

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume V

JULY, 1901

Number 3

FROM ISAIAH TO EZRA. A STUDY OF ETHANITES AND JERAHMEELITES.

By T. K. CHEYNE,
Oxford, England.

PROFESSOR TORREY's investigation of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah is too well known to American theologians to require a recapitulation of its results in this place. Suffice it to say that some further study of Ezra and Nehemiah has served to convince me of the complexity of the critical problems before us. What I have to say now is offered with all modesty, and not as the whole of the truth which I think one may hope to arrive at, nor as either free from error or the sum-total of the results which my own methods have enabled me to attain. Nor have I the time to imitate the exhaustiveness of a doctoral dissertation; I can only indicate certain points on which my attention has been fixed, not, as I hope, without some valuable results. Working under an impulse received from Winckler, but otherwise in almost complete independence of him, I have found in numerous parts of the Old Testament traces of underlying narratives which have been, partly through corruption of the text, partly under the influence of faulty historical theories, largely transformed in early times by Hebrew narrators. A similar remark applies to parts of the prophetic writings. There is, I think, considerable evidence (but depending entirely on the soundness of my

evangelists. Baptism (28:19) is in order to discipleship, is the initial step to it, and is to be followed by teaching. The formula is trinitarian, but does not teach the trinity. These last two verses are, however, of doubtful origin.

The only serious fault that one can find with the book is that the larger and more perplexing questions are too lightly dismissed. A broader logical interpretation and a larger introduction of the element of criticism and valuation of the results of exegesis pure and simple would have increased the value of the book. When the author has to deal with words and phrases, his work is admirable. When it is necessary for him to trace the larger connections of thought, or estimate the statements of the evangelist which he interprets, he sometimes fails us. Occasionally the element of criticism is introduced, as, *e. g.*, in the case of the problem of demoniacal possession. The story of the demons who entered the swine he describes as a piece of Jewish tradition, and his pointing out that in the gospel of Mark the result of possession is wholly confined to psychical disturbances suggests his belief that demoniacal possession is identical with nervous disorder. Much of the work on the Sermon on the Mount is excellent; but the author's unadaptedness for the larger interpretation mars it as a whole. The sermon, he declares, is an address to the disciples concerning the righteousness of the kingdom. He fails to see the defensive attitude that characterizes it; does not adequately recognize that, according to Matthew's version, it is a philippic against the Pharisees in which Jesus declares that instead of breaking the law he is loyal to it; that not he, but they, pervert it. The error of the Pharisees, the author asserts, is in that they took no account of motives. It is much more than that. They altered and weakened the law by additions, and distorted its meaning by sophistries. The homiletical suggestions of the book are comparatively few. It is intended for scholars, is thorough and temperate, and impresses one with the feeling that the author sought nothing so much as truth. We hope it will ere long find a good English translator.

G. D. HEUVER.

WENONA, ILL.

GRIEKSCH-THEOLOGISCH WOORDENBOEK, HOOFDZAKELIJK VAN DE OUD-CHRISTELIJKE LETTERKUNDE. Door J. M. S. BALJON. Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1899. Pp. viii + 939 + lxiii, and viii + 1105. £2.

DR. BALJON is known as the author of several valuable contributions to New Testament science. In 1889 there appeared from his

hand an exegetical and critical commentary on the epistle to the Galatians, in which some, though not an extravagant, use was made of the method of conjectural criticism to reach the original text. This was followed in 1893 by a translation, or, more accurately speaking, a free reproduction, into Dutch of Bernhard Weiss' *Einleitung*. In 1895, on the occasion of his becoming a professor in the University of Utrecht, Dr. Baljon delivered a discourse on the literature of primitive Christianity. In the following year he edited the text of the gospel and apocalypse of Peter. In 1898 appeared the first part of his *Novum Testamentum Græce*, followed by the second part in still the same year. The author's two most recent publications are a commentary on the gospel of Matthew, 1900,¹ and an "Encyclopædia of Theology," issued quite recently. Among the works mentioned especially those of an exegetical nature derive a specific value from the fact that they acquaint the reader to some extent with what has been done in this field by Dutch workers, a point too much neglected in the German commentaries in use among us.

The "Greek-Theological Dictionary" here under consideration has appeared in instalments from 1895 to 1899. The somewhat peculiar combination "Greek-theological" in the title is explained by the manner in which the work came into being. The author's original plan was to prepare a Dutch translation of Cremer's *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*. In several particulars this plan was subsequently modified. Instead of discussing merely the theologically important conceptions, Dr. Baljon decided to admit the entire New Testament vocabulary, and besides this to make a selection from the vocabulary of the Septuagint, the patristic literature, and other Greek Christian writers, determined by the practical aim of aiding theological students. Owing to this the work as it lies before us presents a mixture of two heterogeneous elements. The articles from Cremer (seventh edition), though here and there modified by way of abbreviation, supplement, or correction, have on the whole been taken over in their well-known theological form. So far as their doctrinal import is concerned, no criticism has been exercised. Even such sections as those on *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἐκλέγω*, in which Cremer's theological position determines the treatment in the most pronounced manner, are found here in literal translation. Of course, the author cannot desire to be held personally responsible for the theological views embodied or reflected in such articles. Nevertheless, by not entirely

¹ Reviewed in this issue of the JOURNAL, pp. 562-4.

refraining from corrections and modifications in other articles he has in a sense deprived himself of the privilege of non-responsibility accorded to the ordinary translator. Perhaps this could have been avoided by a clear demarkation in the text between the material literally taken from Cremer and the passages recast by the author, either from a formal or from a material point of view. In the text nothing of this kind is attempted. The index to the first volume designates by a star the articles whose treatment is borrowed from Cremer; in the second volume this star is added to the heading of the articles themselves in the body of the book. Another disadvantage arising from the non-consistency of the author's plan comes out in the order in which the words are given. Where the aim is distinctively doctrinal, as is the case with the German Cremer, it is desirable that the several formations of a root shall be classed together, inasmuch as the comparison of these furnishes one of the means for determining its full and exact theological significance. Whatever practical inconvenience is caused by such an arrangement to the ordinary student is more than offset by the gain in convenience it secures for the purpose of more advanced investigation, to further which a book of this kind is primarily intended. On the other hand, of an ordinary lexicon it is justly expected that it shall follow the alphabetical order. Endeavoring to combine both, Dr. Baljon has fallen into a combination of both methods. Having begun with the intention to follow Cremer's plan, he afterward departed from this. The result is that several sections belonging to several letters are arranged on the one, while all the remainder is arranged on the other principle, a circumstance detracting from the value of the work as a book for ready reference.

The articles added by the author of his own are of a brief, purely philological character. The New Testament vocabulary is completely given, with the exception of occasional, evidently unintentional, omissions; *e. g.*, *ἐπισκιάζειν* is wanting, although the noun *ἐπισκίασις* is given with an extra-biblical reference. The extent to which the patristic and other Greek-Christian literature is drawn upon is not defined. Evidently a large amount of careful labor has been expended on this part of the work. The Greek lexicon of Sophocles is acknowledged by the author to have been one of his principal guides in this comparatively untrodden field. The amount of the material added may be estimated from this, that the size of Cremer's work has been more than doubled. The list of *addenda* and *corrigenda* at the close of Vol. II bears witness to the vigorous effort made to keep in touch with the latest researches of Deissmann, Dalman, Nestle, and others.

It is to be regretted that the translation from the German of Cremer is not always correct. We have noted some instances where the true sense was entirely lost in the rendering; *e. g.*, Vol. II, p. 230, *sub voce* λυτρώω, the German sentence beginning with "*weil Wieder- und Loskaufsrecht*" has been sadly mutilated. On p. 237, under the same head, the Dutch word *vorming* does not express the German *Beschaffung*, the equivalent of which would be *totstandbrenging*. Such blemishes are obviously due to excessive haste in translating. We also venture to suggest that, since the author has allowed himself considerable freedom in recasting the German text, something more might have been done in the direction of increasing the clearness of presentation. Notwithstanding all its excellencies, the work of Cremer is in this respect capable of improvement.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

JESUS CHRISTUS IM THALMUD. Von HEINRICH LAIBLE. Mit einem Anhang: "Die thalmudischen Texte," mitgeteilt von Gustaf Dalman. Zweite Auflage (Anastatischer Neudruck). Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900. Pp. vi + 96 + 20*. M. 2.40.

THE book is a translation and a running commentary on the talmudic texts referring to Jesus given by Professor Dalman in the appendix. The translation is fairly correct. The comments contain amplified paraphrases of what is eminently clear from the translation itself, and serve (1) to swell what should have been a pamphlet of a dozen pages into one of about a hundred, and (2) to bring out in strong relief the "hatred of the Jews for Jesus," a phrase which seems to be an *idée fixe* with the author, for he repeats it on nearly every page, and where no opportunity is offered to ring in the favorite phrase, he is very ingenious in creating one. The enterprise gives him occasion for some critical antics, which would be supremely ridiculous, if their motive were not so saddening. Luckily the appended talmudic texts will enable the intelligent reader to draw his own conclusion. There are forty-two of them in all. Nine of them (V, VI, VII, Xa, XIIa, XIIb, XIIc, XXII, and XXIII) have absolutely no reference to Jesus or Christianity. We can only wonder what they do in this collection. Two supposed references to Mary Magdalene are very doubtful (III and IVa). Six (VIIIb, VIIIc, IXb, IXc, XVIb, XVIIIa) are variants. There thus remain twenty-four scattered texts that have untested reference to Jesus or his disciples, the longest of about a dozen