

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

one with God in respect to Christ. And all harmony and peace centre there. So far as we know or can understand, there is nothing that occupies the mind of God so deeply, and touches so vitally His relations with the creatures, as the kingdom and honour of His Son Jesus Christ; there is nothing that pleases Him so much as our attachment to Christ. "The Father Himself loveth you," said Jesus to His disciples, "because you have loved Me, and believed that I came out from the Father." In Him God is reconciling the world to Himself. Upon faith in Him our individual destiny turns,—and the fate of society and nations. Only when we think aright of Christ are we in unison with God. Only when we think aright of Christ and are rightly disposed toward Him, can we have fellowship with each other, and work together with God for the world's redemption.

*Life, manifestation, fellowship*: these three words resume the teaching of the first paragraph of the Epistle.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

### WELLHAUSEN'S "MINOR PROPHETS."<sup>1</sup>

It must be confessed that there is something disappointing in the appearance presented by this book when one first opens it. The translation of the prophetic writings begins on the first page without a word of preface or introduction, and at the end of the translation the notes on the several books are found. To English readers this cannot but appear abrupt. They miss the help which is afforded by a general statement of the author's aims and views. They prefer to see the relations between the several parts of a work like this explicitly set forth. To the latter point it will be

<sup>1</sup> *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. Von J. Wellhausen, Fünftes Heft. *Die Kleinen Propheten*. Uebersetzt, mit Noten. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

necessary to return almost immediately; meanwhile we content ourselves with acknowledging that Wellhausen is not alone in following this method,<sup>1</sup> and that the position of this volume in the series of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* goes some way towards justifying the course pursued.

Merely to mention the prominent features which characterize *Die Kleinen Propheten* would be an unprofitable procedure. At the risk of dealing with it in what may seem a fragmentary manner, we must content ourselves with indicating the chronological order which has been adopted, and selecting a few instances of textual criticism and exposition.

I. The order in which the minor prophets here stand is as follows: Amos, Hosea, Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Obadiah, Joel.<sup>2</sup> Amos, then, stands first and Joel last in the "goodly fellowship of the prophets." The present writer believes this to be correct, but it is not yet universally admitted. To say nothing of English authors, the Reuss-Erichson version of the Old Testament, which is now being published in Germany, upholds, though with some hesitation, the priority of Joel. And this is a subject which we should have liked to see fully discussed in *Die Kleinen Propheten*. The notes on Joel do indeed point out the dependence of this prophet on the second part of Zechariah and on Ezekiel, a fact which of itself evinces the lateness of his date. But we miss that full and impressive exhibition of the reasons for believing that Joel wrote not much, if any, earlier than 400 B.C. which Wellhausen could have given—the omission of all mention of a king, with the assumption that the initiative rests with priests and elders; the con-

<sup>1</sup> Kautzsch's *Bibelwerk*, now appearing, is constructed on similar lines.

<sup>2</sup> On Jonah, see below. Except that the positions occupied by Zephaniah and Nahum are reversed, the same chronological scheme is adopted in the new translation which is now appearing under the editorship of Kautzsch.

centration of the prophet's attention on the South, in a manner which is best explained on the ground that the Northern Kingdom no longer exists; the language of such passages as iv. 1-7, which can hardly refer to a smaller calamity than that of the Exile; the mention of Jerusalem as a sanctuary, which fits best the troublous experiences after the return from Babylon; the sentiment of ii. 16, compared with the Post-Exilic Psalm li. And when we remember how confidently it has been stated that Amos i. 2 is an imitation of Joel iii. 16, we feel that the relation between the two needs to be clearly understood. Perhaps the comparison of Amos i. 2 with the section that follows, extending from i. 3 to ii. 5, will elucidate the point. Obviously the verse in question is meant to serve as a title to or summary of the section. As obviously it does not serve this end. The drought which burns up the pastures near Tekoa and withers the foliage of Carmel has no connexion with the punishments inflicted on Damascus, Gaza, or Moab. The editor of the Minor Prophets, when they were incorporated in the canon, thinking that the cycle of denunciations required an exordium, built up this verse out of Joel's phraseology, and that with all the greater ease because he found points of connexion in Amos iii. 4, ix. 3.

In Orelli's interesting commentary on the Minor Prophets few things were so unsatisfactory as his declaration that Obadiah occupies the first position chronologically and should be read first. Stronger arguments than his would be required to set aside the apparently direct reference of vv. 10-16 to the overwhelming calamity of the destruction of temple and city by Nebuchadnezzar. And two noteworthy considerations are adduced by Wellhausen. He points out that the language in which the injuries inflicted on Edom are described implies that the spoilers were small nomadic tribes. And he traces succinctly the course of that nomadic movement which began in the sixth century B.C.

and reached its climax in the settlement of the Arabs in Petra at any rate before 312 B.C.

There is no special novelty in the treatment of Jonah. "It is a legend, a narrative in the style of the Midrash." Its object, we are told, was to still the impatience of the members of the theocracy, who could not understand God's longsuffering with the heathen. Dr. C. H. H. Wright<sup>1</sup> appears to regard this view as inconsistent with "a belief in the Divine inspiration and authority of the book." But it is difficult to understand why a parable written with a didactic purpose should be less divine than a "propheticohistorical allegory" which is admitted to be *not historical*. Budde's article in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1892, p. 37 ff., referred to by Wellhausen, is well worth reading.

II. For the most part it will be impossible to keep separate our discussion of the textual alterations and the expositions contained in the book before us. The former so often depend on exegetical considerations, and the latter are so obviously determined by the former, that we must blend them in our examination of a few passages taken almost at random.

We begin with the Book of Amos. Verses 9-12 of the first chapter are omitted from the text as being an interpolation. The chief reasons for thus judging of *vv.* 9, 10 are that "the reproach addressed to Tyre is precisely the same (*ganz der gleiche*) as that against Gaza, that nothing is said of the other Phœnician States, and that the threat comes to an end without the usual concluding formula." But if the reproach were identical with that against Gaza, it is, at any rate, most suitably brought against Tyre, the Phœnicians being the great slave-dealers of antiquity. In point of fact, however, there is a difference between the two reproaches. The Tyrians are spoken of as mere middlemen, delivering up the slaves to Edom; the Philistines are

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 210.

represented as first raiding the country for slaves and then selling them. And why should the mention of the other Phœnician States be necessary? Tyre, now the principal State, might well represent the whole. The absence of the words with which most of the threats close is also as likely in the original writer as in an interpolator. The arguments for the omission of *vv.* 11, 12 are stronger. At so early a period as that of Amos we should have expected Sela to be mentioned rather than Tema and Bozrah. And charges of cruelty are not usually brought against Edom prior to the Chaldean period. On the other hand the cycle would not be complete without Edom. And there is a vast difference between the definiteness of the complaints at Obadiah 10-14 and Psalm cxxxvii. 7 and the indefinite and ambiguous Amos i. 11. If Edom was regularly engaged in the slave-trade, as we learn from *v.* 6 was the case, this might easily lead to sanguinary excesses. For many years Wellhausen has held the opinion which Stade expressed in the second volume of his History, that Amos ii. 4, 5 is due to a later hand. The writer of this notice shares that opinion, but not for the reasons adduced in Wellhausen's Notes. To him the conclusive reason is the expression, "And their lies caused them to err, after the which their fathers walked." Idolatry was not the sin against which Amos and his immediate successors testified. And there is a distinctly later flavour in this designation of the false gods as "lies" or "deceits."

Amos iv. 3 is the despair of textual critics and commentators. Wellhausen accepts the passive form of the verb, in accordance with the LXX. ἀπορρίψήσασθε, and leaves יהדורמונה untranslated. He differs, rightly, from some of his predecessors in maintaining that when the fate of the women only is being described the name of the land to which they are to be cast forth will not be mentioned. To this we may add that even when the entire nation is spoken

of Amos does not state definitely the land of their destined exile (see v. 27 and note the indefinite נו of vi. 14). To make a fresh suggestion for the settlement of the text is hazardous, but might we read **מֵאַרְמְנֵי־כֶן** for **הַהַרְמוֹנָה**? The word **אַרְמְנוֹת** is characteristic of Amos. The changes required in the consonants are few and not violent. The sense, a good one in itself, is almost precisely parallel to that in Micah ii, 9.

Amos v. 26 is one of the most difficult in the book. Our author regards it as an interpolation, because the prophet nowhere else accuses the Israelites of the worship of foreign gods, but reproves simply their corrupt service of Yahweh, and their superstitious reliance on the *opus operatum*. Besides this the intercourse between Israel and Assyria up to this date had been neither of the nature nor of the extent which would explain the adoption of two Assyrian deities as the principal gods of Israel. This, or something approaching this, is clearly implied in the verse we are considering. Wellhausen deletes **כִּי־וַיִּן** as a gloss on **כִּי־וַיִּן** and **צַלְמֵיכֶם** as a gloss on **אֱלֹהֵיכֶם**. These are purely conjectural emendations, and the present writer sees no sufficient reason for abandoning a conclusion which he has elsewhere set forth that **צַל'** is an integral part of the text, but that **צַל'** and **אֵל'** have been accidentally transposed owing to their similarity in form. The remainder of the note errs, if at all, on the side of caution. It refers to the well-known passage in Schrader's *Keilinschriften* (p. 443), but does not fully accept his identification of the **סִכּוֹת** of our text with *Sak-kuth*. To many cautious students there seems no need of hesitation on this score: the point that does still remain unsettled is the name by which this god was more usually known.

Amos ix. 1 is another *crux*. Wellhausen renders: "Smite the capital so that the thresholds may shake, . . . and I will, etc." There are two competing interpretations.

The first is that which makes **דפד** = architraves. As Marti, in Kautzsch's *Bibelwerk*, puts it, giving *Gesimse* in his text: "Das Wort bedeutet sonst 'Schwellen'; hier wohl die Überschwellen (Architrave)." The first words of our quotation contain a strong argument against the suggestion with which it ends. If the word is nowhere else used with this signification, we shall not be entitled to adopt it here unless the common meaning is quite out of place. The other explanation is that given by Prof. Robertson Smith.<sup>1</sup> He argues that Jachin and Boaz (1 Kings vii.) "were built on the model of those altar-candlesticks which we find represented on Phœnician monuments," and that the altar at Bethel may have been "a pillar crowned by a sort of capital bearing a bowl like those at Jerusalem." Accordingly he renders: "Smite the capital till the bowls ring again, and dash them in pieces on the heads of the worshippers." This would be very attractive if it were well grounded. But if Jachin and Boaz were ever used as altars every trace of this has been effectually removed from the narrative. And the figure in Perrot et Chipiez to which Prof. Smith refers would appear to represent an object too low to be compared with Solomon's pillars and credited with sufficient weight to crush the Israelites to death. On the whole, it is best to adhere to the ordinary view and picture to ourselves the worshippers assembled in front of the temple, when a blow is struck, which makes it quiver from roof to basement, from capital of pillar to threshold, so that it falls in ruins and overwhelms the crowd (cf. Judges xvi. 30). The reasons adduced by Wellhausen for leaving **בצעם** untranslated are very forcible: a further indication of the uncertainty of the text is the omission of the suffix by the LXX.; the suffix may be a mistaken reduplication of the **ב** with which the next word opens.

The text of the Book of Micah has suffered so much in

<sup>1</sup> *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 468-470.



transmission that we turn with peculiar interest to its treatment by so competent a critic. How deeply he feels the difficulty of the task is seen by his leaving no fewer than six words or phrases in the first chapter untranslated and five in the second. We have not space for the discussion of these passages, some of which, perhaps, are not so hopelessly corrupt as Wellhausen believes. Three other texts shall be briefly referred to.

For *אתנניה*, Micah i. 7, *אשריה* is suggested. This is, at least, well worthy of consideration. Considering what is said of the fate of the *את* at the end of the verse, it is improbable that they would be represented as burnt at the very outset. And if they are taken to belong to the same class of objects as the *פסילים* and *עצבים*, the *σάλας*, of the Peshitta and the *טעתהא* of the Targum find a natural explanation.

The problematic *בכו* of Micah i. 10 is represented in the new translation by "in Bekaim," and the note says: "According to Vollers the LXX. probably read *בבכים* for *בכו*. Accho lay quite out of the beat." Yet, notwithstanding the authority of Vollers, it may be doubted whether *Βαχείμ* belongs to the genuine LXX. Had they given *Βαχείμ* at Judges ii. 1, 5, there could have been very little doubt remaining. But in those passages we find *Κλαυθμῶν* and *Κλαυθμῶνες*. And if Accho is out of the question, why is not Gath also? As Cheyne says, "The choice of the town would be dictated by the love of paronomasia," *i.e.*, by a literary, not a geographical consideration. The opinion that *בעכו* was corrupted into *בכו* has not yet been proved unreasonable.

At Micah v. 5, the word *בפתחיה* is left untranslated, and in the note the query is proposed, "*בפתחי חרב = בפתחיה?*" To this query it will surely be necessary to return a negative reply. Such a reference by the suffix to the noun *חרב* in the preceding clause would be an ambiguity not very conso-

nant to the genius of the language. What is wanted is a noun parallel to *חרב*, and this is found in the word *פתיחה*, a drawn sword, the plural form of which is used at Psalm lv. 22, and is there understood by all the Versions to mean a weapon. Part of Jerome's note on our passage deserves quoting: "In eo ubi ego et Aquila transtulimus, *in lanceis ejus*. . . . Quinta Editio, *ἐν παραξίφεσιν αὐτῶν*, quod nos possumus dicere, *in sicis eorum*: In Hebræo autem positum est ΒΑΡΗΤΗΕ."

We now turn to a totally different specimen of our author's powers. Many of us have felt that notwithstanding its irresistible impressiveness, there is something jagged and disjointed in the fourth chapter of Zechariah, and that the attempts to explain its symbolism, which presuppose the present arrangement of verses, fail to carry conviction. When Orelli, for example, regards the lamps as symbolizing the fact that the restored community should be God's light-bearer to the world at large the question at once arises whether this was the thought adapted to strengthen the Jews of Zechariah's congregation. When Hitzig and Steiner follow the Massoretic accentuation in v. 10, making the eyes of Yahweh "rejoice and see the plummet, etc.," we cannot but deem this a straining both of language and of sense. Wellhausen's re-arrangement of the verses may be a bold one, but it removes confusion and produces a text which would satisfy the needs it was meant to meet. Justice cannot be done to the attempt without a complete translation:—"And the angel that talked with me came again and waked me, as a man that is wakened out of his sleep. And he said unto me, What seest thou? I said, I see a candlestick all of gold, with a bowl upon it and seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes for the lamps, and two olive trees by it, one upon the right side of the candlestick and the other upon the left side thereof. And I answered and said to the angel that talked with me,

What meaneth this, my lord? And the angel that talked with me answered and said to me, Knowest thou not what this meaneth? I said, No, my lord. And he answered and said to me, These seven lamps are the eyes of Jahveh that go to and fro through the whole earth. And I answered and said to him, What are the two olive trees to the right and left of the candlestick? And he said to me, Knowest thou not what these mean? I said, No, my lord. He said, These are the two anointed ones that stand before the Lord of the whole earth." Then follow 6-10a, as an independent passage, containing the promise that in spite of all hindrances Zerubbabel shall complete the building of the temple.<sup>1</sup> Now it must be freely admitted that several of the details of this translation are open to question. But it is equally plain that the passage as a whole is made more intelligible. The first section, thus arranged, contains a clear and relevant answer to the question proposed in v. 4. The second section gains in force by being detached. The omission of v. 12 as an interpolation is a distinct gain; apart from this verse, any one can form a picture of the lamp-stand and lamps of the vision: keep this verse and the shape becomes unthinkable.

In bringing these necessarily fragmentary remarks to a close it is only fair to add that their fragmentariness does *Die Kleinen Propheten* an injustice. So much else in it deserves examination, and the examination ought to be more exhaustive. But enough has been said to indicate that Wellhausen has given us another most welcome aid to our studies of the Old Testament. Some of the renderings are too free to commend themselves to a conservative taste: there are cases in which they tend to obliterate idiosyncrasies of style. Some of the alterations proposed in the text would

<sup>1</sup> This involves a slight alteration in the rendering of 10a: "For they that have despised the day of small beginnings shall rejoice when they see the keystone in the hand of Zerubbabel."

be more likely to win acceptance if the reasons for them were stated. But taken altogether this small book of two hundred pages is "full of matter," embodying the best results of the most recent inquiry, and bearing in every line the impress of a fresh and independent mind.

JOHN TAYLOR.

### *PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.*

#### II. PAUL'S RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

A STUDY of Paul's conception of Christianity may very fitly begin with an enquiry into his religious history, for two reasons. First, because his theology is to an unusual extent the outgrowth of his experience. He is as remote as possible in his whole way of thinking from the scholastic theologian, being eminently subjective, psychological, autobiographical in spirit and method. In this he resembles Luther, and indeed all the chief actors in epochs of fresh religious intuition. Next, because acquaintance with the Apostle's spiritual history helps us to assume a sympathetic appreciative attitude towards a theology which, though utterly non-scholastic in spirit, yet, owing its existence to controversy, deals to a considerable extent in forms of thought and expression belonging to the period, which, to modern readers are apt to wear an aspect of foreignness. How many words occur in Paul's letters bearing apparently a peculiar technical meaning; words the signification of which cannot easily be ascertained, remaining still, after all the theological discussion they have provoked, of doubtful import. Law, righteousness, justification, adoption, flesh, spirit—words these eminently Pauline, and in a high degree original, therefore interesting, as used by him, yet at the same time presenting a somewhat artificial appearance, and withal belonging to the region of theology rather