

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

was one, and not less useful that it is not at all controversial.

TRACINGS FROM THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. BY C. E. STUART. (*Marlborough*. Crown 8vo, pp. 430. 5s.)

The title 'Tracings' gives Mr. Stuart liberty. This is not a phrase-by-phrase exposition. It is continuous, but not exhaustive. And it varies

the exposition by criticism, philology, or homiletic at will. It is a purely popular book, and should serve its popular purpose well.

From the Sunday School Union comes the seventh volume of *The Silver Link*, with its old, quiet, religious tone, and wholesome family feeling. The same house has published a popular and cheap *Life of Bunyan* in the 'Splendid Lives' Series.

Recent Foreign Theology.

'Catena.'

So great is the number of newly discovered manuscripts which come year by year into our libraries, and of interesting books which are published almost month by month, that other MSS., which are perhaps of not less value than the newly discovered ones, remain neglected for centuries in the mausoleums called libraries, and that even printed books of importance sink into complete oblivion. When Professor Blass startled the theological world by his discovery that St. Luke published two editions of the *Acta Apostolorum*, it had to be followed by the notice that the same statement was made two centuries ago by L. de Dieu. This had been completely forgotten. Or, would it not be a great surprise if I were to state that in one of the great English libraries there has been for more than one hundred years a manuscript of the eleventh century, older than any of those which de Lagarde used in publishing the *Apostolic Constitutions*, containing the first six books of the latter in a recension hitherto known only from the margins of a Vatican manuscript? And yet it is so.

To such a neglected department of study our attention is called by the little book of Lic. Hans Lietzmann, entitled *Catenen*.¹ What is a 'Catena'? Most students of Divinity, in Germany at least, leave the university without ever having seen such a thing, and with a very dark idea about it, if ever by chance they heard the word; even Professors

do not seem to inquire much after them. The very important Catena on the Octateuch, which was printed at Leipzig in the year 1772, I sought in vain in the University Library of Tübingen and all public libraries of Württemberg. If a Professor had asked for it, certainly it would have been purchased at Tübingen in the course of 125 years, which had elapsed since its appearance.

Catena, *Σειρα*, have been for the Greek Church since the early Middle Ages what the *Biblia Glossata* are in the Latin-speaking part of Christianity, commentaries, in which extracts from different ecclesiastical authors on important or difficult passages of the Scriptures are strung together as the links of a chain. At first these explanatory notes were written on the margins of the biblical texts ('Rand-Catene'); afterwards it was found more convenient to let text and notes follow each other; after a verse or a couple of verses comes the explanation. In this case the text is generally written in larger letters or in different ink. Some of the MSS give carefully the names of the authors from whom extracts are given, in rare cases with accurate statements from which book the note is taken; others give no names at all. There are great varieties even between MSS which have a close connexion; *tot exemplaria pene quot codices*. The importance of the *Catena* is threefold.

First, for *exegesis and its history*: they teach us how the ancient Fathers of the Church understood their biblical texts, and many a beautiful saying might be gathered from them to adorn our modern commentaries. Secondly, they are witnesses for the *Bible text* which these authors had

¹ *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte und handschriftliche Überlieferung*. Von Lic. Hans Lietzmann. Mit einem Beitrag von Prof. Dr. Hermann Usener. (Freiburg i. B.: Mohr.) Williams & Norgate, 1897. Nett 4s.

before them. Especially in the Old Testament many a quotation from the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, would be lost for us if it were not for these Catene.

Finally, how many *works of the Fathers* have been lost, or are transmitted to us in a very bad state, through recent MSS! Here are quotations from them. English scholars have made good use of this source; for instance, Pusey, to restore the last two books of Cyril on the Gospel of St. John; H. B. Swete for the Commentary of Theodorus Mopsuestenus on the smaller edition of St. Paul. As a whole this commentary has come down to us only in a Latin translation, but for many parts Swete was able to give the Greek original from the Catena. Not so did Dindorf, when he undertook for the Clarendon Press his edition of Clement; it was then Lagarde who showed in a trenchant criticism that a systematic use of the Catene is a *conditio sine qua non* for the editing of almost all ecclesiastical authors. But it is the vastness of the field and the divergence of interests which have prevented hitherto a systematic study. The editor of Origen, for instance, wishes to know wherever a bit of Origen is hidden in a Catena to any biblical book from Genesis to Apocalypse; he is indifferent to all other matter contained in it. The modern commentator, on the contrary, restricts himself to one book, and it does not matter to him so much whether a remark is from Theodore or Theodoret, or any one else, if it be only to the point and—within his reach. But, alas! the Catene are for the most part not yet printed, but lie in the manuscript-graves, called libraries. In connexion with the recent 'finds,' the Book of Sirach is at present more studied than before; but who has access to the Catene on this book? How important would it be to know whether all who wrote on Sirach had the book before them in the same confused state as in our Greek manuscripts! Or another example. I am at present interested in the Prayer of Manasses, which found its way from the *Apostolic Constitutions* into the little collections of Cantica placed at the end of most of the Greek Psalters. How many of the Catene preserved at the Bodleian contain this piece, and at which place of the collection? What do they say about it? The examples might be multiplied. In the contribution which Professor Usener makes to the book of Lietzmann, he is

able to prove by help of the Catene that a commentary on Job, which has been printed in a Latin translation among the works of Origen, is the work of Tatian of Halicarnassus, the only one which is known of this author.

It would be a very good thing if our great libraries (Paris, Rome, Oxford) and our learned bodies found out ways of publishing these hidden treasures.

Ἡσσαντοῦ κεκρυμμένου καὶ πηγῆς ἐσφραγισμένης τίς ὠφέλεια ἐν ἀμφοτέροις, wrote Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to Epiphanius, to the Professors of Divinity in Jerusalem (τοῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκάλοις), in words of Sirach (20³⁰ 41¹⁴), which have lately come to light in their original dress. May we respect them in our interest!

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The New 'Herzog.'

WITH remarkable punctuality Dr. Hauck publishes every year two 800-paged volumes of his revised and enlarged edition of the *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. In the fifth volume the articles range from DOSITHEOS, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to FELD-DIAKONIE, an interesting account by Pastor Schäfer of the origin in the last half-century of voluntary societies, which, in time of war, care for the sick and wounded under the protection of the Red Cross. At the battle of Leipzig, according to the testimony of a Berlin physician, there were 2000 wounded soldiers for whom there was neither shirt, blanket, straw pallet, nor bed. The change in modern sentiment and practice is described as a triumph of Christian love, or of that humanitarian spirit which is an indirect result of Christianity. 'The most illustrious name is that of Florence Nightingale.'

Professor Kittel of Breslau contributes a new and learned article on

ELOHIM,

which is noteworthy as a concise summary of the various solutions of an intricate problem, as well as on account of its opposition to the theory advocated by Dr. Delitzsch in his article in the second edition of *Herzog*, and in his commentary on Genesis. Dr. Delitzsch derives 'El' and 'Elohim' from two different roots: El means

the *strong* one, whilst Elohim is from a verbal stem found in Arabic, though not in Hebrew, and signifying to be in anxiety, *to fear*; hence Eloah (pl. Elohim), as a name of the Divine Being, means an object of fear. Kittel argues that if El and Elohim can be traced to the same root, such a derivation should have the preference; moreover, he agrees with Dillmann that the Arabic verb to fear is itself a denominative from Allah, the Arabic name for God.

Beginning with the simpler word 'El,' Kittel discusses—(1) the theory advocated by Schultz and Delitzsch, according to which El signifies *the Strong One*, being derived from the verbal stem אָלַח to be strong. The chief objection to this view is that the original quantity of *e* in El is short, as may be seen in such compounds as Elimelech, and as is decisively proved by the Assyrian, in which Ilu (with short *i*) = Heb. El; (2) the theory of Nöldeke, according to which, El signifies *the Leader*, being derived from the verbal stem אָלַח to be in front. This view, like that previously mentioned, assumes that the *e* in El is long, and for the reasons already given it must be rejected; (3) the theory of Lagarde, according to which El signifies *He whom all men strive to reach*, being derived from a verbal stem אָלַח (cf. the preposition אֶל, unto), to reach after. This theory accounts for the short vowel in El, but is exposed to the objection that such an abstract conception of God as He who is 'the Goal of all human longing and endeavour' is not likely to have been the original description of the Divine Being amongst the Semitic people; nor is it easy on this hypothesis to explain such a phrase as יְדֵי לַאֲלֵהִים, 'it is in the power (El) of my hand' (Gn 31²⁰), and the use of such words as אֲלֵהִים for *strong* trees, the oak and the terebinth. Kittel is of opinion that little, if any, support is given to Lagarde's theory by G. Kerber's suggested comparison with the two Assyrian words *Anû*, 'the God of heaven,' and *ana*, the preposition 'towards.' So long as the question, 'What does Anû really mean?' remains unanswered, it is of no avail to build etymological theories on this word; (4) the theory of Dillmann, according to which El signifies *the Strong One*, being derived from a verbal stem אָלַח, to be strong. Kittel regards this derivation as the most probable: the short *e* in El is accounted for; the description of

God as the Strong or Mighty One emphasizes an essential attribute of Deity; and the conception expressed is sufficiently concrete to be regarded as the root-idea of the word El. In our present state of knowledge, however, a final decision is impossible, and philosophical theories of the development of the conception of God ought not to be built upon the etymology of this word.

In regard to the relation of 'El' to 'Elohim' and to 'Eloah,' Kittel thinks that critical opinion is almost agreed that Elohim is an old plural of El and not of Eloah; the word Eloah he, with Nestle, regards as a singular formed by inference from the already existing plural Elohim.

Before answering the question, 'What is the significance of the plural Elohim?' it is necessary to remember the limitations of our knowledge. In the Old Testament, apart from the passages where Elohim is used of heathen deities, it almost always refers to the God of Israel. As a rule, Elohim is construed with a singular verb and with a singular adjective, but there are cases in which both the predicate and the attributive are in the plural. How are these exceptions to be explained? Are we to regard them as proving the prevalence of polytheism in ancient Israel? Kittel thinks not; in the first place, because this mode of speech is found in comparatively later times when the Israelites' belief was certainly not polytheistic; and, in the second place, because the Hebrew of the Old Testament furnishes analogies which are opposed to this numerical interpretation of the plural Elohim.

In Hos 11¹² the plural of 'holy' is used in apposition to El (cf. R.V.); in Is 19⁴ the plural of 'Lord' is found with a singular adjective, 'a cruel Lord'; and in Is 1³ the plural of 'Baal' occurs in the sentence 'the ass knoweth his master's crib.' The reference in these and other passages is clearly to a single person, and, indeed, it is not likely that from Is 1³ any one would draw the conclusion 'that in ancient times the ass was the common property of a plurality of masters.' The plural Elohim is best explained after the analogy of the Hebrew words for 'age' and 'youth.' The plurals of 'old' and 'young' are used to denote abstract ideas—the totality of the qualities connoted respectively by those words. Similarly, Elohim is a plural of abstraction, and signifies the totality of spiritual powers as they exist in a single being. That the plural did not obliterate the idea of unity

is evident from the established use of Elohim with verbs and adjectives in the singular; exceptions to this rule are to be regarded as exceptions and not as survivals of an older usage, and they are best explained as a return from the form which was logically correct to that which was grammatically correct. The use of Elohim—a plural subject—with a singular predicate and attributive, proves that the writer had a monotheistic conception of God, or he would not have departed from the regular grammatical construction; but, on the other hand, the occasional use of Elohim with a plural predicate or attributive does not as conclusively prove that the writer is referring to 'Gods many.' In a living language the plural verb or adjective might sometimes be used in conformity to rule, even though the writer believed in the unity of God.

In summing up, Kittel concedes that it is possible the plural form of Elohim had its origin in a polytheistic conception of God; but in his view it is probable that the plural arose out of men's experience of the many powers and modes of revelation of the one God, and that this interpretation of Elohim is rendered still more probable by the fact that other words signifying 'Lord'—אֲדֹנָי and אֱלֹהִים—are used in the plural in passages where only one person can be meant.

This volume contains two lengthy and masterly articles on *Einleitung*; that on the 'Introduction to the Old Testament' being written by Professor Buhl of Leipzig, and that on the 'Introduction to the New Testament' by Professor Th. Zahn. Dr. Buhl concludes his article with a high commendation of Dr. Driver's work, singling it out for honourable mention. 'Modern Introductions to the Old Testament are to be recommended as text-books only when they sharply emphasize the distinction between what has been convincingly established and what is still problematical, and this is a special feature of the excellent Introduction by Driver.'

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College.

Among the Periodicals.

Critics and Apologists.

IN the *Theol. Rundschau* of December 1898, Dr. STEUERNAGEL gives a survey of recent literature

on the Hexateuch. Such works as Holzinger's *Genesis*, Dillmann-Ryssel's *Exodus und Leviticus*, and the author's own commentary on *Deuteronomy*, are fully discussed. But on the present occasion our intention is to offer our readers some account of Steuernagel's judgment on certain works that have recently been published from the anti-critical side. Although oft wounded to death, if we may believe the 'apologists,' criticism appears always to recover from its death-stroke, and even the extraordinary efforts of Stosch have failed to silence its voice. Of late the anti-critical school in Germany have called in foreign aid against the common foe, and have issued a series of translations of English, American, Dutch, and other publications with anti-critical tendencies. Of these, two in particular are noticed by Steuernagel, namely, Hoedemaker's *Mosaische Ursprung der Gesetze in den Büchern Exodus, Leviticus, und Numeri*, and Green's *Die höhere Kritik des Pentateuchs*.

Against both these authors, and against recent apologists in general, Steuernagel brings three serious charges: that their work is frequently of a very superficial character, that they set up a man of straw for their attacks, and that even their biblical knowledge often leaves much to be desired. He gives an example of each of these allegations. First, it is surely a very superficial explanation of the interchange of the Divine names to say with Green that *Jahweh* is employed when God is thought of as the God of salvation and of gracious condescension, whereas the name *Elohim* is chosen when God appears as the Creator or Judge of the world. Why then, asks Steuernagel, is the God who enters into covenant with Noah (Gn 9) and with Abraham (Gn 17) called *Elohim*? Why is the God who executes judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah called *Jahweh*? Why is it that in perfectly parallel narratives we find at one time *Jahweh* and at another time *Elohim* (compare Gn 12¹⁰⁻²⁰ with 20¹⁻¹⁷)? Secondly, Green sets up a man of straw to represent the position of critics when he alleges that the latter, whenever the name *Jahweh* occurs in an 'Elohistic' passage, assume that a redactor has either introduced a sentence from a parallel narrative or altered the original *Elohim* into *Jahweh*. Green actually makes this allegation in connexion with passages subsequent to Ex 3, although every critic knows that E tells us in

Ex 3^{18E}. of the revelation of the new Divine name *Jahweh* to Moses, and that from this point onwards the latter name even predominates in E! Thirdly, what are we to think of the biblical knowledge of one who can tell us, as Hoedemaker does, that the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles is the day commemorating the entrance of Israel into Canaan (cf., on the contrary, Jos 4¹⁹).

Steuernagel brings out well the essential difference in their attitude to Scripture between the representatives of the critical and the apologetical schools. According to Green, Scripture is an organism whose parts are inspired by God, and consequently combine in a harmonious whole. But he refuses to view this harmony as the result of a process of development under Divine guidance; he will not have a human factor recognized at all, because the possibility of human error would thus be introduced. Modern criticism, on the other hand, assumes a divinely guided development process. Green denies, of course, that the critics believe in Divine revelation at all. From first to last, according to him, they have wrought in the interest of unbelief. Hoedemaker thinks to score a point against the critics by quoting the saying of Wildeboer, that 'criticism is simply a strictly scientific historical exposition of the Scriptures,' and then demanding how such an exposition can be given by one who has no clear conceptions about the mode and forms of revelation, its necessity and its aim, or about God who reveals Himself in Christ, or the sinner to whom He reveals Himself. In short, Hoedemaker makes dogmatics the basis of exegesis. Steuernagel argues, on the other hand, that the critics choose the more excellent way in commencing with an examination of the documents that embody the revelation, and in deriving from these one's dogmatic conceptions as to the mode and the form of revelation, instead of beginning with a dogmatic system constructed to be used as a Procrustean bed for the Bible.

The 'Ethnarch' of King Aretas.

The statement in 2 Co 11³² that the 'ethnarch' of Aretas watched the city of Damascus in order to capture St. Paul, has been the subject of much discussion. How Damascus, which in the time of Augustus and Tiberius, and again from Nero onwards, is known to have been subject to the Romans, should have been at the time of St. Paul's visit under the dominion of Aretas, has not

yet been explained. Professor SCHÜRER's suggestion is that the city may have been bestowed upon the Nabatæan king by Caligula as an act of grace. But another difficulty concerns the use of the term *ἔθναρχης* for the subordinate of Aretas. This forms the subject of a short article by Schürer in *Studien u. Kritiken* (1899, Heft 1). The title *ἔθναρχης* was borne by the Hasmonæan priest-princes before they assumed the title of 'king' (1 Mac 14⁴⁷; cf. 15^{1E}), and at a later period they received the same title, after the Romans had taken away their political independence (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10. 2). Archelaus was refused by Augustus the title of 'king,' but was allowed that of 'ethnarch' (*Ant.* xvii. 11. 4, *B.J.* ii. 6. 3). In these instances an 'ethnarch' is a prince of lower rank than a king. With a somewhat different scope the title 'ethnarch' was applied to the head of the Jewish colony in Alexandria (*Ant.* xiv. 7. 2), and to the head of Palestinian Judaism after the destruction of the Jewish State (Origen, *Ep. ad Afric.* § 14). But as a title for the administrator of a king, 'ethnarch' is unexampled outside 2 Co 11³². The familiar terms for such an office are *ἑπαρχος* and *στρατηγός*. Schürer thinks, however, that the application of *ἔθναρχης* to the governor of Damascus may be explained by having regard to the peculiar conditions of the Nabatæan kingdom. Here it was not *cities* but *tribes* that formed the basis of political organisation. The head of such a tribe is actually called *ἔθναρχης* in more than one of the inscriptions collected by Le Bas et Waddington (see the details in Schürer's article). The ethnarch of Aretas was then the superior or sheikh of the tribal territory bordering on Damascus. The latter city was also placed under his jurisdiction and belonged to his 'province,' whose tranquillity the Jews persuaded him was endangered by Saul.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

The *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 26th November 1898 contains an interesting paper by A. DEISSMANN on the recently published papyri which were discovered by Grenfell and Hunt at Behnesa (the ancient Oxyrhynchus). A warm eulogy is passed upon the marvellous rapidity with which publication has followed discovery, and the extreme accuracy which, in spite of this haste, has been maintained. Deissmann recognizes the convenience of the order followed, although he finds it

scarcely logical to classify the materials, as Grenfell and Hunt have done, as (1) 'theological' texts (Nos. 1-6), (2) 'new classical' (7-15), (3) fragments of already known classics (16-29, all in Greek like the preceding; 30-32 in Latin), (4) a motley group of non-literary Greek texts of the first four centuries of the Christian era (33-124) and the early Byzantine period (125-158), (5) forty-nine other non-literary papyri which the editors have thought it sufficient to describe without publishing them *verbatim* (159-207).

No. 1 is our old friend the *Δόγμᾶ Ἰησοῦ*, of which so much has been heard. No. 2 will doubtless receive the attention to which it is entitled, especially if it should prove to date, as Grenfell and Hunt are inclined to think, from the end of the third century. This would make it, of course, *the oldest extant remnant of a N.T. writing*. Unfortunately it is only a fragment, including more or less distinctly Mt 1¹⁻⁹. 12. 14-20. It is part of a *book*, not of a *roll*, and exhibits a text akin to that of *κ* and *B*. No. 3 is a fragment of an uncial of the fifth or sixth century, and contains Mk 10^{50f.} and 11^{11f.} in a form of text akin to *A*.

Passing over what Deissmann has to say on the other 'theological' and the 'classical' texts, we note the importance he attaches to the non-literary papyri. He thinks it is a mistake that these have not been published in full, because from several points of view they are of more interest than the classical fragments, except where the latter are quite new. Especially does he prize the non-literary fragments for the light they throw upon the history of the Greek language. He instances the distributive use of a number like the *δύο δύο* of Mk 6⁷, which could hitherto be traced backwards to the LXX of Gn 7¹⁵ (and oft.), as well as to Æschylus, *Persæ* 981 (*μυρία μυρία = κατὰ μυριάδας*). The other end of the line terminated in modern Greek. Between these two extremes we had only the doubtful instances cited by Karl Dieterich from the *Apophth. Patrum* (500 A.D.), but now the missing link is supplied by Papyrus Oxyrh. No. 121 (third century), in which one Isidoros writes to one Aurelios that he is to bind the sticks in bundles of three each (*εἶνα δέσση τρία τρία*).

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Sermonettes on the Golden Texts.

BY THE REV. J. S. MAVER, M.A., ABERDEEN.

I.

'So the father knew that it was at the same hour in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth: and himself believed, and his whole house.'—JOHN iv. 53.

THIS was what might be called an instance of putting two and two together. It is rather a difficult thing sometimes to do, though you may smile at the idea of there being any difficulty about it. You think you are far past that stage in arithmetic now, and you look upon it as the easiest thing imaginable. Yet it would seem to be rather an uncommon accomplishment, for it is regarded as high praise of a man to say of him that he can put two and two together. Not literally, it is true, but the meaning is that there are problems just as easy as that bit of arithmetic, and yet most of us may be wonderfully dense with regard to them. We see the thing after it is done, and it appears so simple then that we wonder we never managed

to do it ourselves. Newton, watching the fall of the apple, rose from that to the grand idea of universal gravitation, and we all see it now, see its truth and beauty; but it needed a Newton, for all that, to think of connecting the two things in the first place. Nansen concluding that there was a current in the northern ice that would take his vessel towards the Pole, and bring him out into open water again beyond, was another instance of a man putting two and two together.

The Bible is full of examples of those who in various ways did this arithmetical sum. You remember, when Jacob's sons came back from Egypt and told him that Joseph was alive and governor over all the land, Jacob could hardly believe it, and no wonder. But, we are told, when he saw the waggons, laden with corn and presents, his heart revived. Suppose they had brought the waggons without any explanation, what a mysterious,