

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL 1927

ON THE HEBREW OF DANIEL

In his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*,¹ Dr. Driver gives a list of twenty-five words and usages to show that the Hebrew of Daniel is "of the age subsequent to Nehemiah." As No. 16 in this list he cites the use of the verb *'āmadh* "to stand up" and its derivatives and forms. The statement reads as follows:

עמד to stand up [is used by Daniel], where the earlier languages would use קום, viii. 22, 23, xi. 2-4, 20f., 31, xii. 1a, (probably also xii. 13), as Ezra ii. 63, Eccl. iv. 15 (contrast Ex. i. 8), 1 Chron. xx. 4 (contrast Ps. xxvii. 3): with על against viii. 25, xi. 14, as 1 Chron. xxi. 1, 2 Chron. xx. 23, xxvi. 18 (contrast Dt. xxii. 26): in the sense of to be established xi. 17b (contrast Is. vii. 7). Cf. Sir. xlvi. 1, 12.

No. 14 refers to the use of *'ōmedh*, "place" or "standing." It reads thus:

(עמדי) על עמדי lit. on my (thy) standing viii. 18 (cf. vs. 17) x. 11, Neh. viii. 7, ix. 3, xiii. 11, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxiv. 31, xxxv. 10.

No. 21 deals with the use of this verb in the Hiphil stem:

יעמיד xi. 11, 13, 14, not literally to station, as in the earlier books, but in the weakened sense, appoint, establish: see p. 535, No. 4.

Turning to the treatment of Chronicles, referred to at the end of No. 21, we find this additional statement:

יעמיד metaph. to establish, appoint (a weakened sense: in earlier books lit. to station): 1 [Chron.] vi. 16 [A.V. 31], xv. 16, 17, xvi. 17 (= Ps. cv. 10), xvii. 14, xxii. 2, 2 [Chron.] viii. 14, ix. 8, xi. 15, 22, xix. 5, 8, xx. 21, xxiv. 13 (cf. Ezr. ii. 68), xxv. 5, 14, xxx. 5, xxxi. 2, xxxiii. 8, [2 Ki. נתתי], xxxv. 2, Ezr. iii. 8, Neh. iv. 3, vi. 7, vii. 3, x. 33, xii. 31, xiii. 11, 30, Dan. xi. 11, 13, 14. Cf. Ps. cvii. 25 (Also 2 [Chron.] xxxiv. 32 used specially. In 2 [Chron.] xxiii. 10, 19, xxix. 25, xxxiii. 19, Ezr. iii. 10, Neh. iv. 7, xiii. 19 the lit. sense is more prominent: in Neh. iii. iff., vi. 1, vii. 1,

¹ Pp. 506f. This volume will be referred to by the familiar abbreviation LOT.

THE BLESSING OF ABRAHAM

The exceptions to the general rules which figure more or less prominently in every adequate grammar are often a great stumbling block to the student of language. He resents them because they seem to contradict and invalidate rules which it has perhaps cost him considerable effort to master; he would gladly be rid of them if he could. This feeling is especially strong with the beginner whose time is so largely taken up with rules; and unfortunately it is not offset by that knowledge of the importance which may and often does attach to the exceptional usage, that can in the nature of the case only be expected of one who has already acquired some familiarity with the language.

A good illustration of this is found in the use of the Hithpael stem in Hebrew. Whether this stem is always or only usually *reflexive*, whether it may or may not be *passive*, will probably seem to the student who is beginning the study of Hebrew a matter of minor importance, and the more simply the rule of the Hithpael is stated and the fewer the exceptions given, the better will he be pleased. Consequently, when Professor McFayden in his revised edition of Davidson's *Hebrew Grammar* omits the statement of the latter regarding the possibility of a passive use of this stem, and when in his *Key* he makes the sweeping statement that the Hithpael "can only be reflexive," the student, if he knew of the omission, would be disposed to be grateful to Dr. McFadyen for sparing him the necessity of bothering with what would seem to be a doubtful or negligible exception to the general rule.¹ But if the student were told that it is upon the validity of this seemingly unimportant exception to the general rule that the historic interpretation of the Blessing of Abraham depends and that Dr. McFadyen in his *Key* to the Grammar cuts the evangelical heart out of that glorious promise, he would, if seriously minded, feel quite differently with regard to this

¹ It may be noted, however, that Dr. McFadyen in the case of this stem distinguishes three kinds of reflexive, as well as a reciprocal. So the rule is not very simple after all.

matter. The question of the possible meanings of the Hithpael would cease to belong to the dry bones of Hebrew grammar and become a live issue of no small moment to Christian faith.

The example to which we refer is the following. In the Revised editions of Davidson's *Grammar*,² Dr. McFadyen has omitted the statement found in earlier editions: "The syllable *hith* is a stronger reflexive prefix than *hin*, and the Hithpa'el less commonly has the passive sense,"³ etc., and in his rewriting of the section he makes no reference to a possible passive use of this verb form. Elsewhere, in the lesson on the "Ayin Guttural Verbs," he has added to the Hebrew sentences, which are to be translated into English, the greater part of Gen. xii. 2, 3.⁴ This passage is rendered in the *Key*⁵ as follows: "And I will bless thee and make thy name great, and I will bless those that bless thee, and by thee shall all the families of the earth bless themselves." Here the verb which Dr. McFadyen renders "bless themselves" is in the *Niphal* stem. Since it is generally recognized that this stem while originally reflexive in meaning is frequently used in a passive sense, the rendering given seems to require some explanation, especially since "be blessed" is the generally accepted rendering. So Dr. McFadyen adds the following note:

The use of the Hithpa'el (which can only be reflexive) in the very similar sentences, Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4 וְהִתְבְּרַנּוּ, strongly suggests that the *Niphal* here (Gen. xii. 3), which might theoretically have a passive meaning—"in thee *shall* all the families of the earth *be blessed*"—should rather be taken reflexively (§ 25. 3. i); and the meaning really is that other nations in invoking blessings on themselves will use such words as "God make thee like Abram" (see Skinner's *Genesis*, p. 244); T. H. Robinson (*Genesis in Colloquial English*, p. 17), well brings out the

² *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar*. By the late A. B. Davidson. Revised throughout by John Edgar McFadyen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Nineteenth edition (1914). P. 93.

³ Cf. 18th edition (1907), p. 68, rem. b.

⁴ 19th ed., p. 122.

⁵ *Key to the Exercises in the late Professor A. B. Davidson's Revised Introductory Hebrew Grammar with Explanatory Notes*. By John Edgar McFadyen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924, p. 77, note 15. For a review of this book, cf. this REVIEW for January 1927, pp. 141ff.

meaning by "all the nations of the world shall regard you as a type of the prosperous man."

This interpretation, as the form of statement clearly implies, is not of course original with Dr. McFadyen. It was advocated forty years ago by Briggs who then described it as "the view of most recent interpreters." His statement reads in part as follows:

The verb gives the chief difficulty. The Hithpael of the second passage [xxii. 18] must be taken as reflexive. This favours the view that the Niphal of the same verb, in the first passage [xii. 3], should be reflexive also. The Niphal may be passive, but the passive meaning should never be adopted unless there is evidence against the usual reflexive meaning of the form. We do not hesitate, therefore, to adopt the view of most recent interpreters, DeWette, Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, Delitzsch, Dillmann, *et al.*, that the form is reflexive, and we render "bless themselves with thee."⁶

This interpretation is given by Adeney in the *Hastings Dictionary* without mentioning the usually accepted rendering "be blessed"; and the meaning of the passage when thus interpreted is explained as follows:

A man who is exceptionally blessed is taken as the model and type of blessing, and is then said to be "a blessing" (Gen. xii. 2); and others are said to bless themselves by him, in the sense that they appeal to the blessing he has received as a specimen of what they desire for themselves, *e.g.*, "The nations shall bless themselves in him"—*i.e.*, by Him, by reference to His blessing (Jer. iv. 2).⁷

Now, despite the positiveness with which this view is often stated, it is to be observed that this rendering "bless themselves" instead of "be blessed" is a comparatively new one. Briggs made no effort to claim for it any authority more ancient than that of "most recent interpreters."⁸ The common

⁶ Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 90, note.

⁷ *Hastings Dictionary* I, p. 307a. On the other hand in the art. "Abraham," Ryle gives the passive rendering "be blessed" (p. 15b).

⁸ "Recent" is, however, to be broadly construed. Thus, Joh. Simonis in his *Lexicon* (1771) gives only the reflexive meaning for the Hithpael of "bless"; but does not cite either of the Genesis passages. Eichorn in his edition of Simonis (1793) makes no change in this regard. Winer in his revision of Simonis-Eichorn (1828) gives two uses of the Hithpael and renders Gen. xxii. 18 by "fortunatus, beatus est."

rendering, "be blessed,"⁹ has, as we shall presently see, the support of the ancient versions; and was apparently generally held until about the beginning of the nineteenth century. The question then arises, Why is the new interpretation so generally preferred by "modern" scholars? It will not suffice to say that the reason is purely linguistic, the use of the Hithpael as reflexive. For it is significant that the passage which Dr. McFadyen quotes uses the Niphal which could unquestionably be passive;¹⁰ and Dr. McFadyen would hardly introduce the passage Gen. xii. 2, 3 into a grammar for beginners and use it as an opportunity to state and defend this modern interpretation of the Blessing, if no particular interest or importance attached to the new rendering. It is true that A. B. Davidson assures us regarding Gen. xii. 3 that "the sense is little altered if for 'be blessed' we render 'bless themselves,' *i.e.* wish for themselves the same blessings as Abraham and his seed are seen to enjoy."¹¹ But in saying this Davidson failed we believe to appreciate the real difference between these renderings. We agree with Dr. McFadyen that the difference is important; and we feel obliged to reject the new rendering for the very reasons which would we think dispose him to favor it.

There are two characteristics of the new rendering which should be carefully noted. The first is that it tends to empty the prophecy of its predictive significance; it ceases to be in the same sense and degree a *promise* to the nations. The most that it then says is that by Abraham or his seed the nations shall *seek* a blessing; they will use his name as a formula expressive of their desires. But whether their desire will be granted or not,—as to that there is no answer given. The granting of their desire can only be said to be implied. Furthermore Davidson has this to say in the comment upon this passage from which we have just quoted:

⁹ It is found, for example, in the AV, the text of the ERV and ARV, the Donay version, and the German of Luther.

¹⁰ Driver, *Hebrew Syntax*,³ p. 125, renders it by the passive in xii. 3, xviii. 18.

¹¹ Article "Eschatology" in *Hastings Dictionary*, Vol. I, p. 735.

Equally universalistic, though more definite in regard to the means of its accomplishment, is the promise given to Abraham, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 3). Such a promise could not soon be fulfilled, and there might be room for conjecture even as to the manner of fulfilment; yet the patriarch, knowing wherein his own blessedness lay, in his knowledge of God and fellowship with Him, would surmise that through his seed this true knowledge of God would reach all peoples. The sense is little altered if for "be blessed" we render "bless themselves," *i.e.* wish for themselves the same blessings as Abraham and his seed are seen to enjoy (cf. Num. xxiii. 10).

It would seem, then, that Davidson regarded the blessing of the nations as little if anything more than a corollary to the blessing promised to the patriarch himself, an inference drawn by Abraham. In fact he uses even weaker language. He speaks of it as a "surmise" on the part of Abraham, rather than as a promise of Almighty God. Such being the case we need not wonder that he considered it immaterial which way the verse was rendered. But we do not realize the extent to which the new interpretation can empty this passage of its rich evangelical contents until we place Robinson's rendering which, Dr. McFadyen assures us, "well brings out the meaning," along side of the familiar rendering of the AV.

ROBINSON'S VERSION

All the nations of the world shall regard you as a type of the prosperous man.

AUTHORIZED VERSION

And in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

While not all the critics would empty this promise so completely of its precious and familiar meaning, the tendency of this interpretation is clearly in this direction.

The second characteristic of this rendering is that it brings the Old Testament form of the Blessing into conflict with the New Testament citation and interpretation. The promise is twice referred to in the New Testament (Acts iii. 25, Gal. iii. 8) and in both places the form of the verb is the same as in the LXX, namely passive. The claim of the critics that the passive rendering is incorrect, becomes, thus, an imputation upon the correctness of the use made of the Blessing by the New Testament writers.

It is obvious, we think, that these two characteristics are

calculated to commend the new rendering to the "higher critics," especially to those whose views are pronouncedly naturalistic. It minimizes or denies the predictive element in prophecy. This they approve because the supernatural as present in miracle and prophecy constitutes a "difficulty" which they are constantly endeavoring to escape. It rejects or ignores the authority of the New Testament by adopting a rendering different from the one which it accepts and expounds. This they approve because they hold that the use made of the Old Testament in the New was at times very inaccurate and unscientific, what Dr. Moffatt would call "allegorical." And much "allegorizing" of the New Testament conception of the Old Testament is necessary, if the critics are to avoid the frank admission that their view of the Old Testament differs radically from that set forth in the New Testament. Now it is just because this interpretation of the Blessing involves such serious consequences for Christian faith that we are concerned to know whether the philological evidence which Dr. McFadyen cites in its support is valid and conclusive. We shall now proceed to give our reasons for believing that it is not, but that modern scientific philological research supports the familiar rendering of the Authorized Version.

Dr. McFadyen's comment tells us that, like Briggs, he bases his rendering "bless themselves" upon two grounds. The first of these is that this passage should be interpreted in the light of the parallel passages (Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4) where the *Hithpael* is used, the assumption being that in all of these passages the meaning would probably be the same. As to this it may be remarked that, while we should be disposed to regard such an argument as a valid one, it is rather surprising to find it employed by Dr. McFadyen and other of the critics. Reading Dr. McFadyen's statement the reader might infer that he regards all of these passages as belonging to the same document and therefore as consistent one with the other. But while it is true that all five passages are roughly assigned to J (*e.g.*, Driver), Dr. McFadyen is of course aware that Driver regarded the two *Hithpael* passages (xxii. 18, xxvi. 4) as

“expanded or recast by the compiler”;¹² and leading critics assign nearly all of the relevant passages to the JE redactor. Thus Briggs remarks in comparing xii. 3 (a Niphal passage) and xxii. 18 (a Hithpael passage): “The latter passage is clearer and later, and should be regarded as an interpretation of the former by the Redactor, who had the advantage of both the prophetic and theocratic narrators in his final representation.”¹³ Then Briggs goes on to assert, as we have seen, that the Hithpael “must be taken as reflexive” and that the Niphal “should be reflexive also.” We have here an interesting illustration of the inconsistency of the critics. Usually they would argue that the fact that one passage uses the Niphal and another the Hithpael indicates a “difference” in meaning and consequently points to diversity of authorship.¹⁴ But here while accounting for the difference of phraseology as due to the redactor they are disposed to insist on rendering the verbs alike and to treat the Niphal which could easily be passive as a reflexive on the ground that the Hithpael must be reflexive.

Now we are not disposed to quarrel with Dr. McFadyen for occasionally adopting the much decried “harmonistic” method of the conservative Old Testament scholar, much as we feel that the ‘higher critics’ as a class have deprived themselves of any right to appeal to it. But it may be well to notice that this is not as Dr. McFadyen’s statement would seem to imply a case of interpreting *one* Niphal in the light of *two* Hithpael. For the Niphal form of the verb is also used in Gen. xviii. 18 and xxviii. 14, both of which are strictly parallel to Gen. xii. 3 and both of which are likewise assigned to J or the JE redactor by the critics. But it is a case of interpreting three Niphals in the light of two Hithpael. This naturally raises the question, Why not reverse the process and interpret the two Hithpael in terms of the three Niphals?

¹² LOT, p. 16.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 89 note.

¹⁴ Thus Professor Nourse of Hartford Seminary tells us: “It may be more correct, especially in regard to J, to think of a ‘school’ rather than an individual writer” (*A New Dictionary*, p. 349a).

The main reason that Dr. McFadyen gives for interpreting Gen. xii. 3 in the light of Gen. xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4 is stated to be that these latter passages use the Hithpael "which can only be reflexive,"¹⁵ instead of the Niphal which "might theoretically have a passive meaning." This it will be observed rests the whole case for this interpretation ultimately on the assumption that the Hithpael can only be reflexive. We say assumption, although Dr. McFadyen states it as a fact, because the claim that the Hithpael is *only* reflexive is a comparatively recent one and is by no means universally accepted by Semitic scholars. It is interesting to recall that Gesenius who has been called "the father of Modern Hebrew Lexicography" held the view that the *Hithpael* was "originally a passive of the Piel,"¹⁶ And the most recent editions of Gesenius' Grammar, those by Kautzsch, still recognize that this stem may be used as a passive. We shall make no attempt to give an exhaustive survey of scholarly opinion upon this point. But we note that this view was shared by Freitag, Fuerst, Nägelsbach, Ewald, W. H. Green, W. R. Harper, Preiswerk, A. B. Davidson, B. Davidson; and that it is still held today by E. König, Steuernagel, Brockelmann, Butin, D. T. Evans, R. D. Wilson. The question is a somewhat intricate one because it involves the problem of the relation between the reflexive stems and the passive voice in Hebrew; and this question can

¹⁵ It might be questioned whether Dr. McFadyen is here referring to the use of the Hithpael in general or only to its use in the verb "to bless." That the former in the case would seem to follow from the fact that in the *Grammar*, he mentions the *reciprocal* use of the Hithpael, despite the fact that this use is quite rare, even rarer than the passive, so rare as not to be even mentioned by Davidson.

¹⁶ Cf. his *Lehrgebaude* (1817) also the 1828 and 1834 editions of his *Grammatik*. As a reason for this explanation of the Hithpael, Gesenius appealed to the use of the Vth Stem in Arabic. He mentioned that a few grammarians deny that the passive sense was original. But apparently he was not aware that the usage itself was disputed. It may be noted that Johannes Jahn had shortly before (1809) expressed a similar view. On the other hand it should not be overlooked that while in 1817 Gesenius gave Gen. xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4 as his first examples of the passive use of the Hithpael, in his *Lexicon* (1833) he treated these forms of "bless" as reflexive.

only be adequately considered in the light of the usage of the cognate languages. We shall, therefore, consider (1) the forms and usage of the passives and reflexives in the Semitic languages in general;¹⁷ (2) their use in the Hebrew of the Old Testament; (3) the usage in the case of the verb "bless" in the Old Testament; and (4) the New Testament citations.

I. THE PASSIVES AND REFLEXIVES IN SEMITICS

It is to be noted at the outset that in the Semitic languages the use of the passive is in general decidedly limited. This is due to two things: to a marked preference for the active voice, and especially to a tendency to avoid the use of the passive where the agent is to be named. This latter rule is carefully observed in the Classical Arabic in which "if the agent is to be named, the active voice must be used."¹⁸ The Arab can say "X killed" (*katala*)¹⁹ or "X was killed" (*kutila*). But he would not say "X was killed by Y." For this the proper form of expression would be "Y killed X." What is true of the Arabic is also true in general of the other Semitic languages.²⁰

¹⁷ For the Semitic languages in general the comparative grammars of Wright (1890), Zimmern (1898) and Brockelmann (Vol. 1. 1908) are of great value. A more recent work is that of O'Leary (1923). The four great representatives of the Semitic languages are: Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic for the West Semitic, Assyrio-Babylonian for the East Semitic.

¹⁸ Wright, *Arabic Grammar* II, 269 D. Wright tells us further that "The passive is especially used in four cases; namely (a) when God, or some higher being, is indicated as the author of the act; (b) when the author is unknown, or at least not known for certain; (c) when the speaker or writer does not wish to name him; (d) when the attention of the hearer or reader is directed more to the person affected by the act (patiens, the patient), than to the doer of it (agens, the agent)" (*Id.* I. 50 A).

¹⁹ We shall use the letters *kil* to designate the trilateral root since the verb *kāla* (כָּלַל) is so familiar to students of Hebrew, despite the fact that most of the names of the verbal stems are derived from a different verb (פָּעַל, hence, *e.g.*, Hiph'il or Hif'il). The first two letters are emphatic consonants in Hebrew and are usually written *ḳ* and *ṭ*. But since we are only using the verb as a paradigm and since in Arabic the second letter is written with *t* and not *ṭ*, we shall omit these diacritical marks and simply write the letters *k*, *t*, *l*. When the *t* is aspirated it is written *th*.

²⁰ Taking the Code of Hammurabi as an example for the Assyrio-Babylonian the passive form of expression occurs fairly often, but it is

They show a preference, sometimes a very marked preference for the active voice, especially when the agent is to be mentioned. It is to be observed, therefore, that this tendency to restrict the passive to cases where the agent is not named tends to obliterate to some extent the difference between reflexive and passive. Strictly speaking the distinction between these two verb forms is that in the former the subject is brought into the state or condition expressed by the verb through his own agency, in the latter by the agency of another. Thus between such sentences as "X killed himself" (*i.e.*, "was killed by himself") and "X was killed by Y," the difference is perfectly clear. In the latter sentence the mention of the second party as agent proves the verb to be passive. But when the name of the agent is omitted the expression is much less clear. "X was killed" (by some party unknown, or not to be mentioned) might suggest at least the possibility that the party unknown, unmentioned and perhaps unmentionable was really the man himself. In other words the omission of the name of the agent with the passive makes the distinction between it and the reflexive less apparent; and if the meaning of either were broadened out, it might in many cases cover both ideas. Wright calls this wider use of the reflexive the "effective." He tells us that "It differs from the passive in this—that the *passive* indicates that a person is the object of, or experiences the effect of the action of *another*; whereas the *effective* implies that an act is done to a person, or a state produced in him, whether it be

much less frequent than the active and is practically never found with the mention of the agent. In the expression "by the temple of his city he shall be redeemed" (*ina bīt ili ališu ippaṭṭar*, § 32) the possibility of regarding the temple as the agent is established by the parallel phrase in the next section "the palace shall redeem him" (*ēkallum ipaṭṭaršu*) where the "palace" is used for the civil authority as distinguished from the temple authority just referred to. On the other hand the Syriac has departed rather far from the usage which is so strictly observed in the Arabic. Thus not merely is the passive participle Peal frequently used to express the perfect but according to Nöldeke "a favorite mode of employing this participle includes mention of the agent introduced by 7" (*Gram.* § 279).

caused by *another* or by *himself*."²¹ In other words the effective broadens out the reflexive to include the passive. With this in mind let us now examine the use of these verb forms in detail.

1. The Passive Voice.

a. Its Form.

If we can judge from the *Arabic*, nearly all of the stems of the Semitic verb, both the primary and the secondary, originally distinguished the passive from the active by means of internal vowel changes: *e.g.*, in the case of the first or Simple stem the passive of *katala* ("he killed") was *kutila* ("he was killed").²² In the Classical Arabic these "internal" passives are found for all but one of the ten ordinary stems.²³ In the *Aramaic* the passive is very largely restricted to the participles, and to the perfect of the Simple stem.²⁴ In the *Assyrian* there are no inner passives. But the permansive (a nominal form related to the West Semitic perfect) may be used as such.²⁵ In the *Hebrew* the passives of the Piel and Hiphil are still in use, as is also the passive participle of the Qal. But there are only sporadic examples of other passives.²⁶

b. Its Use.

The facts which have just been given regarding the occurrence of the strictly passive forms in the Semitic languages are significant. They show that only in the *Arabic* is the pas-

²¹ *Op. cit.* I. 38.

²² Cf. Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Gram.* Vol. I pp. 537ff. for a general survey.

²³ Cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 49c.

²⁴ For the Aramaic in general see the synopsis of forms given by Dr. R. D. Wilson in "The Aramaic of Daniel" (*Biblical and Theological Studies* by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912, p. 306); for the Syriac, cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gram.* p. 218; for Biblical Aramaic, cf. Strack, *Bibl. Aramäische Grammatik*, §§ 12b, 13d.

²⁵ Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Grammatik*,² § 117a.

²⁶ There are eight passives (Hothpaal) of the "t" reflexive (Deut. xxiv. 4, Lev. xiii. 55, 56, Isa. xxxiv. 6, Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62, 1 Kg. xx. 27) and perhaps two of the "n" reflexive (Isa. lix. 3, Lam. iv. 14). Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch § 54 h.

sive voice extensively developed.²⁷ In the other principal languages it is restricted to a few forms or is wanting altogether. To what is this due? The explanation is apparently two-fold. It is partly due to the preference for the active voice to which reference has already been made. But it is more the result of a tendency, which as we shall see in a moment is more or less marked in all the Semitic languages, to express the passive by means of the reflexive stems.

2. The Reflexive Stems.

a. Their Form.

The Semitic languages have two stems or conjugations which express the reflexive: the *t*-stems and the *n*-stems.

(1) In the *t*-stems a "t" is inserted either before or after the first radical or formative augment of the verb.²⁸

The *Arabic* has four such stems: the VIIIth (*iktatala*), Vth (*takattala*), IXth (*istaktala*), VIth (*takâtala*), which are formed from the Simple (Qal), Intensive (Piel), Causative (Hiphil or Shaphel),²⁹ and Conative (Poel)³⁰ stems respectively. The *Aramaic* dialects have three such stems in

²⁷ Whether or to what extent this difference between Arabic and the other Semitic families as to the use of the inner passives is due to a development of this mode by the Arabs or to an early disuse of it by the others is not easy to decide.

²⁸ The position of the *t* varies in the different Semitic languages. In the Hebrew and Aramaic it precedes the first radical, except where metathesis results from the fact of that radical being a sibilant. For a general survey, cf. Brockelmann (*op. cit.*) pp. 528-535. In the Assyrian the "t" regularly follows the first radical, or the formative element (in the case of Shaphel and Niphal). In Arabic it precedes the first radical in the Vth and VIth stems, follows it in the VIIIth and follows the formative element in the Xth.

²⁹ The Arabic like the other West Semitic languages does not have a Shaphel, *i.e.*, it does not indicate the Causative by prefixing *sh* (*i.e.*, *s*), as is the case in Assyrio-Babylonian. It uses an ' (hemza); the Aramaic dialects have either ' or *h*; and the Hebrew has regularly *h*. But the fact that the Xth Stem in the Arabic, which is primarily a reflexive of the Causative has the form *istaktala*, seems to indicate that the Shaphel may have been known to the West Semites as well as to the Eastern group.

³⁰ Such forms in Hebrew are largely confined to the weak verbs (Ayin Ayin and Ayin Waw).

frequent use, the Ethpeel ('ethk'thel), Ethpaal ('ethkattal) and Ettaphal ('ettaktal), derived from the Simple, Intensive and Causative stems respectively.³¹ The *Assyrian* has four *t*-stems: the Iftaal (iktatal), Iftaal (iktattil), Ishtafal (ushtaktal) and Ittafal (ittaktal) which are formed from the Simple, Intensive, Causative and Reflexive (Niphal) stems respectively.³² Of these *t*-stems the *Hebrew* has only one in frequent use, the Hithpaal (hithkattel) which is derived from the Intensive (Piel) stem.³³

(2) In the *n*-stem an "n" is inserted before the first radical.

The *Arabic* has one *n*-stem, the VIIth (inkatala).³⁴ The *n*-stems are not found in *Aramaic*, with the exception of the Samaritan dialect in which clear examples are quite rare.³⁵ The *Assyrian* has an *n*-stem (ikkatil < inkatil) from which as we have seen a *t*-stem (ittaktal) is formed.³⁶ The *Hebrew* has one *n*-stem which occurs quite frequently, the Niphal (niktal).

b. Their Use.

(1) The *t*-stems. Speaking of the *t*-stems in general, Brockelmann says, "Out of the reflexive-middle significance there very often develops the passive, as in the case of the Indo-germanic middle; consequently in the younger Semitic languages, the reflexives crowd the old passive, formed by

³¹ Several other *t*-stems occur to some extent. Cf. the table of verbal forms given by Dr. R. D. Wilson (*op. cit.*, p. 306).

³² Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, §§ 112 ff.

³³ Brockelmann accepts the view of Nöldeke, Kautzsch and Stade that the form יתפקרו (Judg. xx-xxi *passim*) is derived from the Kal stem (*Grundriss*, I, p. 529), but this view is opposed by Gesenius-Kautzsch (*Gram.* § 54 1; cf. espec. König, *Lehrgeb.*, I, 198f.). The Hithpô'el (cf. VIIth stem in Arabic), the Hithpa'lel (cf. IXth stem in Arabic) and the Hithpalpel (cf. IIInd stem of the quadriliteral verb in Arabic) also occur, especially with weak verbs. Whether there is a Taphel is a matter of dispute.

³⁴ The Arabic has also two infrequently occurring *n*-stems.

³⁵ Cf. Peterman, *Grammatica Samaritana*, p. 22f.

³⁶ The Assyrian also has *n*-stems derived from two of the *t*-stems: the Iftaneal (iktanatil) and the Ittanafal (ittanaktal), both of infrequent occurrence.

vowel-change, entirely out.”³⁷ As to the *Arabic*, Wright tells us that in the case of the Vth stem (= Heb. Hithpael) the “effective” significance is “even more common” than the reflexive.³⁸ He also points out that the VIIIth stem may be used as a passive. In the *Aramaic* the three *t*-stems are all used as reflexives or passives, *i.e.*, as effectives. As to the *Assyrian* Delitzsch points out that three of the four *t*-stems may, and that the fourth (Ittafal) always does, have a passive signification.³⁹ That the same tendency appears to some extent at least in the Hebrew also is generally admitted. But there is a tendency to insist that it is a late usage. Thus Brockelmann says, “But in Hebrew the passive significance of the reflexive of the intensive stem appears first occasionally in the later language, as *tithhallal* ‘she is praised’ (Prov. xxxi. 30), *hishtakkah* ‘be forgotten’ (Eccles. viii. 10).” We shall return to this in a moment.

(2) The *n*-stems. The *n*-stems which were originally reflexive have also come to be used in the passive sense. Brockelmann describes this as “very frequent.”⁴⁰ In the *Arabic* this stem (the VIIth) is often used according to Wright as an “effective.” In the *Aramaic* dialects the Niphal occurs apparently only in Samaritan and rarely even there. Apparently it can be used as a passive. In the *Assyrian* the Niphal is almost always passive; and this is always the case with the “*t*” form of this stem (the Ittafal). That in *Hebrew* the Niphal can be and often is used as a passive is not open to question; and according to König⁴¹ there is no conclusive evidence of a development in this use in the Old Testament.

The above brief examination of the passives and reflexives in the Semitic languages shows a decided tendency, more or less marked in different languages, on the one hand to restrict the use of the passive voice, and on the other to broaden out

³⁷ *Grundriss*, I, p. 535.

³⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 38A.

³⁹ *Op. cit.* § 113.

⁴⁰ *Grundriss*, Vol. I, p. 535.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, III. § 100.

the use of the reflexive to include the passive ("effective") or to use it instead of the passive. This is very important for our study of the Hithpael of "bless." Thus Lane tells us that the Arabic uses this verb in the Vth stem (Hithpael) in the sense of "he had a blessing; and he was or became blest" and that it very often signifies "he looked for a blessing by means of him or it; he regarded him, or it, as a means of obtaining a blessing."⁴² This is quite different from the strict reflexive sense which Dr. McFadyen seems prepared to insist on for this verb in Hebrew.

One subject still remains for us to consider before leaving this topic. It is the claim that the passive use of the reflexives is a late development in the history of the Semitic languages. It is difficult if not impossible to make any very definite statements with regard to this question since in the case of many of the Semitic languages or dialects the data are too meagre, either because the period covered is too short or because the literary remains are too scanty. Consequently we cannot do better than to turn to the Assyrio-Babylonian for a verdict on the subject. We have in the cuneiform inscriptions documents which go back as far and farther than the date which even the most conservative scholar will claim for the Pentateuch, while the genuineness of the documents will be conceded by all parties to the debate. We have seen that the use of the Iftaal (or Hithpael) as passive is recognized by the best authorities on Babylonian grammar. The only question is then as to the antiquity of this usage. It is significant, therefore, that it is found at least as early as the Hammurabi period (2000 B.C.). The following examples will we believe establish this: "After that speech was exactly determined (*ubtirru*) in the (judicial) Assembly";⁴³ "while the grain, the sowing of the city, is being made ready" (*uktattu*);⁴⁴ "when the offerings of Ur shall be completed" (*uštallimu*);⁴⁵ "there-

⁴² *Arabic English Dictionary, in loco.*

⁴³ Ungnad, *Bab. Briefe*, No. 238, 21.

⁴⁴ *Id.*, No. 88. 17.

⁴⁵ L. W. King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, III, p. 44;

upon . . . search was made (? *uzzenik*).⁴⁶ The expression "he shall take the oath by the God and *utaššar*," which occurs several times in the Code of Hammurabi, seems to mean "shall be acquitted" rather than "shall clear himself."⁴⁷ The expression "*ša kibizu la uttakaru*" may mean "whose command does not change itself,"⁴⁸ but the fact that Ungnad also renders the expression *ina pišu ša la uttakaru* by "through his unchangeable (*unwandelbar*) utterance" shows how easily the reflexive would in some instances pass over to the passive.⁴⁹

This evidence is not as full as we might wish. But it shows clearly, we think, that as early as the time of Abraham, the passive use of the Hithpael was known in Babylon. This does not of course prove that it was equally early among the Hebrews. But it does show that scholars should be very cautious in asserting that the passive significance is late and in fixing some arbitrary date for its emergence in Hebrew. It may be conceded that there is a marked increase in such a use in later times. But this does not prove that the use itself is an indication of late date.

Our study of the cognate languages leads us, therefore, to two important conclusions: first that these languages show a general and in some instances a very marked tendency to use the *t*-stems as passive; second that this use may, and in the case of the best witness, the Babylonian, clearly does, occur at an early date.

Ungnad, *Bab. Briefe*, p. 9, says of this verb "more probably passive than active; hardly 'when he has performed the sacrifices at Ur.'" Muss-Arnolt (*Assyr. Bab. Handwörterbuch*), and Bezold, *Assyr. Glossar*, give the passive sense for this verb.

⁴⁶ Schorr, *Altbab. Rechtsurk.*, p. 78; so Bezold, *Assyr. Glossar*, and (with some doubt) Kohler-Ungnad, *Ham. Gesetz*, III No. 700.

⁴⁷ Cf. Kohler-Ungnad, *Ham. Ges.* II. p. 132.

⁴⁸ So Ungnad, *id.* p. 153.

⁴⁹ Cf. C. H. W. Johns, *Bab. & Assyr. Laws, Contracts and Letters*, p. 394 "whose command is not set aside." It is interesting to note that so careful a scholar as Tallquist has in his *Maqlu* (I. 120) rendered the Iftaal of *nakāru* as reflexive in the text and passive in the glossary.

II. THE PASSIVES AND REFLEXIVES IN HEBREW

We now pass on to examine more in detail the problem of the use of the passives and reflexives as it lies before us in the Hebrew. While the evidence cited from other Semitic languages favors the view that the Hithpael may and probably did acquire effective or passive meaning, this only constitutes a presumption, though a very valuable one, in its favor: it does not amount to proof. The question itself can only be decided by a study of the actual usage in Hebrew. But this preliminary study is of importance because it shows not only that there is no strong presumption against such a usage but on the contrary that were the Hithpael never used as a passive it would be a noteworthy example in Hebrew of a *t*-stem that had successfully resisted a tendency which is so marked in other Semitic languages. It justifies us, therefore, in maintaining that all that is required is a reasonable degree of probability, that the sense of a given passage is passive to warrant us in treating it as such. This is to be borne in mind since as has been pointed out the tendency to avoid the mention of the agent with the passive makes it difficult at times to be absolutely sure as to his identity.

1. The Passives.

Attention has been directed above to the preference for the active voice which is characteristic of the Semitic languages. As evidence of such a preference in Hebrew the following examples may be cited from verbs which are found only in those of the derived stems which have an inner passive: (1) Verbs which occur only in the intensive stem: "seek" (*בָּקַשׁ*) 225 times⁵⁰ in Piel, 3 times in Pual; "reject" (*בָּאֵן*) 41 times in Piel, wanting in Pual; "command" (*צִוָּה*) 476 times in Piel, 9 in Pual; "serve" (*שָׁרַת*) 97 times in Piel, wanting in Pual; (2) Verbs found only in the causative stem: "make known" (*נָגַד*) 344 times in Hiphil, 35 in Hophal; "cast"

⁵⁰ The figures which are given as to the frequency of the occurrence of Hebrew verbs are usually based upon the data given in Harper's *Hebrew Vocabularies*. But where they differ from those found in the Gesenius-Brown *Lexicon*, the latter figures have usually been used.

(שִׁלַּח) 110 times in Hiphil, 13 in Hophal; cf. “smite” (נָכַח), 482 times in Hiphil, 17 in Hophal, 2 in Pual, 1 in Niphal; “bring” (Hiphil of בָּרַח) 566 times, Hophal 23 times. In such instances as these the preference for the active form is obvious and unmistakable.

As to these inner passives it has been pointed out above that in Hebrew they are chiefly confined to the Pual and Hophal stems, and to the passive participle of the Kal. But it was noted that the Hithpael (perhaps also the Niphal) is occasionally pointed as passive.⁵¹ This is a matter of interest and importance. It proves that according to the Massoretes the reflexive stems were at times not only passive in *sense*, but passive in *form* as well. Since the pointing is admittedly late, the significance of the occurrence of these “passive” forms is not clear. On the one hand it is claimed that the existence of an “inner” passive of the Hithpael is a proof that this stem was originally active and reflexive. The existence of such a passive in the Arabic favors this explanation. On the other hand it may be argued that the pointing as passive is simply the result of the late tendency to use the reflexives as passives and consequently cannot be regarded as trustworthy. At any rate it shows that the Massoretic scholars recognized that the Hithpael (or Hothpaal) could be treated as a passive. And it raises the question whether, in some at least of the passages where the passive sense is probable, this is due to the tendency of which we have spoken above of the reflexives to pass over into effectives or passives, or whether perhaps some of the forms which are pointed as actives yet which the LXX renders as passives should actually be pointed as passives i.e. as Hothpaals instead of Hithpaels.

2. The Reflexives.

a. The Hithpael.

This stem is primarily *reflexive* as can be seen in such expressions as “sanctify self” (Num. xi. 18, Josh. iii. 5), “defile self” (Num. vi. 7), “avenge self” (Jer. v. 9), “shake self”

⁵¹ Cf. footnote 26 *supra*.

(Isa. lii. 2), "wash self" (Job ix. 30), "humble self" (Gen. xvi. 9), "strengthen self" (1 Kgs. xx. 22), "hide self" (Gen. iii. 8), etc., where the reflexive sense is either required or at least appropriate. A clear instance of its use as a reciprocal is in the case of the verb "see" (ראה) used of a hostile meeting.⁵²

The following examples where the *passive* sense is appropriate if not necessary, may be cited:⁵³ "it (a utensil) shall be purified" (Num. xxxi. 23, P),* "(the stones) are poured out" (Lam. iv. 1),* "(rods) were broken" (Ezek. xix. 12) "(the iniquity) shall not be purged" (1 Sam. iii. 14)*—where the nature of the subject does not favor the reflexive sense;⁵⁴ "but he refused to be comforted" (Gen. xxxvii. 35, J), where the context shows that he resisted the attempt of others to comfort him; "all their wisdom is swallowed up" (Ps. cvii. 27, AV margin)* by fear of disaster and death; "ye shall be sold" (Deut. xxviii. 68)*; "all the workers of iniquity shall be scattered" (Ps. xcii. 9)*—the context implies that this is to be accomplished by the Lord; "my heart was grieved" (Ps. lxxiii. 21)* by sad thoughts; "she shall be praised" (Prov. xxxi. 30)* by right thinking people; "neither be polluted any more" (Ezek. xiv. 11); "and shall not be reckoned among the nations" (Num. xxiii. 9, JE ?)*; "(fools) are afflicted" (Ps. cvii. 17)*; "and was comforted" (Ps. cxix. 52) by the remembrance of thy judgments; "because thou hast been afflicted in all wherein my father was afflicted" (1 Kgs. ii. 26), the reference being clearly to sufferings at the hands of enemies. Cf. also Deut. iv. 21, 1 Sam. xxx. 6, Isa. xxx. 29,* Micah vi. 16, Ps. lxxiii. 21,* Job xv. 28,

⁵² It was pointed out above that the fact that Dr. McFadyen mentions the reciprocal use of the Hithpael, which Davidson did not mention and fails to mention the passive use which Davidson did mention is a clear indication that his statement that the Hithpael "can only be reflexive" is to be taken in its most comprehensive sense and not as referring merely to the verb "bless."

⁵³ The asterisk (*) indicates that the rendering as passive is supported by LXX and Vulgate.

⁵⁴ Cf. Job vi. 16, 1 Kgs. xviii. 45, Lam. i. 14.

xxx. 16, 19, Dan. xii. 10.*⁵⁵ In Jonah iii. 8, "let man and beast be covered with sackcloth," where the verb may be reflexive as far as the men were concerned, but must be passive as regards the beasts, we have a good illustration of the broader use of this stem. In this case as in some other instances, including some of those given above, we might say that the verb is used in the "effective" sense as defined by Wright.

Closely allied to the passive use and in some instances at least practically identical with it is the idea of *getting something done to oneself*. Thus "he shall get himself shaved" (Lev. xiii. 33) or "be shaved" (AV). In this instance it is obviously improper to regard the verb as strictly reflexive ("shave himself"). For the reference is not merely to shaving the beard of a man, but also the head of a man or a woman, which means that in some instances at least recourse to a barber would have been unavoidable. Consequently the Hithpael may in such instances imply simply the availing oneself of the services of another, allowing or getting something done to oneself. We might call it the voluntary passive. Nordheimer⁵⁶ expresses it thus: "he makes himself the object of another's action"; and uses the above illustration, "to get shaved." Other examples would be: "to get (or, be) healed"

⁵⁵ It is interesting to notice that according to the Massoretes the Hithpael participle of "be clean" (טהר) seems to be used in the sense of the Pual in Lev. xiv. This participle occurs twelve times in this chapter. In the AV it is regularly rendered by the passive "he (him, the man) that is to be cleansed." The LXX renders 7 times by the present passive participle, 4 times by the aorist passive participle and once by the perf. passive participle. Vs. 11 is especially instructive. There we read "and the priest that maketh *him* clean (Piel participle; LXX, ὁ καθαρίζων) shall present the man that is to be made clean (Hithpael participle; LXX, τὸν καθαρίζόμενον)." Here the passive sense is certainly natural in view of the fact that it is the priest who performs the ceremony in which the leper merely participates. The priest is "the one who is to cleanse" and the leper is "the one who is to be cleansed." The Hithpael is equivalent to the Pual. In the expression "were numbered" (Judg. xx. 15, 17, xxi. 9), where the passive sense seems preferable, it is not certain whether the verb is to be regarded as reflexive of קָל or פִּיֵּל.

⁵⁶ *Critical Grammar* (1842), p. 107.

(2 Kgs. viii. 29, ix. 15, 2 Chron. xxii. 6); "to get (or, be) enrolled by genealogies" (e.g. Neh. vii. 5, 64); and, perhaps, "to get (or, be) glorified" (Isa. xlv. 23, xlix. 3, lx. 21, lxi. 3), cf. Ezek. xxxviii. 23. Somewhat similar is the expression "was uncovered" (Gen. ix. 21, J) where the reference seems to be to unconscious or at least involuntary action. If these modifications of the reflexive idea are covered by Dr. McFadyen's statement "It may express action *upon* or *for oneself*," then it must be admitted that his statement in the *Key* that the Hithpael "can only be reflexive" is rather misleading. And it may be remarked that the one example which he cites under this head would not be adequate since "to go to and fro for oneself" (Hithpael of הִלַךְ) is not broad enough to include such expressions as "get healed," "get shaved" which so closely approximate the passive. Clearly between "bless themselves" in the sense used by Dr. McFadyen and "get themselves blessed" i.e. "secure for themselves a blessing" there is a great difference. And this latter meaning differs only slightly from the traditional rendering, "be blessed," and would readily pass over into it. At least it would be most hazardous to affirm that it could not.

Looking back over the examples which have just been given we feel justified in maintaining that there is adequate warrant for holding that in the case of some at least the passive meaning is required by the context; and that in the case of all of them it is certainly as probable if not more probable than the reflexive, if the reflexive is strictly construed. When we remember that the appropriateness of the passive rendering in these instances is supported in general by the tendency of the Semitic reflexives to become passives and confirmed in particular instances by the witness of the LXX and the Vulgate, it seems to us impossible to maintain with Dr. McFadyen that the Hithpael "can only be reflexive."

It will be objected, as we have seen, in favor of the reflexive use of "bless" in Genesis that the passive is a late development in the language and that therefore in an "early" document (J) the Hithpael might be expected to preserve its

original reflexive force. It may be replied, (1) that as we have seen the passive use in Babylonian is at least as early as the time of Abraham; (2) that we are not sufficiently well acquainted with the history of the Hebrew language to be able to say with certainty just when it would be proper to expect the passive usage to make its appearance; (3) that the critics are inclined to assign the passages in question to the Redactor of JE; (4) that even according to the datings adopted by the critics several of the instances we have cited above are early: Gen. xxxvii. 35* being J; Num. xxiii. 9* JE. Other passages (Num. xxxi. 23 and Deut. iv. 21, xxviii. 68) might be added but for the fact that the critics regard them as late.

On the other hand we observe that in Ecclesiastes which the critics regard as late, especially because of its diction, the Hithpael stem only occurs five times (vi. 2, vii. 16, viii. 10, xii. 3, 5) although the Niphal is found frequently. Of the five instances only one, "be forgotten" (viii. 10), is clearly passive. Driver comments on this passage with the words "elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew the passive is always expressed by the Nifal."⁵⁷ As to this it is to be noted that the Niphal of this verb appears twice in this very book (ii. 16, ix. 5) and that of the dozen remaining passages most would be regarded by the critics as late. Yet Driver includes this one passage in giving the evidence for the late date of Ecclesiastes.

b. The Niphal.

That this stem frequently retains its reflexive force does not require proof. A couple of examples may suffice: "I will hide myself in the field" (1 Sam. xx. 5), "he may redeem himself" (Lev. xxv. 49), "lift self up" (Isa. xxxiii. 10). But that on the other hand it has also acquired passive force is equally certain. A good example of this is furnished by the verb "create" (**ברא**). Since in the active stems (Kal and Piel) this verb is always used of *divine* activity it is clear that the Niphal forms must be used in the passive sense. Thus in Gen. v. 2 we read

⁵⁷ LOT, p. 475.

“male and female he (God) created them and called their name Adam in the day of their creating” (Niph. inf. cstr.). Here the reflexive sense is obviously excluded, the agent in creation being clearly named in the first part of the verse (cf. Gen. ii. 4, Ps. civ. 30). Another good example is the verb “eat” (אכל) the Niphal of which is clearly passive (*e.g.*, Ex. xii. 46, xiii. 3, 7, etc.). The verbs “bury” (קבר), “forgive” (סלה), “cut off” (כרת), “choose” (בחר), “find” (מצא) may also be mentioned, since in them the passive force of the Niphal is particularly obvious.

One of the clearest proofs that the Niphal may be used as a passive lies in the fact that in some instances it has apparently replaced the inner passive. Thus “destroy” (שמד) is found 69 times in Hiphil, 21 times in Niphal (cf. “divide” (בדל) and “be humble” (כנע)); but the Hophal does not occur. Furthermore the Niphal is clearly used as passive of the Kal, cf. especially: “build” (בנה) about 350 times in Kal (including 4 occurrences of the passive participle), 30 in Niphal; “give” (נתן) 1917 times in Kal, 82 in Niphal, 8 in Hophal (regarded by some as passive of Kal); “remember” (זכר) found only in Kal, Hiphil and Niphal; “carry” (נשא) used 599 times in Kal (incl. pass. part. 8 times) 13 in Piel, 2 in Hiphil, as against 32 times in Niphal and 10 in Hithpael. There are a number of verbs which occur more frequently in Niphal than in Pual and Hophal combined: “eat” (אכל), “be disturbed” (בהל), “cleave” (בקע), “uncover” (גלה), “hide” (חבא), “know” (ידע), “cut off” (כרת), “carry” (שאנ), “hide” (סתר), “hear” (שמע).

In view of such examples as these it is certainly well within bounds to say that the passive use of the Niphal is “tolerably common,”⁵⁸ and since, as we have seen,⁵⁹ it is difficult to prove that there was any increase in such a usage in later times, we feel that the fact that the LXX, Vulgate and New Testament use the passive uniformly in referring to the Abrahamic

⁵⁸ Gesenius-Kautzsch.

⁵⁹ Cf. footnote 41 *supra*.

Blessing may be regarded as constituting the "sufficient evidence against the usual meaning of the form" which Briggs would require us to produce.

3. The Syntax of the Passives.

It was pointed out above that there is a tendency, especially marked in the Arabic, to avoid the mention of the agent after a passive verb. A good, though extreme, illustration of the Hebrew usage is furnished us by the verb "command" (צוה). This verb which is of frequent occurrence is found only in Piel-Pual (nearly 500 times). The usual expression is "X commanded Y." Thus we frequently read the phrase "as the Lord commanded Moses." The Pual only occurs 9 times: and in eight of these the agent is not mentioned. The phrase "And they said, The LORD commanded my Lord . . . and my Lord was commanded by the LORD" (Num. xxxvi. 2) occurs only once and is so unusual that the text of the passage has been regarded as suspicious by some scholars. This is as has been said an extreme instance. But it serves to illustrate the relative infrequency of the passive as compared with the active, and the tendency not to mention the agent when the passive is used. The prepositions which are used to introduce the efficient cause or agent after the passive are: ל (e.g. 1 Sam. xxv. 7 "and not has anything been missed by (ל) them."), ב (e.g. Gen. ix. 6 "by (ב) man shall his blood be shed"),⁶⁰ מן (e.g. "by the waters (ממי) of the destruction"). But while the agent may be introduced in this way it must be at least admitted that it is relatively infrequent.⁶¹ Where the agent is to be named the active voice would ordinarily be used.

From the above examination of the use of the passives and

⁶⁰ That in Deut. iv. 22, we may render by "the Lord was angered by (ב) me," seems clear (cf. LXX). At the same time, it must be recognized that "against" (Vulg., *contra*) would be a very suitable rendering for the preposition, and that the verb may be reflexive, "angered himself against (or with)."

⁶¹ Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* § 121f., where the word "frequently" as applied to the use of the ל seems to the writer an overstatement; also König *Lehrgebäude* III, p. 35f.

reflexives in Hebrew we may draw two conclusions. The first is that the use of the Hithpael as a passive is sufficiently frequent to constitute a presumption in favor of the possibility of such a use in the case of the verb "to bless." The other is that the mention of the agent after the passive would be infrequent to say the least.

III. THE VERB "TO BLESS" IN HEBREW

While it is clear that a correct understanding of the use of the verb stems in Hebrew and in the cognate languages is of value for the study of the meaning and usage followed by any special word or root, it is also true that such facts as we learn from this broader study are not conclusive of themselves. We cannot substitute *a priori* reasoning for the inductive method without running the risk of establishing the theoretical correctness of a usage for the actual occurrence of which there may be no adequate evidence. Usage in language does not follow such clearly predictable lines that we can say, "This expression is theoretically correct. Therefore, it is good current usage." In fact certain peculiarities at once emerge in connection with our study of the verb "bless" which may be regarded as more or less distinctive. Thus, we observe that while the verb is used in both the active and the passive sense, the former is regularly expressed by the Piel (70% of total occurrences), while for the latter the passive participle of the Kal is usually employed (22% of total occurrences).⁶² The Pual (13 times), Niphal (3 times), Hithpael (7 times) are all of relatively infrequent occurrence. It is to be noted also that the verb is used in two ways: to describe God's blessing as pronounced or invoked upon His creatures, and man's blessing as pronounced or invoked upon God or upon his fellowmen. This difference between the "human" and the "divine" blessing involves an important distinction in meaning which Cremer in discussing the Greek equivalent has well expressed

⁶² In this respect the usage of the Hebrew resembles that of the Aramaic and not of the Arabic. In the Arabic the Simple Stem is not used in the sense of "bless" (cf. Lane's *Lexicon, in loco*).

as follows: "The difference is this—the human *εὐλογεῖν* of God is an exaltation with words, the divine *εὐλογεῖν* is an exaltation by act." We shall now proceed to examine into (1) the use of the verb in the different stems in which it is found and (2) its syntax, especially the use of the preposition "in" (כ) which always follows the Niphal and Hithpael forms.

1. The Forms of the Verb "To Bless."

a. The Piel and Pual.

The verb occurs about 225 times in the Piel stem and is usually found in the perfect, imperfect or imperative; the infinitives occur 25 times; and the participle is found 5 times. The verb nearly always has both a personal subject and object expressed. It is used of God blessing His creatures (e.g. Gen. ix. 1, cf. ii. 3), and of man blessing God (e.g. Ps. xvi. 7) or his fellowmen (e.g. Gen. xlvii. 7). It may be used in a narrative of past time (e.g. Gen. xviii. 15), and it may express a prayer (e.g. 1 Chron. iv. 10, Gen. xxviii. 3) or a promise (e.g. Gen. xxvi. 24) for the future.

The Pual occurs 7 times in the imperfect and 6 times in the participle. It is used as a passive of the Piel. Yet it is to be noted that in two instances where the Piel participle is coupled with the passive, the form which is used is not as we might expect the Pual but the *Ḳal* participle: "and blessed (*Ḳal*) be he that blesseth (Piel) thee" (Gen. xxvii. 29, Num. xxiv. 9), which seems to indicate a tendency to avoid using Piel and Pual in the same sentence. This may be due simply to a desire to vary the expression, or to the fact of the far greater frequency of the *Ḳal* participle. But at least it shows that the *Ḳal* passive participle was practically equivalent to a passive of the Piel.⁶³

b. The *Ḳal* Passive Participle.⁶⁴

This form occurs quite frequently, being found, as we have

⁶³ Cf. Lev. xiv. where as we have already seen the Hithpael participle is, according to the pointing, used a dozen times and apparently as the passive of the Piel.

⁶⁴ The only other forms of the *Ḳal* which occur are two imperfects (2 Chron. vi. 13, Ps. xc. 6), in both of which the meaning is "kneel." It

seen, 71 times.⁶⁵ It occurs usually in the benediction or formula of blessing: "blessed be . . .!" It ascribes blessing to God about 40 times: e.g. "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem" (Gen. ix. 26). About half as frequently it invokes blessing upon men (e.g. Ruth ii. 19).⁶⁶ There are also about a dozen instances where the expression is more properly to be regarded as declarative (e.g. Deut. xxviii. 3ff.).⁶⁷

c. The Niphal.

This stem is found as we have seen only three times in the Old Testament, and in passages all of which refer to the Abrahamic blessing (Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxviii. 14). All three are rendered in LXX and Vulgate as passive and this use of the Niphal is in general so frequent that the burden of proof clearly rests on those who insist on the reflexive sense. Since the Pual occurs so seldom there is no valid reason why the Niphal should not be used as a passive. The frequent use of the passive participle *Ḳal* might be alleged as a ground for assuming that the Niphal is to be taken in its original sense as a reflexive. But as we have seen this use of the *Ḳal* is very largely restricted to the formula of benediction.

d. The Hithpael.

This stem is used 7 times: 4 times in the perfect (Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, Deut. xxix. 19, Jer. iv. 2), twice in the imperfect (Ps. lxxii. 17, Isa. lxv. 16) and once as participle (Isa. lxv. 16). That this stem *may* be used as a reflexive seems to be generally admitted. Indeed it is only to be expected that this would be so. We shall look first at the passages where it is rendered by the *reflexive* in the AV.

is interesting to compare the verb "speak" (דבר) which occurs 1142 times, all but 53 times of which are Piel. Of the 53 all but 14 are in the *Ḳal* active participle.

⁶⁵ With the exception of the passive participles of the verbs "to write" (113 times) and "muster" (75 times) the passive participle of this verb occurs more frequently than any other in Hebrew. It is about twice as frequent as the same form from "curse" (ארר) which is found 37 times.

⁶⁶ The verb "to be" (jussive) is used four times (1 Kgs. x. 9, Prov. v. 18, Ruth ii. 19, 2 Chron. ix. 8).

⁶⁷ The verb "to be" (imperfect) is used twice (Gen. xxvii. 33, Deut. vii. 14).

(1) Deut. xxix. 18 "And it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse that he *bless himself* in his heart saying, I shall have peace," etc. Here the Vulgate treats the verb as reflexive (*benedicat sibi in corde suo*). The LXX renders by the middle voice which may of course be reflexive (*ἐπιφημίσηται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ*). That such an inference may be drawn from the words which follow, "saying, I shall have peace," cannot be denied. Perhaps the meaning is "pronounce a blessing on oneself." The wicked man changes the curse which God pronounces on his disobedience into a blessing which he pronounces on himself. Still the reflexive force cannot be regarded as certainly present. The meaning may be simply that the wicked when he hears God's servant pronounce the curses will "in his heart," i.e. inaudibly, substitute the word "blessed" for "cursed" as applying to transgressors in general and not merely to himself, although he is himself most vitally concerned.

(2) Isa. lxxv. 16 "That he who *blesseth himself* in the earth shall *bless himself* in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth," etc. Here the Vulgate renders by the passive (*qui benedictus est . . . benedicetur in Deo amen*). The LXX renders the first verb (the participle) by the passive, the other by the active voice: "(a name) which shall be blessed upon the earth; for they shall bless the true God." Here the reflexive use is not at all obvious. "Bless" stands in parallelism with "swear." The latter may involve the idea of "advantage or disadvantage," but is clearly not reflexive in the strict sense of the word. If, as seems probable, "bless by the God of truth" means pronounce a blessing in the name of the God of truth, it would be more natural to take the word as implying the pronouncing of a blessing upon *another* than upon oneself. In the formula of blessing we read frequently "Blessed be thou (he, she, etc.)," but never "Blessed be I." And while there are a few instances where the speaker invokes a blessing on himself as in 1 Chron. iv. 10 (cf. Gen. xxvii. 19, 31, 34, 38, 2 Sam. vii. 29, Ps. xxviii. 9, lvii. 2) such examples are exceptional.

Usually the blessing is invoked upon another than the speaker.

(3) Jer. iv. 2 b "And the nations shall *bless themselves* in him, and in him shall they glory." The reflexive rendering of the AV is not supported by the LXX and Vulgate which employ the future active (*εὐλογήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῷ*; *benedicent eum*). While the reflexive force is possible here, the same objection holds against it as in the previous instances. The expression "and thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth" with which the verse begins seems to imply at least that gentile peoples shall use the name of the *Lord* in the blessings which they invoke as well as in the oaths which they swear. Implying as it will their recognition that He is the source of blessing, the thought of advantage (middle sense) is clearly present. But that the primary thought is of naming themselves as the recipients of the blessing, is not clear.

In the three remaining passages the AV and RV, render the verb by the *passive*.

(1) In Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4 the words "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" are rendered in the LXX by the passive ([*ἐν*] *εὐλογηθήσονται*) a rendering of these two Hithpael which corresponds exactly with the rendering of the three Niphals (Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxviii. 14) all five passages being rendered as passives. The Vulgate likewise renders by the passive in all of the five (Gen. xviii uses the gerundive). This seems clearly to imply that the LXX and Jerome instead of translating the Niphals in the light of the original use of the Hithpael i.e. as reflexives, preferred to render the Hithpael in accordance with a well established use of the Niphel, i.e. the passive.

(2) Ps. lxxii. 17. "All nations shall be blessed in him" seems to apply the language of the Abrahamic promise to the Messianic king. Here also the LXX and Vulgate render by the passive.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ In all the five passages in Genesis, (the Niphel as well as the Hithpael), the Samaritan, Babylonian (Onkelos) and Jerusalem (Pseudo-Jonathan) Targums render by the Ethpael. That this can be taken as a passive, can hardly be denied. That it is to be so taken seems probable. In

To prove that the passive rendering is wrong in these three passages or in any one of them, it would be necessary to show that this verb must in Hebrew have only one meaning and that this meaning must be the reflexive. This cannot be done. We have seen that the reflexives show in Hebrew as in other Semitic languages a tendency to become passives, and that this may have occurred at an early date. To support this we have in the case of the verb "bless" the evidence of the early versions.

2. The Syntax of "Bless."

In studying the syntax of "bless" it is well to begin with the Piel, partly because it is of such frequent occurrence, but more especially because having active force its syntax is the simplest and clearest.

a. The Active (Piel).

Two points are especially to be noted (1) that usually the subject and object are both expressed. The subject is either God or man, the object is either man or God. Thus we read: "And God blessed Noah" (Gen. ix. 1); "and Eli blessed Elkanah" (1 Sam. ii. 20); "for there they blessed the Lord" (2 Chron. xx. 26). Or as referring to the future: "The Lord bless thee and keep thee" (Num. vi. 24); "and I will bless

all of these passages the Arabic uses the same form, the Vth stem. Lane, as we have seen, gives as the meaning of this form when occurring in the same construction as in these five passages, *i.e.*, with the preposition "in": "*He had a blessing; and he was, or became, blest; by means of him, or it.*" This corresponds very closely to the commonly accepted interpretation of these passages. Lane adds: "*but very often signifying he looked for a blessing by means of him, or it; he regarded him or it, as a means of obtaining a blessing; he augured good from him, or it.*"

In the case of the three other passages there is no such uniformity of rendering. In Ps. lxxii. 17 and Jer. iv. 2 the Targum and the Syriac use the same verb-form as in the Genesis passages. The Arabic uses the VIth stem in Ps. lxxii (cf. the Ethiopic) instead of the Vth, but the IIIrd in Jer. iv. 2. The same is true of Isa. lxy. 16 except that the Targum uses the Piel instead of the Ethpaal and the Arabic the IIIrd. In Deut. xxix. 19 the Samaritan uses the same verb form as in the Genesis passages. But the Babylonian Targum and the Syriac render by the verb "think" (חשב), one using the Piel, the other the Ethpeel. The Arabic renders by "meditate" or "determine" (קרה).

them" (Num. vi. 27); "I will bless the Lord" (Ps. xvi. 7).⁶⁹ (2) It is to be noted further that a phrase introduced by the preposition "in" (כּ) is used a number of times with the Piel. Obviously כּ cannot in these instances be used of the agent. It is possible to distinguish several different uses. It denotes: (a) the time of blessing: "at all times" (Ps. xxxiv. 2); (b) the scope of the blessing: "in everything" (Gen. xxiv. 1; cf. Job i. 5, Ps. lxviii. 26); (c) the manner of uttering it: "with his mouth" (Ps. lxii. 4), "with a loud voice" (Prov. xxvii. 14); (d) the Deity by whose authority the blessing is pronounced: "in his (the Lord's) name" (Deut. x. 8, xxi. 5, 1 Chron. xxiii. 13);⁷⁰ (e) the example of the blessedness desired: "in (by) thee shall Israel be blessed" (Gen. xlviii. 20), where the words "God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh" (cf. Ruth iv. 11, 12) seem most naturally to be interpretative of the "in thee" or "by thee" which precedes.

b. The Passive (Pual and K̄al)

Since the active forms of the blessing seem to be sufficiently clear the question now arises as to the construction with the passive. Turning first to the Pual we find that in it the subject is either man (e.g. Ps. cxxviii. 4) or God (i.e. His name, Job i. 21, Ps. cxiii. 2), and that in all but two of the thirteen instances the agent is not named. But in "Blessed of the Lord be his land" (Deut. xxxiii. 13) and "For such as be blessed of him" (Ps. xxxvii. 22) the personal agent is clearly expressed by the genitive of the noun and by the pronominal suffix respectively. In 2 Sam. vii. 29 "and with (כּ) thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed," the prepositional clause is expressive of means or instrument. The preposition "in" (כּ) does not occur after the Pual.

Turning to the passive participle K̄al we observe that while

⁶⁹ In the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus (xliv. 21) the Blessing is referred to in the following way "Therefore he assured him by an oath that he would bless the nations in his seed," etc. The Hebrew uses the Piel inf. cstr. which the LXX renders by *ἐνελογηθῆναι*, perhaps being influenced in favor of the passive by the five passives of the LXX.

⁷⁰ This use of the preposition is parallel to that found with verbs of swearing (e.g. Isa. lxxv. 16) and cursing (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 43).

the subject is either the human being or God, the agent (God) is only rarely introduced: *viz.*, by the genitive (3 times)⁷¹, by the preposition ל (8 times).⁷² In two instances where בן is used the agent is clearly not referred to: Deut. vii. 14 "Thou shalt be blessed above all people," Deut. xxxiii. 24 "Let Asher be blessed with children." In none of these unquestioned passives is the personal agent introduced by "in" (ב).

c. Turning to the Niphal and Hithpael passages we find that the data just given have important bearing upon the understanding of the use of the preposition ב, with these stems.

(1) The preposition is used in a local sense in: "in the land" (Isa. lxxv. 16), "in his heart" (Deut. xxix. 19). This is closely akin to the temporal use cited above.

(2) The Deity by whose authority the blessing is invoked or pronounced seems to be introduced in "shall bless (himself) by the God of truth" (Isa. xlv. 14); cf. the phrase "swear by the God of truth" with which it stands in parallelism. Perhaps "and the nations shall bless (themselves) by him" (Jer. iv. 2) is also an example of this usage in view of the clause which precedes, "And thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment and in righteousness."

(3) There remain to be considered the five passages which refer to the Abrahamic Blessing and Ps. lxxii. 17. In all of these the AV renders by "in" following the LXX (ἐν) and Vulgate (*in*) which is a literal rendering of the Hebrew ב.⁷³ This preposition may be interpreted in several different senses. The promise being made *to* Abraham, the blessing was in a very real sense *in* Abraham; and it was

⁷¹ Gen. xxiv. 31, xxvi. 29, Isa. lxxv. 23.

⁷² Gen. xiv. 19, Judg. xvii. 2, Ruth ii. 20, iii. 10, 1 Sam. xv. 13, xxiii. 21, 2 Sam. ii. 5, Ps. cxv. 15.

⁷³ The Targum of Onkelos interprets by בריל apparently in the sense of "on account of." The Samaritan, the Syriac Peshitto, and the Arabic all use the ב of the Hebrew. The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan renders in Gen. xii. 3 by the simple ב; elsewhere it varies the expression somewhat and usually refers to the "righteousness" of Abraham or his seed as the ground (?) of the Blessing.

consequently *in, through, or with*, Abraham that the nations were to be blessed. All of these meanings can be expressed by the **ב** of the Hebrew; and as Olshausen points out the meaning "with" is especially favored by Gal. iii. 9 where after the promise is quoted in vs. 8, the explanation is added "So then they which be of faith are blessed with (*σύν*) faithful Abraham."

The only conclusion which can be drawn from this study of the syntax seems to be that the use of the preposition "in" (**ב**) after the Hithpael and Niphal does not introduce the agent. The AV and RV translators have acted wisely in avoiding the rendering "by" which after the passive would naturally be regarded as introducing the agent. On the other hand there is no sufficient warrant for arguing that because this preposition is used after all the Niphals and Hithpael, all should be regarded as reflexives. The preposition **ב** has too many possible meanings for this argument to be valid; and the fact that the LXX and Vulgate did not render the seven Hithpael all alike is a strong argument against such a supposition.

IV. THE NEW TESTAMENT CITATIONS

The Blessing of Abraham is expressly cited in the New Testament in Acts iii. 25, "And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed" (*καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου εὐλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς*) and in Gal. iii. 8, "in thee shall all nations be blessed" (*ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*). It is to be noted that neither of these citations is a strictly literal rendering of the original Hebrew, nor does either of them follow the LXX rendering of any one of the five passages in Genesis exactly. The three Niphal passages centre the blessing as far as this phrase is concerned all but exclusively in Abraham: "in thee" (Gen. xii. 3), "in him" (Gen. xviii. 18), "in thee" (Gen. xxviii. 14); only one of the three passages, the last, adds the words "and in thy seed." On the other hand the two Hithpael passages speak of the descendants of Abraham and not of himself, "in thy

seed" (Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4). Consequently when Acts iii. 25 uses the phrase "in thy seed," it would be natural to think of xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4, the Hithpael passages, as referred to. Yet the reference there to "kindreds" (*πατριάι* = משפחות) points to Gen. xii. 3 or xxviii. 14, where the Niphal is used. It would be possible to think that Gen. xxviii. 14 is referred to and quoted in abbreviated form. But since the quotation is introduced as spoken to Abraham we should hardly expect to find it cited in the form in which it was renewed to Jacob. Consequently it seems probable that in Acts iii. 25 the speaker has combined the phraseology of Gen. xii. 3 with that of xxii. 18, xxvi. 4. This is favored by the citation in Gal. iii. 8 where the "in thee" points apparently to xii. 3, while the "nations" is probably taken from xviii. 18. In short the New Testament writers have apparently quoted the language of the promise with some freedom not restricting themselves to the phraseology of any one passage but using those phrases which appear in them that were best suited to their purpose. The inference would, therefore, seem to be justified that they did this because they regarded all five as saying practically the same thing. Consequently it would be arbitrary we believe to claim that the New Testament quotations are based only on the Niphal passages and that the use of the passive in the New Testament citations can have no bearing on the significance of the Hithpael. For the LXX renders all five verbs by passives; and if the correctness of this rendering be admitted for the Niphals the proposal of Dr. McFadyen himself that all be rendered alike, would militate against an attempt to draw a distinction between these passages. It seems, therefore, not only permissible but even necessary to recognize in the passive rendering of the New Testament a clear indication and proof not merely that the Niphal may be passive, as Dr. McFadyen admits, but that the Hithpael, which he declares can only be reflexive, may also be passive and is to be so interpreted in the Blessing. At all events to maintain as Dr. McFadyen does that both the Hithpael and the Niphal passages are to be treated as reflexives brings the rendering

adopted by the critics into direct conflict with the New Testament citations and their Apostolic interpretation.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the evidence which has been presented in the foregoing discussion the conclusion is warranted we believe that the rendering of the Abrahamic Blessing adopted by the Authorized Version rests upon good authority and should be accepted. There are two principal arguments in its favor. On the one hand we have the recognized tendency of the reflexives in the Semitic languages, including Hebrew, to develop a passive significance, a tendency which is found at least as early as the time of Abraham. On the other hand we have the witness of the New Testament and of such ancient and important versions as the Septuagint and Vulgate, that this tendency did appear in the Old Testament in a number of verbs among which the verb "bless" is to be included.

In the light of the evidence, the statements of Dr. McFadyen are seen to be too sweeping. It is correct to say that the Hithpael was originally reflexive. It is not the fact that it can *only* be reflexive. It is correct to say that the Hithpael of "bless" may be, and perhaps in several instances is, reflexive. It cannot be proved that it can *only* be reflexive. It is true that the similarity between the Niphal and Hithpael references to the Abrahamic Blessing favors the rendering of the five verbs in the same way. It does not follow that this rendering must be the reflexive. Dr. McFadyen's sweeping assertions must be modified to accord with the evidence; and the evidence supports the familiar rendering of the Authorized Version.

The attention of the reader was directed at the commencement of this study to Robinson's "colloquial" rendering of Gen. xii. 3: "All the nations of the world shall regard you as a type of the prosperous man,"—a rendering which Dr. McFadyen assures us, "well brings out the meaning." In view of the appalling way in which this rendering secularizes this glorious promise and robs it of its richest meaning, it is

gratifying to find that its correctness is not established by those strictly philological considerations which Dr. McFadyen has advanced in its support. Between the Old Testament prophecy and the New Testament interpretation there is no conflict. Modern philological science supports the New Testament use of the group of Old Testament passages of which Gen. xii. 3 is the first. If the critics reject the New Testament interpretation they must do so because their rationalistic reconstruction of the Old Testament leaves no room for so striking a prediction, and because the pronounced universalism of the Blessing is out of harmony with their theory that the ancient Hebrews worshipped a "tribal god," whose domain was as restricted as his power was limited. But this god of the rationalistic critic is not the God of the Bible, the God of Christian faith. The God who called Abraham was "the God of heaven and the God of the earth" (Gen. xxiv. 3). It was the Creator of the heaven and the earth (Gen. i. 1), who chose the seed of Abraham to be to Him a peculiar people, that through them all nations might be blessed. The Blessing of Abraham assures us that the particularism of the Old Testament religion is not to be explained by the evolutionist's theory of a gradual development of the god-idea in Israel through animism, polytheism, henotheism to the ethical monotheism of the Prophets and Apostles, but that the universalism of Isaiah and of Paul was clearly present in it from the beginning, not as a mere "surmise," but as a sure promise which the eternal and unchanging God had made unto Abraham His friend, and which He fulfilled in the gift of His Son to be the Saviour of the World.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.