three interpretations. The only key that will unlock the mystery may be in that power which takes exquisite delight in reading Homer and Milton. The logical faculty cannot solve the doubt. The industrious collection of parallel texts will throw no light upon it. It appeals to the highest endowment of man's intellectual nature, and, in addition, it may be, to a simple and liberal taste. The presence of these powers of imagination and taste gives peculiar value to Lowth's biblical works, and to De Wette's German translation of the Bible.

5. We may briefly advert to one more acknowledged fact of Biblical Science. The interpreter must feel some real sympathy with the truths which he is studying. All other gifts and facilities are not a substitute

for this. A man may possess exact and extensive learning, the soundest judgment, the nicest critical tact, and still fail to recognize the true and full significance of the more spiritual portions of the Bible. He may be an honest man, and sincerely desirous to explain the Bible correctly, but without a spirit in some degree accordant with that which reigns in the Scriptures, he will not accomplish his end. The Bible on one essential point is not analogous to other books. It reveals truths which are to be believed, prescribes duties which are universally obligatory. It speaks with authority to the interpreter himself. It is as impossible as it is undesirable for him to approach his work with an indifferent state of mind. What is sometimes vaunted as perfect impartiality in a biblical critic, never had existence. The student has the deepest personal stake in the pages which he is pondering. Its truths touch his moral nature at innumerable points. His mind cannot be in a perfect equilibrium. Entirely to segregate his intellectual from his moral nature is an impossibility. Feelings will course through his soul in a thousand directions, and must modify and color his mental decisions. Besides, no one can interpret the writings of another, without entering into his spirit. The apostle Paul possessed great fervor of feeling, a tender and ardent love to the Saviour, comprehensive and profound views of the scheme of redemption, and a desire that men should experience its efficacy so great as almost to absorb every other emotion. These characteristics pervade every epistle which he has left. They shine out in all his discourses. They tinge all his language. They account for many peculiarities of his style and diction. Now one who has little or no sympathy with the pure and profound spirit of this great evangelist cannot adequately expound his language. He is deficient in one of the essential qualifications. In his method of handling, the glowing words lose their fire. The parenthesis becomes inextricably involved. He does not see that feeling lies at the bottom of the interjected clause. A rational interpreter, e. g., Grotius, with but little emotion, will explain away or dilute words which came from the depths of the heart, vital and overflowing with truth. Interpreters like Melancthon, Calvin, Olshausen, Tholuck, possess a qualification of fundamental importance, which is denied to the whole neological school. This school furnishes many most accomplished critics and philologists, but they would find a more congenial home in Greek and Roman literature, than among the practical and profound truths of the New Testament. There is also a fine and delicate spiritual apprehension, which is a result of a sympathizing study of the Gospel, and which detects a thousand nice shades of thought, almost invisible graces of language, to which a common critic, or a man of mere learning is blind. The

great current of thought has numerous tributary rivulets, little springs that send in their contributions, which will be wholly unobserved by the gross and worldly sense. It is only to the "pure in heart" to whom those finer lineaments of Christian truth stand revealed. We need not, however, expand these thoughts. They are happily recognized by biblical scholars throughout this country and Great Britain, and to a gratifying extent, in other lands.

In bringing these remarks to a close, we will briefly advert to certain desiderata in biblical science. There are aspects of it which cannot be contemplated with entire satisfaction. We are still reminded of painful deficiencies.

In the first place, the educated and Christian community fail to entertain adequate conceptions of the importance of sacred philology, and of the necessity of pecuniary means for the attainment of its objects. The channels of benevolence are too circumscribed, from the want of enlarged ideas of the value of money. The streams of beneficence do not flow too much, but too exclusively, in certain practical directions, or for the accomplishment of results which are immediately useful. Benevolent and wealthy gentlemen have not yet learned to bestow of their abundance upon fields where the richest harvests may be ultimately reaped. Public notoriety, popular sentiment, determine too much the destination of charitable bequests. It is not sufficiently considered that the happiest results often flow from obscure and almost impalpable causes. Physical science may receive a greater impulse from timely aid rendered to a periodical journal, which from its scientific character is addressed to but few readers, than by the founding of a professorship. A few hundred dollars seasonably bestowed upon a young man of decided genius in the walks of science may result in a most useful discovery. The donation to the library of a college of the most important books in the department of sacred literature might keep the flame of divine knowledge ever burning brightly there. A young man in one country of Europe, who discovers an extraordinary aptitude for music, is generously supported several years at the public expense, till he has laid a broad foundation for his profession. But in intellectual and sacred science, works of the fairest promise are left to languish and die, for want of a little timely encouragement. A journal of acknowledged value, and, from the nature of the case, of very limited circulation, is left to struggle for years, unable to avail itself of the aid of invaluable illustrations, and of other costly contributions. An enlarged philanthropy would surely prompt to a different course. A comprehensive charity would apply its means where the vital forces are most concentrated.

It is essential, in the second place, to the prosperity of biblical science, that its elements should be studied at an earlier period of the student's life than is now common. Hebrew is a part of the required course in the German gymnasia. There is no adequate reason, so far as we can see, why it should not be required as a part of the college course in the United States. The study of it is indeed optional for a small portion of the senior year, at some institutions. But it has shared the same fate, doubtless, with fluxions, and other optional studies. It has either been wholly neglected, or pursued under great disadvantages. What is not a part of the required system will find but few earnest students. The result is that an invaluable part of the theological course is consumed in imperfectly studying that which might be acquired in half the time a few years earlier. Viewed in the light of philology, as elementary grammatical principles, as an important ancient dialect, the Hebrew does not pertain to professional education. It belongs to those general studies which are appropriate to the college. Could one lesson a day for three months of one of the college years be devoted to a Hebrew grammar and Chrestomathy, a foundation would be laid for the subsequent mastery of interpretation, and for a far more useful ministry. We cannot imagine why a sacred language, in a Christian country, settled by a race almost passionately attached to the Old Testament, and that founded the first colleges for the glory of God and the good of the church, should be so sedulously excluded from the collegiate curriculum of later times.

We may advert, in the third place, to certain desiderata in the way of helps for biblical study. The Septuagint version of the Old Testament has as yet received but slight attention compared with its importance. A fundamental work on that version has long been needed, which shall give us a carefully revised text, which shall sift all the facts and traditions in regard to the history of the translation, which shall determine, as far as possible, the relative value and character of the different parts, how far the language coincides with the New Testament dialect, with Josephus, and with the later classical Greek. We need also a carefully discriminated treatise on the Synonymes both of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. The materials for such a treatise may be found, in a measure, in the Lexicons and in commentaries, but, for the most part, they must be collected from an independent and careful reading and comparison of the original. A book of synonymes, such as we have of the German and Latin languages, would be an inestimable acquisition. Again, the Hebrew Syntax has not yet been investigated with that completeness which the subject demands. Invaluable as the labors of Gesenius, Nordheimer and Ewald are in this depart-

ment, yet every intelligent student must perceive, that in certain topics, e. g., the article and the tenses of the verbs, much yet remains obscure and unsettled. The same remarks apply in a measure to the Compound Verbs of the New Testament. Winer, in his Programmes, has given an earnest of what yet remains in this hitherto neglected part of the language. Finally, we need Commentaries of a different character from what can now be found, with a few exceptions, either in the German or English languages. An adequate commentary deals both with the letter and spirit; it has its basis on the sure principles of grammar; but it does not rest in a jejune analysis of the outward form; it seeks to unfold whatever is in the text, however profound and spiritual it may be; it lays out its strength on the really difficult texts, and passes lightly over what is obvious to the cursory reader; it makes no display of the details of interpretation, or the formulae of science; it goes into these details only when the exigencies of the interpretation which is adopted, require; it chooses rather to give the results than the process of an inquiry; it directs its most strenuous efforts to present the exact idea of the original, and in that form, neither so compressed as to become obscure, nor so diffuse as to be wearisome, which will be most satisfactory in giving the full impression of the text. We have many commentaries which are marked by a great ability in a particular direction. They have prominent and characteristic excellencies. But we have few which are symmetrical, well adjusted, which meet the precise demands of the intelligent and Christian reader. The materials for a commentary, somewhat approximating to this ideal, are now liberally furnished. A combining and moulding hand only is required.

Again, there is needed a profounder faith in the reality and harmony of all truth. The student of God's word should proceed in his inquiries with quiet confidence, though the waves of skepticism may rise around him. He may rest assured that ultimately the apparent discordancy shall vanish. Physical science, reverently and earnestly prosecuted, will do homage to that which is divine. Anxiety as to the final verdict of the two great classes of testimony is, in the highest degree, unreasonable. He has no occasion to shun an examination of any of the results of geology or astronomy, ethnography, history, or antiquities. He may admit every fact and just conclusion established by these sciences. They cannot shake the rock on which scriptural truth rests. They cannot impugn the Bible as a literal, simple, credible history. At least no contradiction, no irreconcilable discrepancy has as yet been pointed out. Neither may he shrink from any of the demands of philological criticism. He may subject the records of

Christianity to the sharpest tests without any fear. They will come out unimpaired from the severest cross questioning. After all the efforts of the most sagacious and clear sighted critics of the present day, the life and works of our Saviour, as recorded by four independent witnesses, appear in beautiful harmony. After the fiery ordeal which the Gospels have gone through at the hands of many of the later critics; and after the strenuous efforts of a number of able scholars to break up and rearrange the earlier portions of the Old Testament, it is delightful to find that the integrity and historical value both of the Gospels and the Pentateuch are, in various forms, receiving fresh confirmation and support. The monuments of Egypt, the disentombed cities of Assyria, the searching investigations of accomplished travellers in Palestine, the voice of profane history, the last and severest critical inquiries, all testify that "the foundation of God standeth sure."

ARTICLE II.

EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF JOHN 1 : 1—18.

By M. Stuart, late Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. at Andover.

[The title which is given above to the disquisition that follows, is not perhaps exactly descriptive of it. My design is not simply that of a philologist or interpreter, nor merely that of a theologian. My ultimate object is indeed to develop, if I can, the *sentiments* which the words of John were intended to convey; and these, if they can be made manifest, ought, in my apprehension, to be regarded as truths deeply concerned with theology. But this development I do not undertake to bring about by *theological* argument and reasoning, except in quite a subordinate manner. When the inquiry is made: What has John taught? I know of no satisfactory way of answering this question, except by a resort to the fundamental and well established principles of exegesis. In the present disquisition it is my aim, on all occasions where it is feasible, to pursue this method.

I need make no apology to the well informed reader, for an endeavor to cast some light on John's introduction to his Gospel. It has been hitherto regarded, by most interpreters and many theologians, as one