
THE SOCIETY
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

June, 1880.

G02
S01

8007

1880

Soci A

THE SOCIETY
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

THE Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis held its first meeting in New York June 4, 1880, at 2 P.M., in the study of the Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D.

There were present Professors Ezra Abbot, LL.D. ; W. Beecher, D.D. ; C. A. Briggs, D.D. ; Rev. Francis Brown ; President W. C. Cattell, D.D. ; President Thomas Chase, LL.D. ; Professors George E. Day, D.D., Timothy Dwight, D.D., F. Gardiner, D.D., D. R. Goodwin, D.D., C. M. Mead, D.D., P. Schaff, D.D., Charles Short, LL.D., P. H. Steenstra, James Strong, D.D., C. H. Toy, D.D. ; Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D., and Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D.

Prof. D. R. Goodwin was chosen temporary chairman, and Prof. F. Gardiner temporary secretary.

The report of a committee appointed at a meeting of several of the above gentlemen in New York, Jan 2, 1880, to prepare a Constitution and By-Laws, and to invite additional members, was read. They reported the acceptance of membership by the following, a declining on the part of two others, and no reply as yet received from two others :

- Prof. Ezra Abbot, LL.D. 23 Berkeley Street, Cambridge, Mass.
Pres't S. C. Bartlett, D.D. Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Prof. W. Beecher, D.D. Auburn, N. Y.
Prof. John Binney Middletown, Conn.
Prof. C. A. Briggs, D.D. Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Rev. Francis Brown 9 University Place, New York.
Rev. J. K. Burr, D.D. Trenton, N. J.
Prof. J. H. Buttz, D.D. Madison, N. J.
Pres't W. C. Cattell, D.D. Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Pres't Thomas Chase, LL.D. . . . Haverford College, Delaware Co., Pa.
Prof. T. J. Conant, D.D. Brooklyn, N. Y.

- Prof. George E. Day, D.D....New Haven, Conn.
 Prof. Timothy Dwight, D.D....New Haven, Conn.
 Rev. Henry Ferguson.....Claremont, N. H.
 Prof. F. Gardiner, D.D.....Middletown, Conn.
 Prof. D. R. Goodwin, D.D....3927 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. C. D. Hartranft, D.D....Hartford, Conn.
 Rev. E. Harwood, D.D.....New Haven, Conn.
 Rev. J. F. McCurdy.....Princeton, N. J.
 Prof. C. M. Mead, D.D.....Andover, Mass.
 Prof. Selah Merrill, D.D.....Andover, Mass.
 Rev. J. Mombert, D.D.....Passaic, N. J.
 Prof. A. Oliver, D.D.....Epis. Theol. Seminary, 20th St., New York.
 Prof. George Prentice, D.D....Middletown, Conn.
 Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D.....Hartford, Conn.
 Prof. P. Schaff, D.D.....42 Bible House, New York.
 Prof. Charles Short, LL.D....24 West 60th Street, New York.
 Prof. P. H. Steenstra.....Cambridge, Mass.
 Prof. James Strong, D.D.....Madison, N. J.
 Prof. J. H. Thayer, D.D.....Andover, Mass.
 Rev. W. H. Ward, D.D.....Office of *Independent*, New York.
 Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D....103 East 21st Street, New York.

The proposed Constitution and By-Laws were read, article by article, amended, and adopted, as follows :

CONSTITUTION.

I.

This association shall be called The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

II.

It shall consist of such persons interested in its objects as may be elected by the Society at any regular meeting on the recommendation of its Council.

III.

Its officers shall be a President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, and a Council of nine, of which the above-named officers shall be *ex officio* members. They shall be elected annually, and shall hold office until their successors are appointed.

IV.

Meetings of the Society shall be held as often at least as semi-annually, at such times and places as the Council shall determine.

At these meetings the time shall be chiefly devoted to the reading and discussion of original papers on Biblical subjects.

BY-LAWS.

1. The Secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings of the Society, and shall give notice of the meetings to each member by mail, not less than two weeks before the time of meeting. He shall mention in the notice of such meeting the titles of any papers he may know are to be presented, with the names of the writers.

2. The Treasurer shall have charge of the funds of the Society, and shall make full report thereof at the meeting for the election of officers. His investments, deposits, and payments shall be under the superintendence of the Council.

3. Each corporate member shall pay into the treasury of the Society, on his admission, the sum of five dollars, and there shall be an annual assessment of three dollars, payable at the meeting for the election of officers; but a donation at any one time of fifty dollars shall exempt from obligation to make either of these payments.

4. The Council, in nominating new members, shall be expected, on presenting their names, to indicate some published essay or treatise on subjects within the range of the object of the Society, on the ground of which their nomination is made.

5. Twelve members shall form a quorum for the transaction of business.

After the adoption of the Constitution and By-Laws it was

Voted, that a committee of three be appointed, to which the Secretary be added, to nominate officers.

The following committee was appointed by nomination: Drs. Short, Strong, and Mead.

The committee reported the following names of officers, who were thereupon elected:

Rev. D. R. Goodwin, D.D., President.

Rev. James Strong, D.D., Vice-President.

Rev. F. Gardiner, D.D., Secretary.

Rev. C. A. Briggs, D.D., Treasurer.

Prof. E. Abbott, LL.D.,

Prof. George E. Day, D.D.,

Prof. Timothy Dwight, D.D.,

Prof. Charles Short, LL.D.,

} Additional members of the Council.

The Society, being now duly organized, proceeded to the reading and discussion of papers.

The first paper was by Prof. P. Schaff, D.D., on the glossolalia of the New Testament, of which the following is an abstract :

THE PENTECOSTAL AND THE CORINTHIAN GLOSSOLALIA.

The GLOSSOLALIA, or Gift of Tongues, appears first in active exercise on the birthday of the Christian Church, as recorded in the second chapter of the Acts. A new religion was inaugurated by a new tongue as of fire. The same gift is mentioned in two other passages of the Acts, namely : Ch. x. 46, and xix. 6, in the concluding section of Mark (of disputed genuineness), and is fully described by Paul in the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. There can be no doubt as to the existence of that gift in the apostolic age, and if we had only either account of Pentecost, or only the account of Paul, we would not hesitate to decide as to its nature ; but the difficulty is in harmonizing the two.

(1) The terms employed for the strange tongues are "new tongues" (*καινὰ γλῶσσαι*, Mark xvi. 17, where Christ promises the gift), "other tongues," differing from the vernacular (*ἑτέραι γλ.* Acts ii. 4, and nowhere else), "kinds" or "diversities of tongues" (*γένη γλῶσσῶν*, I Cor. xii. 28), or simply "tongues" (*γλῶσσαι*, I Cor. xiv. 22), and in the singular "tongue" (*γλῶσσα*, verses 2, 13, 19, 27, in which passages the E. V. inserts the interpolation "*unknown tongue*"). To speak in tongues is called *γλῶσσαις* or *γλῶσση λαλεῖν* (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6 ; I Cor. xiv. 2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27). Paul uses also the phrase to "pray with the tongue" (*προσεύχεσθαι γλῶσση*), as equivalent to "praying and singing with the spirit" (*προσεύχεσθαι* and *ψάλλειν τῷ πνεύματι*, and as distinct from *προσεύχεσθαι* and *ψάλλειν τῷ νοῷ*, I Cor. xiv. 14, 15). The plural and the term "diversities" of tongues, as well as the distinction between tongues of "angels" and tongues of "men" (I Cor. xiii. 1), points to different manifestations (speaking, praying, singing), according to the individuality, education, and mood of the speaker ; but not to various foreign languages, which are excluded by Paul's description.

The term tongue has been differently explained :

(a) Wieseler (and Van Hengel) : the organ of speech, used as a passive instrument ; speaking with the tongue *alone*, inarticulately, and in a low whisper.

(b) Bleek : rare, provincial, archaic, poetic words, or glosses (whence our "glossary"). But this technical meaning of *γλῶσσαι* occurs only in classical writers (as Aristotle, Plutarch, etc.), and among grammarians, not in Hellenistic Greek, and the interpretation does not suit the singular *γλῶσσα γλῶσση λαλεῖν*, as *γλῶσσα* could only mean a single gloss.

(c) Most commentators : language or dialect (*διάλεκτος*, comp. Acts i. 19 ; ii. 6, 8 ; xxi. 40 ; xxvi. 14). This is the correct view. It does not necessarily mean one of the known languages of the earth, but may mean a peculiar handling of the vernacular dialect of the speaker, or a new spiritual language never known before, a language of immediate inspiration in a state of ecstasy. The "tongues" were individual varieties of this language.

(2) The glossolalia in the *Corinthian* church, with which that at Caesarea in Acts x. 46, and at Ephesus xix. 6, is evidently identical, we know very well from the description of Paul. It occurred in the first glow of enthusiasm after conversion, and continued for some time. It was not a speaking in *foreign* languages, which would have been entirely useless in a devotional meeting of converts, but a speaking in a language differing from all known languages. It had nothing to do with the *spread* of the Gospel, although it may, with other devotional acts, have become a means of conversion to susceptible unbelievers, if such were present. It was an act of *self-devotion*, an act of thanksgiving, praying and singing, within the Christian congregation, by individuals who were wholly absorbed in communion with God, and gave utterance to their rapturous feelings in broken, abrupt, rhapsodic, unintelligible words. It was emotional rather than intellectual, the language of the excited imagination, not of cool reflection. It was the language of the spirit (*πνεῦμα*), or of ecstasy, as distinct from the language of the understanding (*νοῦς*). We might almost illustrate the difference by a comparison of the style of the Apocalypse, which was conceived *ἐν πνεύματι* (Apoc. i. 10), with that of the Gospel of John, which was written *ἐν νοί*. The speaker in tongues was in a state of spiritual intoxication, if we may use this term, analogous to the poetic "frenzy" described by Shakespeare and Goethe. His tongue was a lyre on which the Divine Spirit played celestial tunes. He was unconscious, or only half-conscious, and scarcely knew whether he was "in the body or out of the body."

No one could understand this unpremeditated religious rhapsody unless he was in a similar trance. To an unbelieving outsider it sounded like a barbarous tongue, like the uncertain sound of a trumpet, like the raving of a maniac (1 Cor. 14 : 23), or the incoherent talk of a drunken man (Acts 2 : 13, 15). "He that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh *not to men*, but *to God*; for no one understandeth; and in the spirit he speaketh mysteries; but he that prophesieth speaketh *unto men* edification, and encouragement, and comfort. He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth *himself*; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church" (1 Cor. 14 : 2-4; comp. 26-33).

The Corinthians evidently overrated the glossolalia, as a showy display of divine power; but it was more ornamental than useful, and vanished away with the bridal season of the church. It is a mark of the great wisdom of Paul that he who was himself a master in the glossolalia (1 Cor. 14 : 18), assigned to it a subordinate and transient position, restrained its exercise, demanded an interpretation of it, and gave the preference to the gifts of permanent usefulness in which God displays his goodness and love for the general good. Speaking with tongues is good, but prophesying and teaching in intelligible speech for the edification of the congregation is better, and love to God and men in active exercise is best of all.

(3) The *Pentecostal* glossolalia cannot have been *essentially* different from the Corinthian: it was likewise an ecstatic act of worship, of thanksgiving and praise for the great deeds of God in Christ, a dialogue of the soul with God. It was the purest and the highest utterance of the jubilant enthusiasm of the new-born church of Christ in the possession of the Holy Spirit. It

began before the spectators arrived (comp. vers. 4 and 6), and was followed by a missionary discourse of Peter in plain, ordinary language. Luke mentions the same gift twice again (chs. 10 and 19) evidently as an act of devotion, and not of teaching.

Nevertheless, according to the evident meaning of Luke's narrative, the Pentecostal glossolalia differed from the Corinthian not only by its intensity, but also by coming home to the hearers then present in their *own vernacular dialects*, without the medium of a human interpreter. Hence the term "different" tongues, which Paul does not use, nor Luke in any other passage; hence the astonishment of the foreigners at hearing each his own peculiar idiom from the lips of those unlettered Galilæans. It is this *heteroglossolalia*, as I may term it, which causes the chief difficulty. I will give the various views which either deny, or shift, or intensify, or try to explain this foreign element.

(a) The rationalistic interpretation cuts the Gordian knot by denying the miracle, as a mistake of the narrator or of the early Christian tradition. Even Meyer surrenders the heteroglossolalia, as far as it differs from the Corinthian glossolalia, as an unhistorical tradition which originated in a mistake, because he considers the sudden communication of the facility of speaking foreign languages as "logically impossible, and psychologically and morally inconceivable" (Com. on Acts 2:4, 4th ed.) But Luke, the companion of Paul, must have been familiar with the glossolalia in the apostolic churches, and in the two other passages where he mentions it he evidently means the same phenomenon as that described by Paul.

(b) The heteroglossolalia was a mistake of the hearers (a *Hörwunder*), who in the state of extraordinary excitement and profound sympathy *imagined* that they heard their own language from the disciples; while Luke simply narrates their impression without correcting it. This view is found in Gregory of Nyssa (who mentions it without adopting it), Pseudo-Cyprian, the venerable Bede, Erasmus, Schneckenburger and others. If the Pentecostal language was the Hellenistic dialect, it could, with its composite character, its Hebraisms and Latinisms, the more easily produce such an effect when spoken by persons stirred in the inmost depths of their hearts and lifted out of themselves. St. Xavier is said to have made himself understood by the Hindoos without knowing their language, and St. Bernard, St. Anthony of Padua, St. Vincent Ferrer were able, by the spiritual power of their eloquence, to kindle the enthusiasm and sway the passions of multitudes who were ignorant of their language. Olshausen and Bäumlein call to aid the phenomena of magnetism and somnambulism, by which people are brought into mysterious *rapport*.

(c) The glossolalia was speaking in archaic, poetic glosses, with an admixture of foreign words. This view, learnedly defended by Bleek (1829), and adopted with modifications by Baur (1838), has already been mentioned above as inconsistent with Hellenistic usage, and the natural meaning of Luke.

(d) The mystical explanation regards the Pentecostal Gift of Tongues in some way as a counterpart of the Confusion of Tongues, either as a temporary restoration of the original language of Paradise, or as a prophetic anti-

pation of the language of heaven in which all languages are united. This theory, which is more deep than clear, turns the heteroglossolalia into a homoglossolalia, and puts the miracle into the language itself and its temporary restoration or anticipation.

(e) The Pentecostal glossolalia was a *permanent* endowment of the apostles with a miraculous knowledge of all those *foreign* languages in which they were to preach the gospel. As they were sent to preach to all nations, they were gifted with the tongues of all nations. This theory was first clearly brought out by the fathers in the fourth and fifth centuries, long after the gift of tongues had disappeared, and was held by most of the older divines, though with different modifications, but is now abandoned by nearly all Protestant commentators except Bishop Wordsworth, who defends it with patristic quotations. Chrysostom supposed that each disciple was assigned the particular language which he needed for his evangelistic work (*Hom. on Acts 2*). Augustine went much further, saying (*De Civ. dei*, XVIII. c. 49): "Every one of them spoke in the tongues of *all* nations; thus signifying that the unity of the catholic church would embrace all nations, and would in like manner speak in all tongues." Some confined the number of languages to the number of foreign nations and countries mentioned by Luke (Chrysostom), others extended it to 70 or 72 (Augustine and Epiphanius), or 75, after the number of the sons of Noah (Gen. ch. 10), or even to 120 (Pacianus), after the number of the disciples present. Baronius mentions these opinions in *Annal. ad. ann.* 34, vol. I. 197. The feast of languages in the Roman Propaganda perpetuates this theory, but turns the moral miracle of spiritual enthusiasm into a mechanical miracle of acquired learning in unknown tongues. Were all the speakers to speak at once, as on the day of Pentecost, it would be a more than Babylonian confusion of tongues.

Such a stupendous miracle as is here supposed might be justified by the far-reaching importance of that creative epoch, but it is without a parallel and surrounded by insuperable difficulties. The theory ignores the fact that the glossolalia began before the spectators arrived, that is, before there was any necessity of using foreign languages. It isolates the Pentecostal glossolalia and brings Luke into conflict with Paul and with himself; for in all other cases the gift of tongues appears, as already remarked, not as a missionary agency, but as an exercise of devotion. It implies that all the one hundred disciples present, including the women—for a tongue as of fire "sat upon each of them"—were called to be traveling evangelists. A miracle of that kind was superfluous (a *Luxuswunder*); for since the conquest of Alexander the Great the Greek language was so generally understood throughout the Roman empire that the apostles scarcely needed any other—unless it was Latin and their native Aramæan—for evangelistic purposes; and the Greek was used in fact by all the writers of the New Testament, even by James of Jerusalem, and in a way which shows that they had learnt it like other people, by early training and practice. Moreover, there is no trace of such a miraculous knowledge, nor any such use of it after Pentecost. On the contrary, we must infer that Paul did not understand the Lycaonian dialect (Acts 14: 11-14), and we learn from early ecclesiastical tradition that Peter used

Mark as an interpreter (*ἑρμηνεύς* or *ἑρμηνευτής*, *interpretes*, according to Papias, Irenæus, and Tertullian). God does not supersede by miracle the learning of foreign languages and other kinds of knowledge which can be attained by the ordinary use of our mental faculties and opportunities.

(f) It was a *temporary* speaking in foreign languages confined to the day of Pentecost and passing away with the flame-like tongues. The exception was justified by the object, namely, to attest the divine mission of the apostles and to foreshadow the universalness of the gospel. This view is taken by most modern commentators who accept the account of Luke, as Olshausen (who combines with it the theory b), Baumgarten, Thiersch, Rossteuscher, Lechler, Hackett, Gloag, Plumptre (in his *Com. on Acts*), and myself (in *H. Ap. Ch.*), and accords best with the plain sense of the narrative. But it likewise makes an essential distinction between the Pentecostal and the Corinthian glossolalia, which is extremely improbable. A temporary endowment with the knowledge of foreign languages unknown before is as great, if not a greater miracle than a permanent endowment, and was just as superfluous at that time in Jerusalem as afterwards at Corinth; for the missionary sermon of Peter, which was in one language only, was intelligible to all.

(g) The Pentecostal glossolalia was essentially the same as the Corinthian glossolalia, namely, an act of worship, and not of teaching; with only a slight difference in the medium of interpretation: it was at once internally interpreted and applied by the Holy Spirit himself to those hearers who believed and were converted, to each in his own vernacular dialect; while in Corinth the interpretation was made either by the speakers in tongues, or by one endowed with the charisma of interpretation.

As I can find no authority for this interpretation (not even in Neander) I suggest it with some diffidence, but not without good reasons. Its advantages over all other explanations are: 1. It avoids the insuperable difficulties which seem to surround the assumption of a miraculous outfit with the gift of speaking foreign languages either permanently or transiently. 2. It harmonizes not only Luke with Paul, but also Luke with Luke; for in Acts 10 and 19 the glossolalia has obviously no connection with foreign languages. 3. The Holy Spirit was certainly at work among the hearers as well as the speakers, and brought about the conversion of three thousand on that memorable day. If he applied and made effective the sermons of Peter, why not also the preceding doxologies and benedictions. 4. Peter makes no allusion to foreign languages, nor does the prophecy of Joel which he quotes. 5. This view best explains the opposite effect upon the spectators. They did by no means all understand the miracle, but the mockers, like those at Corinth, thought the disciples were out of their right mind and talked, not intelligible words in their native dialects, but unintelligible nonsense.

The speaking in a foreign language could not have been a proof of drunkenness. It may be objected to this view that it implies a mistake on the part of the hearers who traced the use of their mother-tongues directly to the speakers; but it must be remembered that it was the same Spirit who inspired the tongues of the speakers and the hearts of the susceptible hearers and raised both above the ordinary level of consciousness.

Whichever view we take of this peculiar feature of the Pentecostal glossolalia, in this diversified application to the cosmopolitan multitude of spectators, it was a symbolical anticipation and prophetic announcement of the universalness of the Christian religion, which was to be proclaimed in all the languages of the earth and to unite all nations in one kingdom of Christ.

The humility and love of the church united what the pride of Babel had scattered, and in this sense the Pentecostal gift of tongues was the counterpart of the confusion of tongues.

The subject was then discussed until 6:20 P.M., when the Society took a recess until 8. On re-assembling at 8 a paper was read by the Rev. E. A. Washburn, D.D., on the *κόλασιν αἰώνιον . . . ζωὴν αἰώνιον* of Matt. xxv. 46.*

The subject was discussed until 10½ P.M.

Voted, that the Secretary be requested to print for the use of the members the proceedings of this meeting, with the Constitution and By-Laws adopted, and an abstract of the papers read.

Adjourned to 9 A.M. on Saturday.

The Society re-assembled at 9 A.M. on Saturday. A paper was read prepared by the late Rev. Robert Hutcheson, of Washington, Iowa, on the syntax of *זָרַע* with especial reference to its bearing on Gal. iii. 16.

The etymology and the collective use of this term and its Greek equivalent *σπέρμα* are sufficiently familiar, but its syntax has been little studied. It is used very early in an individual sense (Gen. iv. 25). Essentially the same argument as in Gal. iii. 16 is used by St. Peter in Acts iii. 24-26, quoting Gen. xxii. 17, 18. To the latter passage reference is also made in Ps. lxxii. 17. There must be some principle, well known at the time, which enabled these several Hebrews, in certain cases, to take *זָרַע* in an individual rather than a collective sense.

Of this usage other instances will be given further on.

The construction of the word with nouns, adjectives, and verbs, shows nothing to our purpose; the peculiarity is in the construction with the pronoun. The Hebrew idiom requires that *a plural pronoun should be used to represent it in its collective sense, and a singular pronoun for it in its individual sense*. This rule is absolute and uniform, and may be illustrated by the English word *sheep* and its pronouns in Isa. liii. 6, 7.

It is unnecessary to give instances of its plural use. A single crucial example may suffice. In Jer. xxx. 10, Jacob, Israel, servant, and seed are used

* NOTE.—Owing to the continued ill health of the author the appearance of this paper will be postponed till the next issue.

identically, and the same things are predicated of them all, and all the pronouns relating to them (more than thirty in the entire connection) are in the singular, except the one representing זָרַע as distinguished from all its adjuncts, and this is plural. Jer. xlvi. 27 follows the same construction. Other instances of the plural pronoun with the collective זָרַע are Gen. xv. 13; xvii. 7-9; Ex. xxx. 21; Lev. xxi. 17; 2 Ki. xvii. 20; 2 Chr. xx. 7, 9; Neh. ix. 2; Ps. cvi. 27; Isa. lxi. 9; Jer. xxiii. 8; xxxiii. 26; Ezek. xx. 5-12. They embrace forty-eight pronouns in the plural. In four cases (Deut. i. 8; iv. 37; x. 15; Isa. xli. 8) the word is used collectively, and the pronoun is in the singular; but they form no exception to the rule, since in these cases "thee" does not refer to "seed" as its proper antecedent, but to the people then living who are the subject of the address. There are no other cases in which the word as a collective occurs with the pronoun.

Examples of the word with the singular pronoun are less numerous, but equally decisive, embracing twenty-three pronouns. In 1 Sam. i. 11, the word is clearly used in an individual sense, and all the pronouns relating to it are in the singular. So also in 2 Sam. vii. 12-15. In both cases the LXX translate by σπέρμα and all the ancient versions use the singular pronoun throughout. The application of the latter passage typically to Christ does not interfere with the grammar. 1 Chr. xvii. 11-14 is another, somewhat varied, record of the same transaction and observes the same syntax.

Gen. iii. 15: זָרַע again has the singular pronoun, the LXX has σπέρμα and all the ancient versions (except the later Targums) interpret individually. It was so understood evidently by Eve (Gen. iv. 1), and its individual interpretation is assured by later revelation.

Ezek. xvii. 13 is not strictly to be cited as an instance, since the expression there is "of the seed of the kingdom" instead of simply "seed." Nevertheless the reference is to the individual Zedekiah, and the pronouns in the Hebrew, as in the ancient versions, are in the singular. ¶

Only one exception can be alleged to this rule, Isa. xlvi. 19. But here the text may fairly be considered doubtful. The LXX changes the pronoun *his* to *thy*, introducing a different antecedent and making the passage more homogeneous. Similarly the Targ. Jonathan. This would entirely remove the exception. Even as the text stands, however, the pronoun may well go back to vs. 15 for its antecedent and thus form no exception to the rule.

Of the two remaining passages, one is immediately involved in the apostolic argument, and the second is dependent on the first. Gen. xxii. 17 contains first a promise to all the posterity of Abraham, and then, by the construction, a selection of one in whom "all the nations of the earth shall be blessed." The reference of זָרַע here to an individual accords with the promise

of Gen. iii. 15, which Abraham must have understood as now renewed to his own descendant. The LXX omits the pronoun, and all the ancient versions understood the word collectively; but in the application of the promise in Ps. lxxii. 17 (when זָרַע does not occur) they all understand it individually,

and it is so interpreted by St. Peter in Acts iii. 25, 26. The remaining passage, Gen. xxiv. 60, depends upon this. Rebecca is blessed by her Aramite friends, and the pronoun referring to her seed is singular (not plural as in the A. V.) The ancient versions, as well as the modern, except Luther, have missed the Messianic sense of the passage; but in the original the singular pronoun in the mouths of these relatives of Abraham seems a reminiscence of the promise to him, and a prayer that it may be fulfilled through the wife of his son.

St. Paul, therefore, in quoting (Gal. iii. 16) the promise to Abraham, with its singular pronoun, was justified by the syntax in giving it an individual application; the grammatical sense, even independently of any theological tradition, afforded a sound basis for his argument.

After some discussion the next paper was read by Prof. W. Beecher, D.D., on the use of the Hebrew tenses in Ps. cix. 6-19, of which the following is a brief abstract:

USE OF THE HEBREW TENSES IN PS. CIX. 6-19.

This passage includes all of the Psalm that can fairly be called imprecatory. In verse 20 there is no reason for supplying the copula in the imperative, and after this verse the verbs, imprecatively translated, are simply indeterminate.

Our passage is divided, by the style of its verbs, into three sections. The first section, verses 6-11, contains nine verbs in the imperfect and two in the perfect, with seven conversive following an imperative. The nine are all indeterminate except *ti'k'yeh*, in verse 7, which is distinctly declarative. In the second section, verses 12-15, the verbs are jussives. In the third section, verses 16-19, the verbs of the first three verses are either perfects or imperfects, with vav conversive, while verse 19 begins with a jussive.

The presumption is that this grouping of the verbs was designed, and not accidental. It is therefore against a jussive translation of the verbs which, in the Hebrew, have been thus carefully made declarative or indeterminate; and particularly against the breaking up of the first and third of these sections into pairs of disconnected imprecations. It is easy to translate in accordance with this presumption, if we consider the first section as a conditional sentence, having for its protasis either the whole or the first half of verse 6. This use of the imperative is not at all infrequent, either in Hebrew or in English.

“ If thou put a wicked man in office over any one,
And thus a Satan (instead of a protector) stand upon his right hand;—
When that one is put upon trial he will come out wicked,
And his prayer (not his alleged offences, merely) will become sin;
 Few will his days be,
 His office another will take;
Orphans his sons will be,
And his wife a widow;

And his sons will wander, wander, and be beggars,
 And will seek, from their desolate homes ;
 A creditor will set a trap for all which belongs to him,
 And strangers will plunder his earnings."

Then follow the imprecations in verses 12-15, and then :

" Because he was not mindful to do mercy,
 And pursued a man poor and needy,
 And humiliated of heart, to put to death ;
 And loved cursing, and it entered him,
 And delighted not in blessing, and it was far from him ;
 And put on cursing as his garment,
 And it entered as the water within him,
 And as the oil into his bones ;—
 Let it be to him as clothing which he will wear,
 And for a belt which he will continually gird."

The first section describes the evils brought upon any one by a bad ruler. The second imprecates similar evils upon such a ruler himself. The third calls attention to the law of self-retribution in the case, attributing the divine judgment imprecated upon him to his own malignant, persistent choice. The presumption with which we started becomes pretty decided proof, when we thus find the logical divisions of the meaning coinciding with the transitions in the style of the verbs.

This view makes the imprecations of the Psalm more terrible, by diminishing their number ; but it entirely clears the Psalm from the charge that its author loves to repeat over and over his harsh prayers against his enemy, and gloats over the evil which he imprecates.

This paper was also discussed by most of the members present. The next paper was by Prof. F. Gardiner, D.D., on *χρηματίσαι* in Acts xi. 26.

ON THE *χρηματίσαι* *χριστιανός* OF ACTS XI. 26.

This name, equivalent to "followers of the Messiah," could not have been given by the Jews, the form of expression implies that it was not assumed by the disciples themselves (Suidas being erroneously quoted for this view), and hence it has been often wrongly supposed to have been given by their enemies.

The adoption of the name marks an important epoch in the growth of the church, when it began to be more distinctly separated from Judaism, and embraced large numbers of Gentile converts. It involves a recognition by the world of Christ as the source and centre of the new religion.

If we look at the grammatical form alone, *χρηματίσαι* may be considered as under the same regimen with the preceding *διδάξαι*, so that they have the same subject. This construction is favored by the particle *τε*, and would

lead to the translation that the apostles "taught much people and called the disciples Christians first at Antioch." The objection to this view is that *χρηματίζω* seems to belong to the class of verbs which assume in the active voice a neuter sense. It is used often enough with the accusative of *λόγος* (or its relative), but this rather completes the sense of the verb itself. Josephus (Ant. x. 1, 3; xi. 8, 4) uses it with a personal object in the dative, and once (ib. v. 1, 14) with an infinitive. Basil (Hom. in Ps. vii. 1) uses it transitively in a passage quite parallel in construction to Acts xi. 26, and as synonymous with *ὀνομάζω*. This construction, however, may be left as doubtful.

The point of interest is in the connection in which the word is always used in Hellenistic Greek. The later common sense in classical Greek is to take and bear a name or title, and this text is generally explained accordingly. But in the Scriptures and Josephus it never occurs except in connection with some divine communication. It is used ten times in the LXX. (1 Ki. xviii. 27; Job xl. 3 (Eng. 8) Jer. xxxii. 16 (Eng. xxv. 30) *bis*; xxxiii. (Eng. xxvi.) 2 *bis*; xxxvi. (Eng. xxix.) 23; xxxvii. (Eng. xxx.) 2; xliii. (Eng. xxxvi.) 2, 4, when the Vatican text substitutes *ἐλάλησα* and *ἐλάλασε*, but the Alexandrine still shows the usage of the word. In all these places the fact of a divine communication is made plain, either by the nominative or by the context; but the point is that, occurring so often, it never occurs in any other sense. In the New Testament it is used nine times, six of them being in the passive, and in these six our translators have supplied "of God," except in Lk. ii. 26, where the text itself has *ὑπὸ τ. πνεύματος τ. ἁγ.* The passages are Matt. ii. 12, 22; Lk. ii. 26; Acts x. 22; xi. 26; Rom. vii. 3; Heb. viii. 5; xi. 7; xii. 25—all referring to divine communications. The only passage which may be thought doubtful is Rom. vii. 3, where it is said of the woman who marries another while her husband is yet living, *μοιχαλῆς χρηματίσει* shall bear the name adulteress. But *in quo foro?* The word may seem here to revert to its later classical usage of "bearing a name." But the Apostle is declaring the divine law in the matter, and as no such consequence was attached to the act in those days by either human law or human opinion, and it would seem that the writer must have had in mind the association of the word to which he was accustomed in the LXX., and have meant, "she shall bear with God the name adulteress." In Heb. xii. 25 *χρηματίζοντα* is used of Moses speaking by divine command, but the word here has to do duty also for the next clause of a direct divine communication.

The noun *χρηματισμός*, occurs in 2 Macc. ii. 4; xi. 17; Rom. xi. 4. In all of them it means a divine communication, although otherwise translated in 2 Macc. xi. 17. No other derivative words are used in the Scriptures.

In the simplicity of the early days of the faith it was customary to refer all things directly to the divine guidance, and when this fact is taken in connection with the universal association of the word in Scripture, it seems clear that the writer, in Acts xi. 26, meant to say that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch by a divine direction. This inference would be made certain if the construction can be admitted by which *χρηματίσαι* is put in the same regimen with *διδάξαι*; but it has its own probability independently of that construction.

After a short discussion, the last paper was read by the Rev. F. Brown, on Cyrus the Great, in the Bible and in the cuneiform inscriptions. The following is an abstract of this paper :

The Scriptural passages referring to Cyrus may be grouped as follows : (1), The edicts of Ezra, i. and vi. ; (2), The prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah ; (3), The allusions in Daniel. Of cuneiform inscriptions concerned with Cyrus there were, until the summer of 1879, only two, and these brief and comparatively unimportant. But within a year, two long inscriptions, a clay cylinder and a tablet, have come into the possession of the British Museum, and been translated respectively by Sir H. Rawlinson and Mr. T. G. Pinches. These give us material for comparison, and being contemporary documents, carry great weight. Several points may be noted : (1), The edict, Ezra vi. 3-5 (probably more accurately reproduced than that in Ezra i.), is confirmed by the cylinder, which shows the care of Cyrus in restoring and maintaining the worship of the conquered Babylonians and others. When the edict, Ezra i. 2-4, represents him as using the name of Jehovah, as Supreme God, such usage is shown to be not impossible, even for a Persian, because on the cylinder he speaks of Merodach in the same way, while this fact proves that no more religious significance can be attached to the employment of the name in one case than in the other. (2), The prophecies show how the Jews looked toward Cyrus as a deliverer. The same hope appears on the cylinder as that of priests or worshippers of the Babylonian religion, whose particular gods had been neglected by the Babylonish king Nabonidus. While, further, it does not appear that Cyrus really gave his hearty assent to the claims of Jehovah, yet the prophecies of Babylon's fall were realized, and though the idol-worship was not abolished (as the inscriptions prove), yet the gods of Babylon were shown up in their impotence to protect the oppressors of Israel. (3), On the tablet, there is mention of Nabonidus' son, as holding high military office ; confirming what other documents had already reported of Bel-sar-usur (the Belshazzar of Daniel), though his name is not given in the new inscription. On the other hand, no room is given on the tablet for "Darius the Mede," although the details of Babylon's capture, and the first acts of Cyrus as conqueror, are found at some length.

The discussion of this paper was somewhat limited by time.

The Council reported that the next meeting would be on Thursday, December 30th. at 10 A.M., in the same place.

The minutes of the meeting were read and accepted.

At 1:30 P.M. the Society adjourned.

FREDERIC GARDINER, *Secretary.*

NOTE.—The following papers were not reached for want of time, and by vote are first in order for the next meeting :

On γεννηθῆν ἀνωθεν in Jno. iii. 3.

On the construction of Tit. ii. 13.

On discoveries in Palestine.

On the use of the English Article : a study in Revision.

On Rom. ix. 5.

An Exegesis of Gen. ii. 5, with reference to ch. i.

On the connection between Phil. ii. 12, 13.