

BIBLIOTHÈQUE S. J.

Les Fontaines

60 - CHANTILLY

THE

EXPOSITORY TIMES.

2436

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.



VOLUME THE TENTH.

OCTOBER 1898 - SEPTEMBER 1899.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IT will soon be recognized that the second volume of the new DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE (which has been sent for review) is of wider interest than the first. The painstaking student, slowly building up an accurate knowledge of the letter of Scripture, will work his way through the smaller articles. But the average reader will turn at once to the great subjects which fall so lavishly into this volume.

They are well distributed between the Old Testament and the New. Professor Ryle's 'Genesis,' Professor Driver's 'Habakkuk,' Professor Davidson's 'Hosea' and 'Jeremiah,' Professor Smith's 'Isaiah' and 'Joshua,' Professor Davison's 'Job,' Professor Cameron's 'Joel,' Professor König's 'Jonah' and 'Judges,' and Mr. Burney's 'Kings' are all articles of the best type of critical scholarship. And besides these books we must notice such subjects and persons falling within the Old Testament as Flood, Food, Genealogy, Glory, Hexateuch, Holiness, Idolatry, Jacob, Joseph. Of these we might single out the article IDOLATRY for special attention. It is not long, not nearly so long indeed as articles that have appeared in previous Dictionaries. But there is a distinction recognized between different kinds of idolatry found in the Old Testament, a grouping as contrasted with a mere repetition of the passages, which gives to such an article the value of science,

and makes it useful to the most ignorant as well as the most accomplished reader.

But on the whole the New Testament has the best of it in this volume. The great doctrinal articles are mostly concerned with New Testament teaching. 'Glory' and 'Holiness' belong to both Testaments, and are handled by two different men. But Mr. Bethune-Baker's 'Forgiveness' is chiefly New Testament, while Principal Stewart's 'Grace,' Mr. Ottley's 'Incarnation,' Principal Simon's 'Justification,' and Professor Orr's 'Kingdom of God' are entirely so. Then there are the three great articles on 'God,' 'Jesus Christ,' and the 'Holy Spirit.' And besides the very full articles on 'Galatia' by Professor Ramsay, we have the whole subject of St. John and his writings, written by Mr. T. B. Strong of Christ Church, Oxford, Principal Salmond of Aberdeen, and the late Principal Reynolds of Cheshunt.

'I wonder if you are feeling the importance of the distinction between *sin* and *offences*, a distinction constantly lost sight of, so that men often cherish the former in their efforts to get rid of the latter. If men would but believe in the truth that *the sin is taken away*, instead of whitewashing and painting up the old Adam and attempting to get others to do the same, the

following the LXX we there read תשובתך for the doubtful (חשוקתך).

II. It remains to deal with the rest of the difficult verse 4⁷ which in the M.T. runs הלא אם חטיב לא חטיב לפתה חטאת רבץ שאת ואם לא חטיב לפתה חטאת רבץ. This, as Ball (*op. cit.*) justly observes, 'yields no adequate sense'; and he accordingly, on the basis of the LXX, restores הלא אם חטיב לשאת ואם לא חטיב לבתר, חטאת רבץ, *If thou makest a proper offering but dost not properly divide (the sacrificial victim), art thou not in fault? Quiet (lit. lie down)!* In other words, Cain's offence is a ritual one, and he is reminded that he has no ground of complaint for the rejection of an irregular offering. 'This sense,' as Ball points out, 'agrees with the context and with ancient ideas far better than any which can be wrested out of the doubtful Hebrew of M.T.' One serious criticism, however, must be made, though possibly it may not prove a fatal objection to the emended text. Cain's sacrifice was *not* an animal one (v.³). That being so, can לבתר properly be applied to it? Possibly, however, this difficulty can be overcome by giving the words a wider range of application than to the immediate context.

One other, and this a minor, difficulty remains: רבץ in this connexion can hardly be right. I venture to propose רב, enough! (cf. Nu 16^{3, 7}); or possibly רב עתה; cf. 2 S 24¹⁶; though עתה in this connexion requires, according to usage, some words to follow.

G. H. Box.

Merchant Taylors' School, E.C.

Dr. W. H. Green of Princeton.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of February 1896 an editorial notice of Dr. W. H. Green's treatise on *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* bore strong testimony to the scholarship of the author. Mention was made in that notice of a higher critic who had recently said, 'There is now but one Old Testament scholar who rejects the results of criticism.' That scholar was said to be Professor Green of Princeton. Criticism has advanced so far in three years that in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of February 1899 even the scholarship of Dr. Green is completely discredited. The Rev. J. A. Selbie, on pp. 221-2, reproduces some criticisms of apolo-

getic writings recently translated into German made by Dr. Steuernagel in the *Theologische Rundschau*. One of these books is Dr. Green's work above mentioned. Against him and other apologists Dr. Steuernagel brings what Mr. Selbie calls 'three serious charges.' I confine my attention to these serious charges as they affect Dr. Green. The second of them I take up first. It is evidently considered the gravest; and its statement in the English translation is followed by a note of exclamation. It runs as follows:— 'Green sets up a man of straw [the original is, ein Zerrbild der Kritik] 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^{27ff.} of the revelation of the new Divine name *Jahweh* to Moses, and that from this point onwards the latter name even preponderates in E!' This looks bad for Green. But has Dr. Green 'set up a man of straw to represent the position of critics'? I will let the most distinguished of the higher critics tell in their own words their position in regard to the mooted point. They should know what they have been in the habit of teaching.

Dr. August Dillmann, in his treatise, 'Ueber die Composition des Hexateuch,' appended to the second edition of his *Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, p. 617, in treating of the Elohistic document, whose existence he and the other divisive critics postulate, writes, thus:— 'Das wichtigste Kennzeichen dieser Schrift ist die Benennung Gottes mit Elohim (auch nach der Einsetzung des Jahvenamens Ex. 3), welche E mit andern alten Geschichtsschreibern (in Jud. u. Sam., Vgl. Knobel, 561) gemeinsam hat; sie ist bei ihm durchgängig, u. JHVH (Jehovah) in seinen Stücken erst durch die Späteren Bearbeiter hereingebracht.'

In this quotation Dillmann distinctly asserts that the most important criterion of the E document is its naming of the Deity by Elohim, and that God is so named in it both *before* and *after* Ex 3; that this use of Elohim in E is *thoroughgoing*, or universal; and that when the name Jehovah is found in passages belonging to E, its introduction

is to be ascribed to later hands. If Dillmann was competent to give an account of his own doctrine, Dr. Green must be acquitted of the charge of setting up a man of straw to represent his position.

Wellhausen is another critic who may be allowed to give testimony on this question. In his treatise, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*, p. 72, speaking of Ex 3¹⁰⁻¹⁵, which he claims for the Elohist document, he remarks: 'Wirklich erscheint hier überall im Munde des Erzählers Elohim (vv. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15.) während von nun ab dies Kriterium für längere Zeit aufhört, freilich wie es scheint mehr durch Schuld des Bearbeiters, als nach der Absicht des Elohisten selber, der nach wie vor für gewöhnlich den allgemeinen Namen gebraucht zu haben scheint.'

In this quotation Wellhausen clearly makes the use of the name Elohim a criterion of the E document, and ascribes the omission of this name in Elohist passages after Ex 3 to the fault of the redactor, and not to the original author, whom Wellhausen holds to have, both before and after Ex 3, commonly employed the general name of God or Elohim. I have additional evidence at command. But surely enough has been produced to prove to the satisfaction of all reasonable men that the second charge brought against Dr. Green is not true, and that neither through dishonesty nor ignorance has he been guilty of misrepresenting the position of the higher critics. The case is so clearly in his favour that I suggest the propriety of his accusers making to him a public apology.

I now turn to consider the first charge made by Steuernagel, which is thus stated: '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 He 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* (cf. Gn. 12¹⁰⁻²⁰ with 20¹⁻¹⁷)?'

If Dr. Green had given such an inadequate

account of the Divine names as is here attributed to him, and had said that they were respectively used only in the cases mentioned, a very superficial and unsatisfactory explanation would be furnished of their interchange. How he really distinguishes Elohim and Jehovah can be learned from the book reviewed, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, pp. 102-3 and p. 106. But Dr. Green's most thorough connected discussion of this subject will be found in two papers in the *Homiletic Review* for August and September 1898, pp. 166 ff. and pp. 257 ff. He first examines the use of Elohim and Jehovah in the books that follow the Pentateuch, and then considers the use of these Divine names in the books of Moses. At the close of a very careful and complete study Dr. Green makes this claim, which, in my opinion, is not too strong: 'The Divine names occurring in the Pentateuch have now been considered in detail, and I think it may fairly be said that it has been shown that their employment is regulated by the same principles which prevail in the rest of the Old Testament. Jehovah is the name peculiar to the God of the chosen race, and is used when His relation to His own people is in the mind of the speaker or writer. Elohim represents the Divine Being under those aspects in which He is related, not to the chosen race merely, but to the whole world and to all men, as the Creator and universal Sovereign, controlling nature and the affairs of men. It is used, therefore, when the Most High is spoken of by Gentiles or in connexion with them; and when the Divine is contrasted with the human or with objects belonging to any other grade of being; and when the sense requires a common rather than a proper noun.'

I have not been able to discover in any of Dr. Green's writings that he has stated that *Jahweh* cannot be properly used when God is thought of as Judge of the world. He often refers to acts of judgment on the world inflicted by Jehovah. But I take up Steuernagel's questions *seriatim*. 'Why is the God who enters into covenant with Noah (Gn 9) and with Abraham (Gn 17) called *Elohim*?' The covenant described in Gn 9 was made, not with the chosen seed merely, but with all living creatures, with all flesh upon the earth (Gn 9⁹. 10. 15. 17). Its universal character is made very prominent. Therefore the general name of God is most appropriate. When God is set forth as distinguishing the chosen seed from the rest of

mankind, then Jehovah is more fittingly used. See v.²⁶ of the same chapter, where we read: 'Blessed be Jehovah, God of Shem.' It is surely not by accident that in the next verse the blessing of Japheth is attributed to Elohim.

But why is it Elohim who enters into covenant with Abraham (Gn 17)? I answer that the first verse of Gn 17 tells us that it was Jehovah who did this; and I refuse to listen to the critics who in the interest of their theory say that this verse is an interpolation by R, or that R has at least substituted in it Jehovah for Elohim. But why is Elohim used throughout the remainder of the chapter? Because there is a peculiar propriety in speaking here of God in His character as the Omnipotent Creator. El Shaddai, God Almighty, is what Jehovah calls Himself in the first verse. There was special cause to dwell on God's power. The chapter begins with a significant mention of the great age of Abraham. See also v.¹⁷. A son by his wife did not seem to him within the bounds of possibility. But he is told definitely that Sarah should bear him a son in the next year, and that she should be a mother of nations. If, to strengthen the patriarch's faith, Jehovah in the beginning of the chapter thought it proper to call Himself El Shaddai, thus emphasizing His Divine power, it is in admirable keeping for the sacred narrator to use subsequently throughout the theophany the familiar name of Elohim, which is a nearer equivalent of El Shaddai than Jehovah is, and is more suggestive that power belongeth unto God than this latter name.

It is further asked: 'Why is the God who executes judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah called *Jahweh*?' I may let Dr. Green answer this question. 'It is Jehovah in chap. 18 who in condescending grace concludes the covenant transaction with Abraham by becoming his guest, and in the familiarity of friendship admits him to His counsel respecting Sodom, and accepts his intercession on its behalf; and who still further (19¹⁻²⁸) executes the purpose which He had disclosed to Abraham of *purging His own land* of gross offenders (13¹³ 15¹⁶ 18²⁰. 21)' (*Unity of Genesis*, p. 152).

I have another question to answer: 'Why is it that in perfectly parallel narratives we find at one time *Jahweh* and at another *Elohim* (cf. Gn 12¹⁰⁻²⁰ with 20¹⁻¹⁷)?' There is a remarkable resemblance between these two narratives. I add that there is a likeness between them which the

divisive critics want to obliterate. In the earlier the name Jehovah is used but once, and no other name of God occurs in Gn 12¹⁰⁻²⁰. In v.¹⁷ Jehovah is said to have plagued Pharaoh and his house 'because of Sarai, Abram's wife.' In the similar narrative in Gn 20 the name Jehovah occurs once (v.¹⁸), and that too in describing the judgment inflicted by Jehovah on Abimelech's house, 'because of Sarah, Abraham's wife.' The correspondence is striking. But such critics as Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Dillmann cannot tolerate in an Elohistic chapter a verse in which the name Jehovah is found, and accordingly they ascribe this verse to R. But it closely connects with the preceding sentence, which is, in fact, unintelligible without it. It is easy to account for the use of Elohim throughout the rest of Gn 20. It was shown long ago that for Abimelech God is Elohim. He knew not Jehovah. Only as Elohim could God appear to him. Abraham uses in conversation with Abimelech Elohim, while he accommodates himself to His standpoint. He prays to Elohim, for his intercession is uttered in the ears of the King. How the use of Elohim is occasioned by the contents of the chapter appears very clearly from v.¹¹, where Abraham says, 'Because I thought, surely the fear of Elohim is not in this place.' There was in Gerar the fear of Elohim, but not of Jehovah.

Dr. Green is censured further for maintaining that 'Scripture is an organism whose parts are inspired by God, and consequently combine in a harmonious whole.' This charge is true. But the view condemned was the view which Christ and His apostles held and taught concerning Holy Scripture. It is the view to which those who call Jesus Master are committed; and it can be vindicated against all impugnors. But I cannot discuss here this and one or two other points which I would be glad to dwell upon.

Let me contradict but one more false charge which is thus made: 'Green denies, of course, that the critics believe in Divine revelation at all.' This is a random fling unworthy of a serious critic. I could prove its falsity by abundant references to Dr. Green's published opinions. There is room here for only one brief quotation. Even of Dr. C. A. Briggs, whose utterances Dr. Green must have often felt to be painful and provoking, he could use this language of wide charity (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, October 1893, p. 553): 'Beyond question Dr. Briggs is honestly aiming to

defend the revealed Word of God and evangelical religion against the hostile attacks of a destructive and revolutionary criticism.'

DUNLOP MOORE.

Pittsburg, Pa. U.S.A.

Bleanings in the Books of Kings.

2 K 17²⁹ (E. V.)—'And the men of Babylon made Succoth-benoth.' Benzinger, in his new commentary on Kings, remarks that Sukkoth-Benōth is still unexplained. Schrader's view (*KAT*, 281) is no doubt scarcely tenable. But a clue may be got from a work well known to all scholars. If Benzinger had referred to Delitzsch's *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 215, he would have seen that in 1881 that eminent Assyriologist explained the name as *Sakkut-binutu* (?), 'supreme judge of creation.' Delitzsch has no doubt (see *Calwer Bibel-lexikon*, s.v.) abandoned this view for good reasons. But it should be plain to those who study the habits and dangers of the scribes that סכות בנות is really סכּוּת כַּיָּוָן, Sakkuth Kaiwān (ח in בנות is due to assimilation). Compare the inserted passage Am 5²⁶, 'That is, ye took up Saccuth and Kaiwān,' or rather, Saccut and Kaiwān being both names of the Babylonian Saturn, 'ye took up Saccuth-Kaiwān.' The only possible alternative, I think, is to read 'Sakkuth and Nebo'; but this combination no Assyriological student can call probable. I have already pointed out a very probable occurrence of Kaiwān in Ezk 7 (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, 1898, p. 142).

2 K 18³⁴.—Winckler (*Alttest. Untersuchungen*, pp. 102 f.) has already pointed out that 2 K 18³⁴ must originally have run, 'Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? where are the gods of Sepharvaim and of 'Avvah (?)'? In *Isaiah* (Haupt's Hebrew Bible), in dealing with Is 37¹⁸, I have adopted this view, but in the text of the notes (p. 114), I have left the correct reading of the name of the last-mentioned place an open question. Kittel, in his new edition of Dillmann's commentary on *Isaiah*, chronicles previous suggestions. It is not very bold to suppose that עזה or עוז is a corruption of עֵזָה, 'Gaza,' and that the reference is to the conquest of Gaza by Tiglath-Pileser in 734 B.C., when, according to Winckler's restoration of a defective passage in his inscription, that king

introduced the cultus of his god Assur (*Gesch. Bab. u. Ass.*, 228, 333). I am sorry not to be able to accept Professor Hommel's most ingenious suggestion (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, April 1898) that Hena' and 'Avvah may be star-names; Hena' is, I agree with Winckler, entirely due to corruption, and a name corresponding to Sepharvaim is absolutely required to complete the parallelism. Nor can I believe that Nibhaz, the god of the Avvites in 2 K 17³¹ is Nip̄u-Ṣalmu; it is most probably nothing more nor less than Marduk (נבחז corrupted from כרמר, i.e. מרר). Not improbably Adrammelech and Anammelech are also corruptions of Marduk. I have already offered this as an alternative to a less simple conjecture (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, ix. 428 f. [1898]). Certainly, Hamath and Avvah have no right to exist in 2 K 17²⁴, as the context requires well-known Babylonian cities, and the so-called 'Avvites' are intruders in 2 K 17³¹, as Winckler has shown. On the god Tartāk cf. my article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xvii. 105 [1898]; I come to the same conclusion as Winckler. תרתח=תרתק (Job 38³⁰); Tartahan was, we are assured, a title of the god Ninib.

This is a list of the divine names in 2 K 17^{20f.} with their identifications—

Succoth-benoth = Sakkuth-Kaiwān (Ninib) = *Saturn*.
Nergal = *Mars*.
Ashima = Ishtar = *Venus*.
Nibhaz (Nibhan) = Marduk = *Jupiter*.
Adrammelech = " "
Anammelech = " "
Tartak or Tartah = the lance-star (Antares).

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

The Wells of Beersheba.

I HAVE received here the number of *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* of this month (April), where you have inserted my letter from Jerusalem on the Wells of Beersheba. There has occurred in it a printer's error, in page 329, line 11, which makes a sentence quite incomprehensible. Instead of 'in "style" the place was entirely desert,' read, 'in "1894" the place was entirely desert.'

LUCIEN GAUTIER.

Haifa, Palestine.