

## NOTES.



NOTE A.—Philo, who was a contemporary of Josephus, says that “the Jews would rather have suffered a thousand deaths, than that anything should be once altered in all the divine laws and statutes of the nation.”

(Philo Judæus ap. Eusebii *prepar. Evang.* lib. viii.)—The Jews were extremely fond of arranging their sacred books, and even several minute portions of them, in accordance with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. It was on this account that the canonical books of the Old Testament, which really amount to 39, were reckoned at the reduced number of 22. The twelve minor prophets were considered as forming one book. But that the twenty-two books comprehended the whole thirty-nine is proved to a demonstration, by a comparison of our present list with that drawn up and published by a succession of early Christian writers: by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the second century, who travelled to the East in order to make the relative inquiries into the state of the Old Testament canon, as known in that quarter of the world; by Origen in the third century, who enumerates the twenty-two books; by Athanasius in the fourth, who also gives the names of the twenty-two books, which were recognised by the universal church of that age as forming the canon of the Jewish Scriptures. This list is confirmed by the subsequent testimonies of Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome, and it is

established by the Council of Laodicea in 363. Collateral evidence of the same point is furnished by the Septuagint translation, by the Targums or paraphrases of the said books, and by the steady, uniform adherence of the modern Jews to the canon as acknowledged and held by the church of their fathers. The *Chetubim* or *Hagiographa* include the whole of the Psalms, the book of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, and the prophecies of Daniel. The triple distinction of the Jews is quite fanciful. Moses, *i.e.* the Pentateuch, was of course the first division. Under the "prophets," or second division, are included Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, besides all the prophets, except Daniel. This shows, in our Lord's real classification, the historical books ought to be included under the prophets, having been written by prophets. "When our Saviour," says Bishop Marsh, "spake of the Old Testament as composed of three parts,—the *law of Moses*, the *prophets*, and the *Psalms*,—He gave an exact description of the *Hebrew Bible*. It is true that our Saviour did not enumerate the books of each class; but it may be easily shown that the three classes comprehended the *present books* of the Hebrew Bible, and *no more*. For the first class was devoted exclusively to the writings of Moses, and the second class admitted the writings only of those whom the Jews denominated the *prophets*. Neither the first nor the second class, therefore, ever could have contained the productions of later writers, whom the Jews could not *possibly* regard in the same light as their ancient prophets. Nor could even the third class have contained any of those books which we call Apocrypha. For *most* of them were Greek in their very origin, and consequently were incapable of admission into the

Hebrew canon. And with respect to the few among them which may have been written in that kind of Hebrew which was spoken in *later times* by the Jews in Palestine, it would have been quite inconsistent with the veneration of the Jews for their ancient Hebrew Scriptures to have admitted *whole books* written in Chaldee, though they did not exclude the works of Ezra and Daniel on account of some parts of them being Chaldee." <sup>1</sup>

NOTE B.—It is well known that Biblical scholars have long been divided in opinion as to the proper translation of 2 Tim. iii. 16. In the original Greek there is no verb; and the insertion of the substantive verb *ἔστι* being left to the reader's discretion, its position at the beginning or the end of the sentence must affect the import of the passage. Its introduction in the early part of the text, so that the words stand, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and profitable," etc., asserts the inspiration of all parts of the sacred volume; whereas, if it is deferred to a remoter place in the verse, the meaning of the passage is materially altered: "Every writing, divinely inspired, is also profitable," etc. But this rendering is objectionable on various grounds. 1. Because *γραφὴ* has here a special meaning, defined by the *ἱερὰ γράμματα* of the preceding context, which cannot be expressed by "writing." It denotes Scripture, according to the use of the term in the New Testament; and *γραφὴ* being without the article, and standing absolute, it is evident that the Scripture referred to was not limited to the Jewish Scriptures, but comprehended the whole of the revealed word of God. But the translation, even as amended, "All Scripture,

<sup>1</sup> *Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*, p. 102; see also Cosin on the Canon, pp. 94, 95.

divinely inspired, is also profitable," etc., is open to various objections. It evidently implies that some parts of the Scripture are not divinely inspired. Besides, it makes the conjunction *καί*, *and*, serve as an emphatic instead of a merely connecting word. And it tends to weaken the import of the statement, that "all Scripture is divinely inspired," by transferring the emphasis to the affirmation of its being profitable, which no one needs to be informed that Scripture is. It can scarcely be supposed, therefore, that the apostle would make so trivial a statement, nor that it could enforce the counsel which he had addressed to Timothy. The weight of critical authority in modern times, from De Wette to Tregelles, is in favour of the first translation. Dr Pye Smith, particularly in the last edition of his *Scripture Testimony*, supports the second rendering; as does Alford also, although he acknowledges that he does so with great hesitation. Our Authorized Version has adopted the first, along with the Ethiopic version. The Syriac, the Arabic version, and the English Bible of 1549, and other English versions, lend their countenance to the second. Although the Clementine Vulgate has *est* after *utilis*, and totally omits the *καί*, giving this meaning, "All Scripture, divinely inspired, is useful for instruction," the Vulgate itself has the same reading as the Greek, *Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata, et utilis ad docendum*. (See Findlay's *Vindication*.)

It has been considered by some, that the statement of the apostle was limited exclusively to the Old Testament Scripture, under the persuasion that, during the youth of Timothy, no part of the New Testament could have been written, or at least been generally published. But this is to overlook the established facts of the history. The words occur in the Second Epistle to Timothy, which was the last that he wrote, and that in

the year 66, when already the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as well as the Acts, had appeared, together with almost all the other Epistles, besides those of Paul. Now the Epistles were regarded by Paul from the first as Scripture, for he gave orders that they should be read publicly in the churches (1 Thess. v. 27), and to be exchanged one with another, so that all might participate in the privilege of hearing their instruction (Col. iv. 16). And hence it may be concluded, that he, as well as Peter, ranked all his own with those of the other apostles amongst the "all Scripture that is given by inspiration of God."

In regard to the Pastoral Epistles, they have been subjected to a series of severe attacks in modern times, begun by Schleiermacher in 1807 upon the First Epistle of Timothy, and extended by Eichhorn, De Wette, and Baur against the two Epistles to Timothy and that to Titus,—all of which Davidson has marshalled in full array. But able defenders appeared in vindication of these Epistles; and while their authenticity and genuineness have been fully established on critical grounds, their full recognition by the church before the close of the second century has been proved by the strongest testimony of ecclesiastical history. In fact, the discovery of the work of Hippolytus has overthrown the theories and arguments of those critical sceptics.

NOTE C.—It has been alleged that the majority of expositors have found the Messiah in too many prophetic passages. We do not think so; but most assuredly Rationalistic writers, who eliminate altogether the Messianic element, have gone to the opposite extreme, and have maintained their theories on very slender, often untenable ground. We take Dr. Williams, who has retailed the opinions of the German critics in his

famous contribution to *Essays and Reviews*, and from that work we cull a sample or two of their interpretations of prophecy. Thus, "the child born" (Isa. ix. 6) he refers to Hezekiah,—an interpretation to which the objections are insuperable. No one single feature of the prophecy corresponds with the life and reign of Hezekiah. The very lowest meaning which German rationalism or Jewish unbelief can give to such words as "Mighty God," are as inapplicable to Hezekiah as the highest. If it would be blasphemy in the prophet to designate him by this appellation in the full sense of the words, it would be equally low, unworthy flattery, to style him "Mighty God" in the sense of Godlike Hero or Divine Warrior; for Hezekiah, though a good man, was in no conceivable sense a hero. Such a word as "mighty" can hardly be associated with the name of one who, when his land was invaded, made abject submission in such words as those which he sent to the king of Assyria: "I have offended; return from me: that which thou puttest upon me I will bear" (2 Kings xviii. 14).

With as little propriety can he be styled "Wonderful Counsellor;" for Hezekiah, though a good, was a very weak, man. He had to lean for counsel on others, and God gave him a counsellor of surpassing excellence in Isaiah. In fact, if applied to Hezekiah or any of his successors till the destruction of the monarchy, this most astonishing of prophetic utterances is utterly meaningless. If applied to the Virgin-born, it is a glorious anticipation of the Christian faith; and every one of these attributes is seen to be a distinguishing characteristic of the Redeemer, as displayed in the government of the church. If the Holy Ghost spoke by Isaiah at all, He does so in this prophetic utterance, which refers solely to Him of whom, at His conception,

it was announced that "the Lord shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever." Another sample of Dr. Williams' interpretations is that put upon Isa. iv. 2, which he translates and explains most incorrectly, making "the Branch of the Lord," *i.e.* the Messiah, into "*Jehovah's budding*," *i.e.* a better generation of sons and daughters.

The grand attempt made to destroy the predictive character of the prophetic writings is by the division of the book of Isaiah into two parts, the latter part being written at an interval of two hundred years after the former by a younger prophet of the same name, who was personally acquainted with Cyrus, and hence the reference to him! The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, in which the last sufferings of the Messiah are so graphically described, is represented as a historical summary of the life of Jeremiah. The ground on which this elaborate effort of criticism to expunge the predictive element from the Hebrew prophecies rests, is the use of Chaldaic forms of the Hebrew verb *Hiphil*, the introduction of the name of Cyrus, and the adoption of the Chaldaic word *Sagan* for prince. See *Replies to Essays and Reviews*; *Birk's Bible and Modern Thought*; *Davison's Use, Intent, and Inspiration of Prophecy*.

NOTE D.—The prophets were men to whom God communicated a knowledge of future events, long before the causes of them had begun to develop themselves, so as to make them discernible by human sagacity. It might be supposed that the prophecies of Christ and of the kingdom of God would be the result of a sagacious mind, full of pious aspiration in times of great revival, when men's minds were animated by more than usually devout feelings. But some of Isaiah's

prophecies, and those the most spiritual, were uttered or written in the reign of idolatrous kings, when idolatry was rampant. The prophets all predicted something of Christ. Jacob had said, Christ's advent should be before the sceptre departed from Judah, or a lawgiver from between his feet; Haggai and Malachi, that He should come when the second temple yet stood; and Daniel had foretold the very year, eighteen centuries ago, in which He would appear,—a prediction which appeared so unprecedentedly minute, as to excite doubts and suspicion respecting the credibility of this prophet. "But this has now been established on a solid basis of proof, and scepticism on the book of Daniel been dispelled. The prophetic declaration as to the exact time of Messiah's advent did not rest on mere circumstantial evidence, but was capable of mathematical and absolute demonstration. Interpret the seventy weeks in what way we will, and put the period of their commencement backward and forward, it is evident to all that the time must have expired, and Messiah the Prince have come."

NOTE E.—The vernacular language of our Lord's contemporaries—ancient Hebrew having not survived the captivity—was, though still called "the Hebrew tongue,"<sup>1</sup> Syro-Chaldaic, or Aramaic. But throughout the Roman Empire, Greek was a universal medium of communication. Not only in Greece and its colonies, in Asia Minor and Egypt, but in Rome itself, the prevalent use of the Greek tongue was a remarkable feature of the age; and that Palestine was no exception is proved by many considerations. The common use of the Septuagint in the synagogues, and the quotations from the ancient prophets made by our Lord and His apostles from that version; the composition of the Gospels and

<sup>1</sup> Luke xxiii. 38; Acts xxvi. 40.

Epistles in that language, for the use of the resident inhabitants of Palestine as well as of the Hellenistic Jews of the Dispersion ; the fact of there being only two New Testament books which were said to have had Hebrew originals, of which, however, no record exists, and which have never been seen by any but in their Greek form ; the testimony furnished by the writings of Philo and Josephus ; the Sermon on the Mount, addressed to a mixed multitude, comprising people from Tyre and Sidon,<sup>1</sup> who spoke the Greek language, and from the Decapolis ;<sup>2</sup> — these and various other circumstances afford evidence that cannot be gainsaid, that Greek was known to, and familiarly spoken by, all classes in Palestine during the first age of Christianity.—Roberts' *Discussions*, Part I.

NOTE F.—Mr. Froude (*Short Studies on Great Subjects*, p. 254) says : “ Though extremely probable, it is not absolutely certain, that those passages in the Acts in which the writer speaks in the first person are by the same hand as the body of the narrative. If St. Luke had anywhere directly introduced himself,—if he had said plainly that he, the writer who was addressing Theophilus, had personally joined St. Paul, and in that part of his story was relating what he had seen and heard, there would be no room for uncertainty. But so far as we know, there is no other instance in literature of a change of person introduced abruptly, without explanation.” In answer to this expression of doubt, several of the early Christian Fathers,—Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria,<sup>3</sup> towards the close of the second century, Ter-

<sup>1</sup> Luke vi. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. iv. 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Adver. Hæres.* lib. iii. ch. 14 and 15 ; *De Jejuniis*, ch. 10 ; *De præscrip. Hæres.* ch. 22 ; *Adver. Marcion*, lib. v. ch. 2 and 3, etc. ; *Stromat.* lib. v.

tullian in the beginning of the third,—bear concurrent testimony to the book of the Acts and the authorship of Luke. And Eusebius<sup>1</sup> has placed it amongst the sacred books that were universally acknowledged as of canonical authority by the churches.

NOTE G.—Mr. Matthew Arnold's idea of inspiration is given in his last work, *Literature and Dogma*. According to his view, it is a mystic something that inspires the mind with awe, sometimes even to "cruel terror," or a "timid religiosity," which exerts a powerful influence on the imagination. "This," in his view, "was what moved the men who wrote the Bible." When the sacred books were produced, a secret but strong influence beyond themselves acted upon the Israelitish people, and inspired them with awe,—an influence from which they got a sense of righteousness, and were stimulated to do right. This mystic tendency, which was "not themselves, but beyond themselves," was what they meant to express under the name of *Jehovah*, which, untranslated, gives the name of a mere mythological divinity, and which our translators have erroneously rendered by the word *Lord*, conveying the idea of an exalted man. In short, Arnold's representation of this mystic influence is, that it is an innate power which, like that operating upon the impulses of men to self-preservation and reproduction, prompts them to righteousness. We are accustomed to speak of God guiding and governing men. But Mr. Arnold rejects the idea of a personal God, and says it is something which he calls "not ourselves." The stimulus of this secret influence, he says, was the whole inspiration of the Hebrew writers; and when they declared their

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 25.

emotions of joy or sorrow, and their consciousness of sin, they thought not of a personal God, but meant only to express the idea of righteousness. "God is simply the stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being. And this was Israel's consciousness, out of which the grand, solemn statements of Moses, the passionate affections of David, and the lofty imaginations of Isaiah sprang." If there be any meaning lying hid in this conglomerate of hyperbolical expressions, it has baffled all our efforts to penetrate it; and the conclusion to which we are forced to come is, that although Mr. Arnold's work professes to be a guiding light towards a better apprehension of the Bible, we feel that we are left totally in the dark as to what this strange work means to teach.

NOTE H.—The following excellent remarks on the internal proofs of the supernatural in the Scripture, from the pen of the eloquent Dr. Harris, President of Bodwoin College, form an appropriate sequel to the sentiments contained in the latter half of this chapter:—

"Naturalism must account for Jesus as the necessary outgrowth of His age. It must affirm of Him, as of all great men, that His individual force is of slight account: all that was in Him was but the outgrowth of His age; if He had not lived, the spirit of the age would necessarily have found utterance through some other. But Jesus cannot be accounted for as the natural outgrowth and product of His age. His age was, of all the ages, the most barren of spiritual life: polytheism had decayed into epicurean scepticism; Judaism had degenerated into the formalism of the Pharisee and the unbelief of the Sadducee. Jesus was in all particulars unlike His age, and contrary to it; not only so, but He introduced into it a new life, and com-

menced its transformation into His own likeness. The world was like a barren field,—nothing visible but the blackened cinders of scepticism, and the scorched and hollow stalks of empty profession. Jesus came, and life, verdure, and fruit appeared. There went forth from the very publicans, Matthews, and from the very Pharisees, Pauls ; from that ungodly age there went forth godly men and women, confessors and martyrs,—a living church of God, a power of faith and love, which have been the admiration of all succeeding ages. Demonstrably, here was not a life spontaneously developed out of humanity, but a life coming down upon humanity from above,—an energy of God's redeeming grace, as a new and renovating power into the history of man."

NOTE I.—Many of those passages which have been singled out as containing errors and contradictions, admit of a satisfactory explanation. Thus, Num. iii. 39 states the total number of the Levites as 22,000 ; whereas the aggregate amount of the different summations given in other parts of the same chapter makes the whole as 22,300. It is supposed that the sum-total is given, as in former instances, in round numbers, or that the 300 in excess were themselves first-born, who could not on that account be substituted for other first-born. The small number of the first-born males may be ascribed to one or other of the following causes : either that there was no notice taken of families in which the eldest child was a daughter, or that the first-born was counted after the law was promulgated. 2 Chron. xvi. 1 records that " in the six-and-thirtieth year of the reign of Asa, Baasha king of Israel came up against Judah ;" whereas it is alleged, from 1 Kings xv. 33, that Baasha had apparently died in the twenty-seventh year of Asa's reign ; so that there is a flagrant contradiction between

the two statements. If, however, the chronology here be reckoned, as it is believed it should be, not from the commencement of Asa's reign, but from the disruption of the kingdoms, the thirty-sixth year from that epoch would agree with the sixteenth year of that monarch's reign; and this was in all probability the chronology adopted in the national register, from which the sacred historian drew his materials. Again, it is said that 2 Chron. xxii. 2 makes Ahaziah forty-two years old when his father died; whereas xxi. 20 states that his father himself was but forty years of age at his death. It is evident, from the nature of the case, that the text in the parallel passage 2 Kings viii. 26 is the correct reading; most commentators are accustomed to remove the difficulty by suggesting that the letter *Caph*, whose numerical power is *twenty*, was substituted for *Mem*, whose numerical power is *forty*. We prefer the explanation given by Dr. Lightfoot, which is this: that Ahaziah began to reign in the twenty-second year of his own age, but in the forty-second of the reign of the Omri dynasty,—a powerful and disastrous dynasty to the kingdoms both of Israel and Judah, and therefore most likely to form an epoch in the eyes of a Hebrew writer. 2 Chron. xxv. 7, 8, have been pronounced contradictory and unintelligible. It must be admitted that the passage is obscure as it stands; but many critics of eminence have suggested that the particle "not" has in the course of transcription been dropped out of the text, and that the insertion of this little word will restore the clearness and sense of the prophet's advice to Amaziah. It has been noticed that there is a contradiction between 2 Chron. xxiv. 14, which states that "spoons and vessels of gold and silver were made of the surplus money collected by Jehoiada;" and the parallel passage in 2 Kings xii. 13, where it is said

“there were *not* made for the house of the Lord bowls of silver, etc., of the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.” It may be that the word “not” has dropped also out of the text in the former passage; otherwise there is here a direct contradiction. But it is in a matter of very trivial importance, and errors of this kind are very apt to occur in the course of frequent transcription. Various errors also have been noticed in regard to numbers; as in the story of the Bethshemites it is said, “God smote fifty thousand threescore and ten men” (1 Sam vi. 19). Bethshemesh being a small village, the numbers must be erroneous. The verse should be rendered: “He smote fifty out of a thousand.” God, instead of decimating, according to an ancient usage, slew only a twentieth part, *i. e.*, according to Josephus, 70 out of 1400 (see Num. iv. 18–22). Such errors were inevitable, unless there had been a constant miraculous superintendence of transcribers. But the errors are comparatively unimportant. Prof. Rawlinson describes the Pentateuch as “a history absolutely and perfectly true,” but as having “accidental corruptions of the text, a few interpolations, glosses, which have crept in from the margin.”<sup>1</sup> Mr Birks considers that “the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures are not synonymous with entire freedom from the intrusion of the slightest error.”<sup>2</sup> And Messrs. Webster and Wilkinson express themselves in the following manner: “It will be understood that an inspiration which may be truly characterized as direct, personal, independent, and plenary, is consistent with the use of an inferior or provincial dialect, with ignorance of scientific facts and other secular matters, with mistakes in historical allusions or references, and mistakes in conduct, and with

<sup>1</sup> *Bampton Lect.* p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> *The Bible and Modern Thought*, p. 208.

circumstantial discrepancies between inspired persons in relating discourses, conversations, or events." <sup>1</sup>

NOTE K.—Although the Scriptures were given to instruct mankind in religious truth only, yet, considering their divine origin, it might be expected that, wherever mention is made of the material world, there would be no opposition to the principles of true science. The sacred writers speak of physical nature in popular language, and it is evident that in no other way could they have been understood by the generality of mankind in any age. But their statements are far-reaching in all they have said upon this subject. The idea of creation, the bringing the matter of the universe out of nothing, could have been derived only from divine inspiration; for all pagan writers speak of the world as formed from pre-existent matter. The second and third verses of the first chapter of Genesis are quite in accordance with all the cataclysms and revolutions to which geology has shown the pre-Adamite earth was subjected. The subsequent account which the historian gives of the preparation of the world for the existing economy of providence,—of the animal creation, beginning with the formation of the simplest animals, and ascending in the scale of organized structures, in exact accordance with the modern zoological arrangement established by Cuvier,—of the distinction of species, and the succession of species both of plants and animals from parent species,—of the natural supremacy of rational man, the descent of the human race from a single pair, and the antiquity of man,—is confirmed by the testimony of the most enlightened observation and the conclusions of true science. Nor is there less confidence to be attached to the Mosaic account of the Flood—partial,

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to the Greek Testament*, p. 46.

indeed, in superficial extent, as the Scripture use of the word "all" frequently warrants, but universal in the destruction of mankind, with the exception of a single family. A similar remark may be made as to the introduction of diverse languages, which, as has been most satisfactorily proved by Sir H. Rawlinson and others, must have occurred in the place and time which the Bible history assigns to it. The allusions which are occasionally made to the sun, moon, and stars, to all objects beyond the earthly scene, are extremely guarded, and described only as objects of sight. In other respects, great progress has been made in illustrating obscure points of Scripture history through the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments. Pharaoh Sesonch (Shishak) is represented dragging a group of captives to the temple of his gods—each having his breast labelled with an inscription telling his country; and amongst them is Rehoboam, king of Judah, with the name *Jaudh Malk*, "Judah Melek," king of Judah, in a cartouche over him (see Lepsius' *Letters*); also it has been proved that the immense number of Egyptian monarchs enumerated by Manetho do harmonize with the Biblical chronology; for there were three dynasties—before Upper and Lower Egypt were united—ruling contemporaneously. The researches at Nineveh have also thrown great light on Scripture history, particularly on those historical puzzles,—the promise made by Belshazzar that Daniel should be "the *third* ruler in the kingdom:" for it is now fully ascertained that that young king was reigning conjointly with his father Nabonadius; and also the existence of Merodach Baladan, king of Babylon, who had revolted from Assyria (Isa. xxxix. 1).