

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1844.

No. I.

Review

ART. I.—*An Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship, of the Primitive Church, that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ; faithfully collected out of the Fathers and extant writings of those ages.* By Peter King, Lord High Chancellor of England. With an introduction, by the American Editor. New York. Published by G. Lane and P. P. Sandford, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, 200 Mulberry street.

THE republication of this rare and valuable work, which has given us much satisfaction, is but a natural consequence, of the revival of the conflict, between free ecclesiastical principles and the exclusive claims of prelacy. Though it was hardly to be expected that such a book should owe its republication and introduction to the American churches to the publishing office of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Here is surely a verification of Samson's riddle: "Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness." But the gift is no less acceptable for the seeming incongruity of the hand that conveys it. Indeed, this incongruity of the publication, is itself congruous with the authorship of the book. And we have in it not only a book against episcopacy, published by the Methodist Episcopal church, but also a book against episcopacy, written by a member of the English Episcopal church. We know,

The principle of representation is so obviously incorporated in the plan of government, laid down in the New Testament, that it cannot escape the notice of the attentive reader. The pastors and rulers of the churches are, at once the representatives of Christ, in whose name and by whose authority they act, and of the people, by whom they are elected. When these delegates meet, the members of the church are gathered together in them, for the transaction of business. In this respect our civil government is the same with that polity, established by the apostles. The wisdom of this plan is obvious to every reflecting mind. Instead of five hundred, or a thousand members coming together, and each individual taking a part in the business, a few judicious men, chosen for this special purpose, can much better accomplish this object.

ART. III.—*Commentary upon the Psalms*: By E. W. Hengstenberg, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Berlin. Volume First. Berlin: 1842. pp. 475. 8vo.
James W. Alexander

A work, from such a hand, on such a subject, cannot but be welcome; and we take pleasure in saying that a translation of it is now in progress in this place. Meanwhile, it may be useful to offer some statements in regard to what may be expected. There is no part of scripture on which a work of thorough interpretation is more needed, than the book of Psalms. The books which commonly stand on the shelves of our clergy are insufficient. The great work of Venema is voluminous and rare; that of Bishop Horne, though both ingenious and pious, is uncritical and fanciful; and the neological commentaries of the Germans are not once to be named. As the chief inspired record of religious experience, and the only extended and authoritative directory of our prayers, as well as a fund of prediction concerning the Son of David who was to come, the Psalms must continue to the end of time to be the delightful study of the private Christian. For the same reason they will always furnish a large proportion of topics for pulpit exposition. Preachers need a work which shall be a comprehensive and sufficient interpretation of these sacred hymns; a work which shall concentrate on the text

all the lights of modern learning, and which shall answer the objections of modern infidels. From no man living do we suppose that such a work can be more confidently expected than from Professor Hengstenberg. His qualifications for the task are known and read of all men, being sufficiently evinced by his Christology, and other researches in the same field. He is second to no biblical scholar, for accuracy of acquaintance with the original text and all the necessary helps. He has been trained to the work in all the varied and profound learning of the age. His studies for years have lain precisely in this field, and he has year after year delivered lectures on this very subject, in the first universities of Germany. He is familiar, as a champion, with the persons, the works, and the strategies of all the neological host. He is in the very prime of life, at the very focus of continental civilization and learning; and, best of all, having once been a rationalist, he is now an humble, affectionate disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ.

There is every thing in the character of Hengstenberg's mind, to make him both acceptable and useful to the English and American public. Here and there, in his copious productions, we meet with a pardonable vagary, which savours of his nation, but in every good sense, he may be said to be the least German of the Germans. As he sees nothing dimly, he expresses nothing obscurely. In his teachings there is nothing doubtful, ambiguous or transcendental; there is no lurking in the shade of mere diction, nor any vapouring about wonders half-revealed, and to be confided only to the initiated. The moment you open his volume, you find yourself in commerce with a mighty understanding; with a master who knows his own mind and takes the briefest, directest, strongest way of uttering it, with a decision and fearlessness, which scorn all reserve, delay and equivocation. It is needless to say to any one who is acquainted with the rationalistic controversy of the last fourteen years, that Hengstenberg is a man of singular courage. His intrepidity is, however, serene and collected, and manifests itself without transport and without noise.

No writer of our day more reminds us of Calvin. Like the great reformer, Hengstenberg sees all things at once in their logical connexion, and in their immediate relation to the religion of the heart. But, like Calvin again, he rejects all those aids which a pious fancy is ready to deduce from doubtful sources. Determined to find Christ in the Old

Testament, he dares not, for an instant, sacrifice to this intention the strictest canons of interpretation. He is a cool, a rigid, and, therefore, a safe interpreter. For the same reason, he is admirably fitted to correct the errors of those fastidious minds which revolt against the Cocceian and other similar methods, and to bring back rationalists, by the way in which he was himself brought back, to the acknowledgment of the truth. Many in our own country need just such a monitor, and are less reluctant to follow a foreign guide. They will see with surprise, one of the most learned and independent of transatlantic scholars, exploding those bubbles which here attract the admiring gaze of the novice, and ascertaining with invincible logic those foundations of exegesis which bore the structure of the Reformation.

The course of this exposition necessarily leads the author to discuss some of the most important Old Testament prophecies of Christ. In what manner he may be expected to do this, may be satisfactorily gathered from his treatment of the Messianic Psalms, in the Christology. To those among ourselves who have adopted rationalistic principles of interpretation, who have derived nothing from Germany but the art of disbelief, who acknowledge no type in the Old Testament but that which is cited as such in the New, who are jealous of any finding of Messiah in the prophecies, and who attribute the imprecatory passages of the psalms to the unsanctified ire of the psalmist, the conclusions of Hengstenberg may be both startling and unwelcome. A larger class, we trust, of biblical students, will hail them, as stopping the mouths of adversaries, and erecting a new trophy upon the triumphal way of evangelical opinions.

One great advantage possessed by the readers of these volumes is the satisfaction of knowing that they bring down the literature of the subject to the very latest date, so as to render unnecessary any recourse to the numerous critical commentaries of Germany. The opinions of these scholars are taken up and sifted, and all that is valuable is retained. They are here examined by one who knows them all, and sees through them all. Their authors are confronted by one who is their equal in sacred learning, and more than their equal in diligence, in argument, and in that peculiar trenchant wit which has a sisterhood with argument. In regard to the intentions of the author, we may let him speak for himself.

“The author was possessed with a serious purpose of writing a commentary on the Psalms, a number of years ago, when his eyes were first opened to their depth of meaning. As early as 1830, he was desirous to undertake it, but then, and whenever afterwards the determination was awakened, other labours pressed into the foreground. After completing the former part of the exposition of the most important and difficult portions of the Pentateuch, the inclination to this work revived with such strength, that the author was no longer able to resist it. He feels the greater freedom in deferring the work already commenced, as the former part of it was expressly announced as a special treatise.

“What the author has essayed, and what he has actually accomplished, may be best learned by the reader from the book itself. With all its imperfections, he trusts it will commend itself as one upon which he has long been engaged with zeal and affection.

“The whole will be completed in three volumes. But lest the fulness of exposition in the first volume should mislead any as to the probable extent of the whole, the reader is desired to compare the labours of his predecessors, as for example the first volume of Rosenmüller, which contains only the first twenty Psalms. Of the Psalms, more than of any other work, it may be said, that it demands fulness in the beginning, and brevity in the sequel, from the very nature of the subject.

“The third volume, besides the completion of the Commentary, will contain a series of treatises on the Psalms, which will discuss the topics usually comprised in Introduction, as well as a particular examination of the doctrinal and moral instructions of this part of scripture.

“The author foresees, that the practical character which pervades the whole commentary will give occasion to many objections. Without the hope of fully averting such objections, he observes, that these practical remarks have their origin, not in any intent foreign to that of the work, but in the essential interest of the interpretation. The psalms are products of holy experience, and can be understood by those only in whom the same has a living existence. To labour in this direction, is therefore the proper province of the Expositor. And especially, if any are disposed to complain that the citations from Luther’s commentary, which so remarkably subserve this end, are too numerous, they may take satisfaction in considering, that these will in a great measure end with the present volume, as the larger work of Luther comprises only the first twenty-two psalms. The author believed himself to be justified in being less sparing of this sterling matter, by the consideration that the work, as a whole, is in some degree unattractive.

“However the labour may be received, the author has found in it a rich reward for himself, and hopes to look back upon it with joy from the eternal world. For which reason he must surely wish, that it may be blessed to others also, and especially that, of the multitude who are now fainting in the desert, it may bring back here and there one, to the green pastures and still waters of the divine word.”

The spirit of the sentences last quoted will find a cer-

tain response in the heart of every Christian reader; they indicate the temper of the work. The copious citations of Luther and Calvin are in a great degree introduced with a similar feeling, and these add a new value to the composition.

The most that we can do, in the way of specimen, is to exhibit by extracts, the judgment of the author on a few passages, taken without anxious selection. And we cannot make a better beginning, than with the second psalm. This, as might be expected, the author applies immediately to Christ. The psalmist beholds with amazement numerous nations and their kings set in array against Jehovah and his Anointed, their rightful king: v. 1—3. He then depicts the relation of Jehovah to these attempts: v. 4—6. He first derides, then terrifies them in wrathful discourse, and pronounces their endeavours vain, because they rise against him whom God has made king. He then announces the Anointed, declaring to the revolters, that the Lord has given Him, as his Son, all people and lands as a possession, and also right and power to execute vengeance: v. 7—9. The psalmist finally turns to the kings, and exhorts them to humble subjection to God's Son and Messiah. There are few psalms, according to our author, in which the division into strophes is so discernible. At first view, it falls into strophes of three members. The verses are further of two members each, except that the last completes the full cadence of four members.

“It appears upon sufficient grounds, that by the King, the Anointed, and the Son of God, none other than the Messiah can be understood. It is commonly admitted that this interpretation was the *pre-dominant* one among the ancient Jews, and that only polemical considerations in regard to Christians have induced the modern ones to depart from it. This is confirmed, not only by the distinct exposition of Jarchi, and a considerable number of passages from ancient Jewish writings, in which the Messianic interpretation is extant, as may be found among the citations in Venema's Introduction to the Psalms, but also by the fact, the two names of Messiah which were current at the time of Christ, the very name Messiah, Anointed, and the name Son of God, used by Nathanael in discourse with Christ, John i. 50, and by the high priest, Matt. xxvi. 63, are derived from the Messianic interpretation of this psalm. The former is applied to the coming Saviour only in Dan. ix. 25; the latter not at all. Now although this fact is certainly remarkable, we will not ascribe to it the significancy of a proper proof. Nor will we rest on the fact, that in a number of New Testament passages, this psalm is applied to Christ; that it is thus interpreted by the assembled apostles, Acts iv. 25—26, and by Paul, Acts xiii. 33; and in Heb. i. 5—v. 5, and that the Messianic interpretation is the basis of the distinct allusions

in Rev. ii. 27, xii. 15, xix. 5. As in the New Testament typical Messianic psalms are frequently referred to Christ, and as this psalm actually contains an indirect prediction of Christ, even if the primary application is to an individual living under the Old Testament, thus making the two opposite interpretations less far asunder than might seem at first view, it would be unfair to build upon those declarations. Yet the fact that the New Testament writers follow the direct Messianic interpretation, makes it very probable that this was absolutely prevalent among their contemporaries. The proper proof we found solely upon internal reasons, in regard to which we observe in the outset, that we can have no interest in mistaking their import, as the Messianic kernel of the psalm, and its validity for the matter in hand, remain unimpaired, even if the internal reasons should fix a reference to David or any other individual. That which gave him security of the fruitlessness of revolt among the people subjected to him by God, namely his divine appointment, and the nearness of his relation to God, must have the same import in a still higher degree as applied to Christ in reference to his insurgent subjects. But the internal reasons for a direct Messianic interpretation speak a voice so loud and decisive, that opposition to it must be ascribed to a like interest on the other side, and derived from causes from which we are very remote. There are traits in this psalm which agree with no subject except Messiah. Superhuman majesty is ascribed to the subject of the psalm, in verse 12, where the revolters are admonished to submit themselves to their king, with fear and trembling, because his enemies should be destroyed by his heavy wrath, while on the other hand it should be well with those who trust in him. The futile attempt of those who deny the Messianic view, to apply what is said of the Anointed, to the Lord himself, only shows how impregnable is the position of Venema: *Ira regis eo modo metuenda proponitur, v. 12, qui creaturae minus convenit et fiducia in eo ponenda commendatur ibidem, quae a creatura abhorret.* Against a reference to any other subject than Messiah, stand also verse 12, where the king is called absolutely the Son of God, and verses 6 and 7, where he is called His King, and His Son, in such sense that with this relation lordship over the whole earth is immediately attributed to him. Against a reference to any earthly king, v. 1—3 and v. 8—10 are decisive, in which the people and kings of the whole earth are given to him, and shall seek in vain to cast off his yoke. Here the extent of his kingdom is defined, in terms every where else applied to the extent of Messiah's kingdom, in passages of which the Messianic character is generally admitted; as Zech. ix. 10, Isaiah ii. 2, Micah iv. 1. De Wette here tries to escape by appealing to the alleged 'tendency of the Hebrew poets to hyperbole, and the susceptibility among theocratic enthusiasts of high-flying hopes.' But hyperbole, under all circumstances, has its bounds; and the exaggeration must here be applied not to a picture of the present, but to promises of the future. Hoffman (*die Weiss. u. ihre Erfüllung*, S. 180.) maintains that in v. 8, the words, 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession,' means no more than this: 'As many people as he desires for a possession, as many distant lands as he desires for a dominion, so many will Jehovah subject to him.' Of a truth, David's desires were moderate enough, for he asked no more

than a little domain in the neighbourhood of Canaan. But it is forgotten here, that this divine appointment and authority are set in opposition to the *kings of the earth*, who had risen up against the king, their rightful lord, v. 2: and that, in consideration of this, the *judges of the earth*, are warned, v. 10, to return to their allegiance. And then, where does there appear a sign in history, of king David's having offered, or had it in his power, to become the conqueror of the whole world? He never undertook a war of invasion: his warfare was always defensive. It is moreover against the idea of an earthly king, that this revolt against the Anointed and Son of Jehovah is represented throughout as a revolt against Jehovah himself, and that the nations are warned to submit themselves to him, in humility and reverence. It would be entirely a different case, if the reference were to such enemies as plotted the destruction of God's kingdom; the enemies here represented have no intention but to free themselves from the yoke of the king. Though we would not absolutely assert the impossibility of such a representation, there is a total absence of parallel places, in which such a design as a revolt against God is represented. The significancy of this argument, as given in the Christology, I. 1. p. 102, is acknowledged by Hitzig. He denies, even more positively than we could do, that heathen nations who were subjected to God's people could thereby be treated as subjects of Jehovah, and that every attempt to regain their freedom would be revolt against the Lord. To serve any deity, he says, either means to profess a religion, or at least involves or presupposes this: the Moabites served David, 2 Sam. viii. 2, not Jehovah. Now, as he rejects the Messianic interpretation, which removes every difficulty, he is thereby forced to refer the composition to the time of the Maccabees, in which we first meet with an attempt to embody vanquished gentiles among the people of God, by circumcision; an assumption in which certainly no one will follow him. Finally the Messianic interpretation is sustained by the same proofs which establish a similar application of the 45th, the 72d and the 110th psalms, all which so remarkably accord with this, that, in regard to their Messianic character, they must stand or fall together. These reasons are so stringent, that we find among the defenders of the Messianic interpretation a number of writers whose theological tendencies are by no means in this direction, especially Eichhorn, Bertholdt, whose very decided expositions are given in the Christology, I, 1. p. 104, Rosenmüller, and Koster. Of the same judgment also are Sack, (Apol. 2 Aufl. S. 282 ff.) and Umbreit, (Erbauung a. d. Psalter S. 141. ff.)

The further exposition of this psalm contains particulars which vary from the received orthodox interpretation, especially as regards the seventh verse. Which leads us to observe that in recommending this work, we do not wish to be understood as assenting to every statement. Nor is such exception surprising, nor of such moment as it would be in a systematic view of truth. An expositor may sacredly hold a given doctrine, and at the same time deny the pertinency of many passages familiarly cited as proving it. Thus Hengstenberg denies any primary view to the Mes-

siah in certain psalms of which such reference has been confidently predicated by the older interpreters. Yet all who know his works, know also that it is the darling object of his life, to bring to view this very character of the Old Testament oracles; which is the more remarkable, when we revert to the fact, that in the days of his youthful neology, his first academical performance was a defence of the thesis, that it is vain to look for Christ in the Old Testament. We have never seen, we expect not to see, a commentary on any one book of Scripture, to which we could subscribe in every particular.

It will serve to show how Hengstenberg deals with difficult points, if we produce some of his opinions upon the Hebrew terms in the titles of the Psalms. The full discussion of many questions connected with this subject, he has doubtless reserved for his last volume; but he does not omit the particular titles as they occur. If the private Christian finds himself stumbling at these hard words, it may console him to observe, that the most learned students of the original have had scarcely less trouble than himself. Yet it is only from the sources of Hebrew erudition that any light is to be expected.

The title of the fourth Psalm is, 'To the chief musician on Neginoth.' The former part of it is prefixed to no less than fifty-three Psalms. Some render it, "for singing," others, "for singing throughout," i. e. to the same tune. Hengstenberg considers both as inadmissible, on grammatical grounds. The radix of the word occurs in Chronicles and Ezra in the sense of "overseeing," and only as a technical and Levitical term. In 1 Chron. xv. 2, it is specially applied to musical direction. Nothing comports better with the inscription of a sacred song. The term implies that the psalms to which it is prefixed were designed for public performance in the temple. 'To the chief musician,' affords the sense that it was consigned to him to be sung. The word *Neginoth* is the name of stringed instruments in general. So that the whole title may be thus understood: A Psalm of David, to be committed to the chief musician, that he may direct the performance of the same, with the accompaniment of stringed instruments.

In the fifth psalm, the same title is varied thus: 'Upon Nehiloth.' There have been three interpretations. 1. The Chaldee and other interpreters understand certain instruments, particularly flutes. But there is no trace of etymo-

logical proof. The preposition employed is never prefixed to the names of instruments. Flutes, though occurring in the schools of the prophets, 1 Sam. x. 5, formed no part of the temple music. We read of stringed instruments and trumpets, but never of flutes, in enumeration of instruments: Ps. cl. 2. Others suppose that the words refer to another hymn, the melody of which was to be applied to this. So Aben-Ezra, and Hitzig. But this is a violent assumption, supported by no analogy. 3. The third opinion is that the words refer to the subject of the psalm. This is the view expressed by the Septuagint and the Vulgate. So Luther renders it, 'For the inheritance.' Hengstenberg regards it as favourable to this view, that a critical examination of the most obscure and difficult titles, reveals an enigmatic allusion to the contents of the psalms which follow them respectively. The only other connexion in which this preposition appears in a title, Ps. lxxx. justifies this opinion. *Nehiloth* properly means that which is obtained, or possessed, and here, in the plural, possessions, lots. See Job vii. 3. Now the whole psalm is occupied in representing the two-fold lot of the righteous and the wicked.

The word 'Sheminiith,' in the title of the sixth psalm, has been taken to denote an instrument, and particularly an eight-stringed instrument. But even if we translate 'the eighth,' it can scarcely mean an instrument of eight strings. Hengstenberg understands it to denote some specific intonation, unknown to us from our ignorance of Hebrew music.

In the seventh psalm, we have the word 'Shiggaion.' The translation 'Elegy,' or lamentation, by no means suits the predominant subject, here and in Habakkuk, chap. iii. where it also occurs. The rendering *carmen*, adopted by some, after the Syriac, agrees as little with the latter place. That it is a musical direction, seems improbable, from its being prefixed to this psalm only. The *radix* means 'to wander:;' the word itself 'wandering.' As applied to this psalm, it very naturally indicates the wanderings of the ungodly. This applies as well to the passage in Habakkuk.

'Upon Gittith,' in the title of the eighth psalm, means upon the Gittite harp, a harp of Gath. This may have been either an instrument invented in that city of the Philistines, or a mode of singing derived thence. All the psalms so marked are of a joyful character. 'Muthlabben,'

Ps. ix. has vexed the grammarians. Winer and de Wette, by their mode of punctuation read 'Alamoth,' as in Ps. xlvi. and understand it of a melody. 'Labben,' they render, 'for Ben, or the Benites.' There is a Ben named in 1 Chron. xv. 18, among the singers. This is specious; but all external evidence is for the received division and punctuation. The grammatical difficulties of this interpretation are also great. Others take it to be the title of another psalm, of which the melody was to be used for this; but without the semblance of a parallel. Grotius surmised such a transposition of letters in 'Labben' as would read 'Nabal,' and took it accordingly as referring to the death of Nabal. Hengstenberg admits the probability of such a transposition, but translates the word, which gives the meaning, 'Upon the fool's death;' which is actually the subject of the composition.—'Michtam' in the sixteenth psalm has given occasion to wonderful discussion, and the reader will find here the opinions of Aben-Ezra, Luther, Vorstman, Gesenius, Hitzig, and others. Hengstenberg interprets it 'Secret or mysterious;' as pointing out the profundity of the subject, a *procul profani* to irreverent readers.

We must take leave to close this portion of our remarks by presenting the opinions of our author on that little stumbling-block, which from its frequent occurrence has impeded so many devout readers, we mean the word 'Selah,' which first appears in the third psalm. This word occurs seventy-three times in the Psalms and three times in Habakkuk. It is best deduced, says Hengstenberg, not from the Syriac, but from the Hebrew root 'to rest.' It may be taken either as a noun, 'rest, pause,' or with Gesenius, as an imperative, 'pause.' It is primarily a musical direction. But inasmuch as the musical pause always occurs where the feelings demand some rest, it is not less important for the sense; and those who omit it, as our author justly observes, take an unwarrantable liberty with the inspired word. This interpretation is confirmed by an examination of the passages in which the term occurs. It almost always follows just where a pause is in place. As some have supposed it to mark a change of strophe, it may be observed that this is always a proper site of a pause, but that such was its specific design, is disproved by the fact that it frequently occurs in the midst of strophes. The passage of Habakkuk where it occurs, is constructed in several respects upon the

plan of the psalms. Another confirmation of this view, is the concurrence of Selah in the ninth psalm, with 'Higgaion,' meditation. The unaided feeling of pious readers has often brought them to the same conclusion, and left them with the right impression, even when they did not understand the word. Such was the sentiment no doubt which led to what is perhaps the only introduction of the term into an uninspired work; we mean the dying expressions of Bunyan's pilgrim, in the waters of Jordan. "Selah," says Luther, "sheweth, that one must hold still, and diligently ponder the words of the psalm; for they demand a quiet and still-keeping soul, which may thus conceive and comprehend what the Holy Ghost here sets forth and represents."

Although it may be regarded as a sample-brick from the building, we nevertheless deem it proper to subjoin an extract for the purpose of shewing Hengstenberg's manner of treating the details of a passage. For this, we select the seventh verse of the fourteenth Psalm.

"The Psalmist concludes with an expression of his longing for the salvation promised in the preceding verses, to be accomplished in God's destruction of those who oppressed his church. *O that the salvation of God were come out of Zion, and that the Lord would return to the captivity of his people! Then exult Jacob, and rejoice Israel!* The former clause is literally, *Who will give out of Zion the salvation of Israel?* The phrase 'who will give,' as is well known, is used in Hebrew to mark the optative, being equivalent to 'O that it were!'—'Out of Zion,' because there, as in the sanctuary of his people, the Lord is enthroned. De Wette, very unjustly, would represent the Psalmist as absent from his native land and looking back to it. The expectation of help from Zion is found throughout those psalms which are clearly by David, or at any rate earlier than the captivity: such as Ps. iii. 4. 'He heard me out of his holy hill;' xxviii. 2, xx. 2, cxxviii. 5, cxxxiv. 3. In expressing this expectation, the sacred psalmists remind God, that it is his province to help, because as the Head of the divine kingdom he cannot abandon it to the desolations of the wicked. If the psalm belonged to the time of the captivity, the writer could not expect help out of Zion. For this, since the destruction of the temple, was no longer the central point of the kingdom of God, as appears from Ezek. xi. 22, where the Shekinah, or visible symbol of the divine presence is solemnly lifted up from the temple. And though, after the destruction of the temple, Daniel turns his face in prayer towards Jerusalem, he does this out of regard to what had been there, and what was to be there again. He did not expect help out of Zion, but directed his face thitherward, because he accounted the place holy, where the temple had once stood, and where a temple was yet to stand. The only passage which De Wette makes available, to show that even during the captivity, help was expected from Zion, namely Ps. cxxi.

1, derives all its seeming pertinency from the arbitrary assumption that it belongs to the time of the captivity; a supposition, of which the unreasonableness is sufficiently apparent from the opening words, 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.' The words before us therefore prove, that the psalm was not composed, as recent interpreters allege, during the captivity, and so render that interpretation of the sequel, which is founded on this supposition, inadmissible.

"The 'return to the captivity of his people,' presents more distinctly the mode in which Israel's help should come out of Zion. It comes thence, because the Lord, enthroned on Zion, pities the wretchedness of his people, and returns to them in the demonstrations of his grace. The recent interpretations generally give; 'when the Lord brings back the captives of his people.' From this they derive a proof that the psalm was not written by David, and not before the Babylonish captivity. Others, attributing the psalm to David, are thereby led to consider this verse as a subsequent addition; as did the author himself at a former period; a supposition which is the more hazardous, as the verse recurs in the fifty-third psalm, and as the seven-fold repetition of the divine names, above-mentioned, is thus disturbed. But the whole exposition is clearly wrong; for 1. The verb here used never has the meaning 'to bring back,' transitively, but always 'to return.' 2. It is asserted altogether without proof, that the noun signifies 'captives,' as it rather signifies in all cases where it occurs independent of the present phrase, 'the captivity'—*status captivitatis*. 3. The whole phrase demonstrably means in many passages, gracious commiseration in general. Captivity is a figure of misery, as are often the prison, Ps. cxli. 7, and bonds, Isa. xlii. 7, xlix. 9, etc. So Job xlii. 10, 'God turned him to the captivity of Job,' though Job had not been a captive. In Jer. xxx. 18, 'I will turn me to the captivity of Jacob's tents,' is used for their lamentable situation, because the tents cannot be regarded as captive. Ezek. xvi. 53, 'I will return to their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters,' &c., means, I will have compassion on their misery; inasmuch as Sodom and the other cities of the plain were not carried into captivity, but were totally destroyed. On the other hand, there is not a single place to be found, in which this phrase can be proved to be used of exiles. 4. The origin of all the passages, where this phrase occurs, is to be found in Deut. xxx. 3, 'And the Lord thy God will turn back to thy captivity.' That the verb 'turn' is there used in its usual intransitive sense, with the object to which the return is made in the accusative, is undeniable. In the first six verses alone this verb occurs six times, and in five of these is taken in the sense 'to return to'; why should it in the sixth have the other meaning? If, further, regard be had to the special reasons, in respect to this very passage, against a reference to restoration from exile, such as the longing for help out of Zion, the entire contents of the psalm, which has not the slightest allusion to the captivity, but rather concerns itself with a general relation pervading all times, and finally the inscription, no doubt will remain that the only true interpretation is: 'when the Lord returns to the captivity,' i. e. to the misery. The accusative is here used, as with verbs of motion; compare Ex. iv. 19, 20, Num. x. 36, Is. lxxxv. 5, Isa. lii. 8, Hab. ii.

3. But David had occasion the rather to wish that the Lord should have mercy on the misery of his church, in a psalm designed for the general use of the pious in all ages, from the peculiar greatness of the troubles of which he had himself been a witness in the times of Saul and Absalom.

“The wish here expressed received its highest accomplishment only in Christ, and of this the highest point is yet in the future, when instead of a militant, shall be a triumphal church. Till then, we have abundant cause to make the wish of the pious psalmist our own. Our joy over the inferior fulfilment can never prevent our longing for that last and greatest consummation.”

Our author vindicates the title of the third psalm, against the objections of De Wette and others; shewing in an admirable manner the conformity of its contents with the circumstances of David during the revolt of Absalom. He argues at some length for the reference of the fourth psalm to the same period. He objects, however, to any such special application in regard to the fifth. The seventh he places, after a rigid examination of contrary opinions, in the period of Saul’s persecution. In the eighth psalm he recognises no direct Messianic character. In regard to the eighteenth, he dissents from Venema, who supposes it certain that it was composed at an earlier period than the mournful events which gave occasion to the fifty-first; and, on the authority of the books of Samuel, assigns it to the closing period of David’s life. We have particularized these, as the only portions comprised in this volume, of which it has been attempted to assign the period.

In reading the admirable works of such a writer as Hengstenberg, one who seems to be set for the defence of the gospel amidst a host of unbelievers, we have sometimes been disposed to wish that he had chosen to write in the Latin tongue; that so his labours might be accessible to all educated theologians of other countries. And we have mourned over that decay of Latin learning which has confined the theology of recent times to the countries in which the several works have appeared. But when we consider that of late years no country of the European continent, except Germany, has produced any considerable amount of valuable matter, and that in that country, since the irruption of neology, the chaff has been a hundred fold greater than the wheat, we are ready to reconsider our lamentation. It may be in mercy, that Providence has locked out from English readers a multitude of insidious works, by keeping them in an unknown tongue. It is matter of thankfulness that the worst productions of the German press

have never been translated into English. Now and then a great but pestilent work, like that of De Wette, appears in a version, but, most happily, the demand, in England and America, has been for such as those of Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Neander and Krummacher. Not long ago we met with a proposal to give to American readers, Rosenmüller's Commentary on the Psalms. Most cordially do we hope, that since the appearance of the book we have here noticed, the labours of that singularly cold and incredulous Rationalist will be allowed to sleep. With such a guide as Hengstenberg, the most critical student may be satisfied; assured that he will be led to the results of the most accomplished modern exegesis, and to a sufficient acquaintance with all the recent literature of the subject; so that all resort to the multitudinous and chaotic mass of conflicting expositions may well be spared.

ART. IV.—*Report of Mr. Kennedy, of Maryland, from the Committee of Commerce of the House of Representatives of the United States, on the memorial of the Friends of Colonization assembled in convention in the city of Washington, May, 1842. To which is appended a collection of the most interesting papers on the subject of African Colonization, &c., &c. Feb. 28, 1843. Printed by order of the House of Representatives.*

Isidore Alexander

THE American Colonization Society have, since their first organization, presented several memorials to Congress, soliciting their aid, and co-operation, in carrying into effect the plan which they had adopted for planting a Colony on the Western coast of Africa, composed of such free people of colour in these United States, as might be willing to engage in the enterprise, and should be judged suitable by the agents of the Society. In every instance, a favourable and respectful attention has been given by Congress to these memorials, and the Committees to whom they were referred, have uniformly reported favourably, as to the objects of the Society. But there has been very little efficient action based on these reports. Sometimes the subject has been laid over for want of time to consider it; but principally, it is presumed, from the inherent difficulties of maturing any