

# 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)

Jesus is typical, is capable of varied and extensive application, and the result of a courageous and faithful application of it, would be that on the one hand the life of Jesus would gain in human interest; and the life of the Christian, on the other hand, in Divine significance. It was by this spiritual reproduction of Himself that Jesus intended to raise up that spiritual temple to God, which would replace the material Temple, the worship of which the priests were destroying by their formalism and secularity. If the one incident teaches us the sublime confidence which Jesus cherished regarding His ability to fulfil this vocation, the other shows us the no less sublime humility of His method of fulfilment. He knew that He could lead men up to the heights where God dwelleth; but He was willing that He might so lead them to tread every step of the path which runs in the depths of man's sin and misery, darkness and death. He was alike confident of exaltation, and prepared for humiliation.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

ON THE MEANING AND SCOPE OF JEREMIAH  
VII. 22, 23.

BUT, lastly, the most important of the phrases relevant to this point is דַּעַת אֱלֹהִים מְעֻלֹת (Hos. vi. 6b). In the paraphrase of this clause the מן is retained by the Targum.

עֲבָרֵי אִוְרֵיתָא דִּי מִמְּסַקֵּי<sup>1</sup> עֲלוֹן ("the fulfillers of the Law of Jahveh are better than the bringers of sacrifice"), and also by the Peschitta (ܘܚܘܢ). This מן is also rendered by the sign of the comparative in LXX. (καὶ ἐπιγινώσκων θεοῦ ἢ

<sup>1</sup> So pointed according to Levy's *Targumwörterbuch*, but the supra-linear punctuation shows ם with a Shevâ (Merx, *Chrestomathia targumica*, s.v. מְעֻלֹת; and Dalman, *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, 1894, p. 57). The pronunciation of ם״י (Gen. iii. 8, etc.), which is marked by ם״י in the editio Sabineta of the Targum of Onkelos (ed. Aug. Berliner) and with the sign of Pathach under ך in Kautzsch, *Mittheilung über eine alte Handschrift des Targum Onkelos* (1893, p. xi., and Exod. iii. 2), is not, so far as I see, discussed by Winer, Levy, Merx (*Chrestomathia*, p. 2, ם״י), or Dalman.

ὄλοκαυτώματα), and in Jerome (et scientiam Dei plus quam holocausta). In like manner Abulwalid, for example, (Riqma, p. 26, line 10 from below, ed. Goldberg) interprets the כִּן of מַעֲלִית in Hosea vi. 6b by יִתֵּר כִּן; that is to say, in a comparative sense. But not only has Luther, for example, translated thus: "and in knowledge and not in burnt sacrifice," but Nolde-Tympe also (pp. 464b, 879a), and Dathe (p. 414) render this כִּן by "non." Gesenius also in his *Thesaurus*, although in verse 6b he writes, "magis quam," nevertheless opens his discussion of Hosea vi. 6 with the words, "magna intercedit necessitudo inter comparativum particulæ כִּן usum et vim negativum." Nevertheless, this passage has been cited *last* among those in the great majority of which the relative has been wrongly regarded as a substitute for the absolute negation, because this very passage, on account of verse 6a, belongs to those clauses in which,

(ii.) On the contrary, a merely relative force has been ascribed to the absolute negation.

This principle has been adopted in the following sentences: Genesis xlv. 8, לֹא אַתֶּם שְׁלַחְתֶּם אֹתִי הִנֵּה כִי הָאֱלֹהִים; but in Onkelos, Peschitta, LXX., and Jerome, the simple אֵל, א, οὐ, and non, are rightly given. For the text is intended merely to deny that the brethren of Joseph had been the originators of the historical mission which Joseph had to discharge in Egypt. Neither does Genesis xlv. 8, in consequence of this negative assertion, set itself in contradiction with chapter xxxvii. 28. Thus Luther is right in paraphrasing:<sup>1</sup> "Venditio vestra non deduxit me in hunc locum." The more recent expositors also have taken the passage in the same way, and, with especial clearness, J. P. Lange in the *Theologisch-Homiletisches Bibelwerk: Genesis*, 2nd edition, p. 444.<sup>2</sup> Without necessity, and even in oppo-

<sup>1</sup> Lutheri opera exeg. lat. x. 364.

<sup>2</sup> "He makes now a definite antithesis. 'Not you': therein lies, firstly, his

sition to the purpose of the text, Nolde-Tympe, p. 424, and Dathe, p. 418, have translated נל in Genesis xlv. 8 by "non tam." The same commentators wish to find the relative sense of נל in the following passages besides: in Exodus xvi. 8b, "not against us are your murmurings directed, but against Jahveh." But there also "non tam" is against the intention of the text, as is expressly shown by the preceding question, "What are we?" The case is the same in 1 Samuel viii. 7 (Nolde); Isaiah xliii. 18, where לנ is taken by Nolde in the same sense; Jeremiah iii. 16; vii. 22 (see below); xvi. 14; Psalm l. 8 f. (see below); Proverbs viii. 10a, and xvii. 12b (Dathe). Buxtorf, in his *Thesaurus Grammaticus*, p. 553, quotes as examples of this approximation of נל or נל and נ only Proverbs viii. 10; Hosea vi. 6; and Joel ii. 13 ("vide Prov. xvii. 12, et xxiii. 23"). In Proverbs viii. 10a נל is taken as a comparative expression by Kamphausen, also in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, and by Wildeboer.<sup>1</sup> But see above, p. 017.

Gousset, who otherwise frequently goes wrong in his *Commentarii linguae Ebraicae*<sup>2</sup> on this point, has some almost entirely accurate remarks. For, after adducing a number of such passages in which others sought to find only a relative meaning of נל, and after showing the most of them (with the exception of Genesis xxxii. 28; Exodus xvi. 8; Ezekiel xvi. 47) to be invalid as proof-passages, he proceeds to add the following warning: "Lector non debet particulam נל spectare ut ancipitem inter sensum absolutum et comparativum, quasi æquali jure liceret ipsi eam quo mallet modo sumere. Sed pro proprio sensu, nempe absoluto, standum est, donec vel experientia vel analogia fidei

forgiveness; and, secondly, the exposure of the futility of their scheme and its disappearance before the great purpose of God."

<sup>1</sup> Wildeboer, *Kurzer Handcommentar zu den Prov.*, 1897, *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> I have used the *editio secunda*, Lipsiae, 1743.

alium sensum doceat." These words have in them a ring of anxiety lest the meaning of  $\text{N}^{\text{b}}$  should become an inconstant quantity.

Some have thought, however, that it was possible to show from the Arabic that the particles of absolute negation might to some extent receive a merely relative signification. Marti<sup>1</sup> appeals to the fact that among Arabic proverbs, for example, we find "carrying stones with a wise man (*scilicet* is feasible or tolerable) and not (ولا, walâ) drinking wine with a fool," but also "carrying stones is better (خير من chairun min) than running a bad trade." But the fact that both forms of expression were used is no guarantee that both were meant to convey the same degree of negation. The first form may have expressed a more definite disapproval than the second. The two forms can only have been intended as equivalents, when they both convey the same content, as when it is said, "An egg to-day (*scilicet* is worth something, and is to be desired) and not (ولا, walâ) a chicken to-morrow"; but also "an egg to-day is better ('achjaru min) than a hen to-morrow." But the conclusion here also must be (see above, p. 153) that the use of the comparative form of expression may be a kind of *litotes* in the expression of a negation. Lastly, Marti cites a passage from Hariri's *Maqâmen*, which runs thus: "And ye laugh at a funeral, and your laughter [is or occurs] not in the hour of dancing." Marti translates this passage as though it were a comparison: "And ye laugh at a funeral more than your laughter in the hour of dancing." To me, however, the antithesis seems to require the absolute negation of the idea that the laughter of the persons addressed should proceed from some cause of merriment.

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marti, *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1880, p. 310 f. The original Arabic sentences are there printed from Socin's collection of Arabic proverbs and idioms (*Academische Einladungsschrift*, Tübingen, 1878), Nos. 68, 69.



16 that the negation in verse 17 is only a relative one. For by the words *οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλέ με Χριστὸς βαπτίζειν, ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* the Apostle may have meant that he had performed the before-mentioned baptisms without an express injunction. Paul may have so thought and done, because he does not anywhere say that Christ has forbidden him to baptize. Thus he may have regarded baptism as an act permitted to him. Winer himself, as I remarked above, does not find any relational character in the statement of 1 Corinthians i. 17, seeing that he recalls Bengel's phrase "*quo quis mittitur, id agere debet.*"<sup>1</sup>

This idea, that the *adverbia negandi* (לֹא, לֹא־, etc., οὐ, μὴ) may frequently stand for "not so much," cannot be supported by the assertion that לֹא, etc., sometimes include the notion of "only" or "more" or "first" (Genesis xxxii. 29; xxxv. 10; Jeremiah xvi. 14, which Nolde-Tympe (p 424) would include in this group; Ezekiel xvi. 47; Matthew ix. 13 (see below, p. 217); Mark ix. 37; Luke x. 20; John v. 45; vii. 16; viii. 50; xii. 44; Acts v. 4; 2 Corinthians viii 5. For, in the first place, this rendering is not beyond doubt in all of the passages cited.<sup>2</sup> And, secondly, both Hebrew and other languages yield other

<sup>1</sup> Hommel, on the other hand (*Die Altisraelitische Ueberlieferung*, 1897, p. 16), can prove nothing by citing the Reverend Mr. Baxter as representing the opposite opinion.

<sup>2</sup> Flacius, *Clavis scripturae sacrae* (Bas. 1567; I have used the edition of 1628), says in vol. i. *sub voce* "non": "*Non interdum non tam negat quam corrigat*; Mark ix. 37: *qui me recipit, non me recipit pro non tam me recipit*; John vii. 16: *doctrina mea non est mea pro non tam mea, quam Patris*; John vi. 38: *non ut faciam meam voluntatem pro non tam meam quam eius qui me misit*; Deut. v. 3: *non cum patribus nostris iniiit fedus id est non solum*; Gen. xxxii. 28: *non vocabitur nomen tuum Jacob pro non solum.*" But out of these five examples only the first contains a *correctio*, so that *οὐ* receives the sense of *non tantum*. In the second example *οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμῆ* must actually mean "proceeds not from me." In the remaining three examples the negation is a complete one. In Genesis xxxii. 29 (!) also the "only" which was supplied as early as by *Salomo ben Melech* in *Michlal Jophi* ad loc. (לְבַד) corresponds with the intention of the text just as little as the later practice, which continued to use "Jacob" as the name of the third patriarch.

cases of similar brachylogy, in which an "only" is omitted as understood from the context.

It is only now, after having stated and criticised both lines along which many scholars have justified a passing over of the relative into the absolute negative, and *vice versa*, that we can attempt to find a conclusive interpretation of Hosea vi. 6, where it might be possible to discover both of these lines of transference. There are, of course, three possible interpretations of this passage.

(a) Cannot both clauses, 6*a* and 6*b*, mean just what they express, *i.e.*, cannot 6*a* involve an absolute and 6*b* a relative negation? May not the meaning be, "If in regard to me the true choice lies between חסד and slaughter-offering, then חסד alone has value; and if the choice is between knowledge of God and whole-offering, then the former has the preference"? More than one consideration may be adduced in support of this way of taking the passage. For in its favour we have first the actual difference between the expressions (לֵא, כֵן) chosen in the two clauses, and secondly the difference of their objects. For חסד is undoubtedly active within the sphere of feeling and will: implying affection towards a person or thing, inclination towards it, respect, loyalty, or the like. But דעת אלהים concerns, in the first place, the mental sphere, although the idea of ידע frequently contains also an echo which is roused in the sphere of feeling and even of willing by means of some new knowledge (Hos. v. 4*b*; Ps. i. 6, etc.). Now in this passage, where a process in the sphere of feeling and will (חסד) and one whose source is mental (דעת) stand side by side, is not the suggestion an obvious one that the movement whose origin is mental is to be understood in its proper and narrower sense? It is true that "knowledge" may describe here an action of soul distinct from חסד. The proper identity of the two processes חסד and דעת does not follow from the fact that they are put in relation with

similar quantities.<sup>1</sup> For slaughter-offering (זבח) and burnt offering (עלה) are not identical in their religious value; but the burnt offering was a stronger expression of religious feeling. It follows from all this that Hosea in vi. 6 wished to express the two following thoughts: "I take pleasure in affection (love, loyalty, and the like), and not the slaughter-offering, and (even) recognition of God do I value more highly than (even) burnt-sacrifice."<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the Peschitta has retained the distinction between 6a (אֵל) and 6b (אֵל וְאֵל). So too Jerome writes *et non* in 6a and *plus quam* in 6b. Scholz<sup>3</sup> also gives a translation which simply corresponds with the Hebrew; and Driver<sup>4</sup> also translates without further explanation, "For I desire kindness and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." Molin<sup>5</sup> too mentions Hosea vi. 6 only as an example of the כִּן *comparativum*. Lastly, Hitzig-Steiner, in their commentary on the Minor Prophets, express no opinion on the inner relation between 6a and 6b; while Joh. Bachmann, in his *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (1894), p. 34, passes over Hosea vi. 6 altogether.

(β) The formal difference between Hosea vi. 6a and 6b might be nothing more than an external variation, and the כִּן of 6b might be an expression of preference amounting to a substitute for the negation. This interpretation has enjoyed the preference not only of older (*vide p.*

<sup>1</sup> The relationship between the activities of soul described by דעת and חסד ought not therefore to be emphasized; Driver's *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament* (1892), Sermon xii. on Hosea vi. 6 (pp. 218 ff.), p. 224: "By 'knowledge of God' Hosea means here not a merely intellectual apprehension of His nature, but a knowledge displaying itself in conduct, a knowledge of His power, His influence, and His character, resting upon spiritual experience, and resulting in moral practice."

<sup>2</sup> Thus דעת אלהים stands here for "recognition of Me"; analogous cases will be found in my *Syntax*, §§ 4 and 5.

<sup>3</sup> Anton Scholz, *Comm. zum Buche des Propheten Hoseas*, 1882, 65, 77.

<sup>4</sup> Driver, *Sermons*, pp. 220, 224.

<sup>5</sup> Olof Molin, Om prepositionen כִּן i *Bibelhebreiskan* (Upsala, 1893), p. 53.

149), but also of later scholars. It is true Zerweck<sup>1</sup> says only, like Gesenius in his *Thesaurus* (p. 021): "Here also (Hos. vi. 6) the close connection is seen between  $\text{בֵּן}$  and the negative." But Wellhausen<sup>2</sup> translates "for love I will have *and not* sacrifice, knowledge of God and no burnt offering"; and Guthe in Kautzsch's *Altes Testament*, renders 6b, "in knowledge of God *and not* in burnt sacrifice." Again, Oettli<sup>3</sup> "holds the comparative sense to be excluded in this passage, although the variation in the expression of the negative is certainly not made without intention; for the prophet cannot, immediately after he had roundly denied the value of  $\text{זֶבַח}$ , mean to say, 'in  $\text{עֵלָה}$ , on the other hand, God does take pleasure, though of course still more in  $\text{דַּעַת אֱלֹהִים}$ .'" Still this rendering is not quite adequate to the form of the words. Taking  $\text{בֵּן}$  in the comparative sense, the words of 6b would mean, "and in knowledge of God more (even) than in whole-offering." The two parts of the verse, therefore, are not synonymous, but synthetic, and this logical relation of 6a and 6b cannot after all be regarded as excluded (*vide supra*, p. 214). But Nowack<sup>4</sup> also remarks, "Seeing that  $\text{בֵּן}$  has undoubtedly a negative sense, as is proved by Psalm lii. 5, and since Hosea presents other passages parallel to this utterance, in which the prophet expresses himself in quite a similar way concerning worship,  $\text{בֵּן}$  must be taken here in this negative significance." But the appeal to Psalm lii. 5 (*vide supra*, p. 151) provides no indubitable result. Further, it would be possible to deduce the equivalence of  $\text{לֵב}$  and  $\text{בֵּן}$  from Hosea vi. 6 only if in 6a and 6b precisely the same emotional activity were

<sup>1</sup> Nath. Zerweck, *Die Hebr. Pröp.*  $\text{בֵּן}$  (Leipzig, 1893), p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*; Heft 5: *die kleinen Propheten übersetzt mit Noten* (1892), p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Oettli, *Der Cultus bei Amos und Hosea (Griefswalder Studien, 1895)*, p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Nowack, *Handcommentar zu den kleinen Propheten*, 1897, p. 43, "and in knowledge of God in preference to the burnt-offering."

referred to,—if, that is to say, we had “I take pleasure in love, and not in slaughter-offering, and in love *מְעִלּוֹת* (more than in burnt-offerings).” But as the two expressions lie before us in the two parts of the verse, it will still be the safest course to regard the different degrees of rejection, which are expressed in the form of the address, as intentional. This can undergo no change in consequence of any other utterances of Hosea (*e.g.* v. 6; viii. 13*a*) which correspond with vi. 6*a*.

(*γ*) It has frequently been thought that, on the contrary, the negation in Hosea vi. 6*a* ought to stand on the same level with the disparagement in 6*b*. For over against the Peschitta and the Vulgate, which have been quoted above (p. 019), the Targum renders 6*a* by אָרִי בְעֵבְרִי הִסְדָּא רַעְיָה קָרַמִּי מִפְרֻבָּה. In like manner 6*a* is rendered in the LXX., *Cod. Vat.*, by ἔλεος θέλω ἢ θυσίαν. Only in *Cod. Alex.* we have καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, as in the Gospel of Matthew ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν is twice offered by the text (ix. 13 and xii. 7).<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, Flacius<sup>2</sup> comes to the conclusion, Hosea vi. 6: *Misericordiam volo, non sacrificium pro magis volo misericordiam quam sacrificium.*” In the same way Buxtorf, in his *Thesaurus Grammaticus* (*vide* p. 017, note <sup>2</sup>), p. 553, interprets וְאֵל in Proverbs viii. 10 by “et non, *i.e.* prae vel magis quam. Simile exemplum est Hosea vi. 6.” This assimilation of the two sections 6*a* and 6*b* has recently found support from the following exegetes: Wünsche, *Der Prophet Hosea erklärt*, 1868, p. 254, who says: “Jehovah has more pleasure in love, piety, and practical knowledge of God than in slaughter-offering and

<sup>1</sup> Did the reading of *Cod. Alex.* arise from this (Böhl, *Die Alttestamentliche Citate im Neuen Testament*, p. 35)? Eugène Massebieau, *Examen des citations de l'ancien Testament dans l'évangile selon St. Matthieu*, 1885, p. 20, finds a difficulty in the suggestion, because *θυσία* in Matthew is relatively ἀπαξ εἰρημένον, since it occurs besides only in xii. 7, and because θέλω is by no means a ready substitute for וְאֵל.

<sup>2</sup> *Clavis scripturae sacrae*, vol. 2, s.v. “Comparativus.”

burnt-offering"; Schmoller, *Die Propheten Hosea, Joel und Amos* (in J. P. Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1872), pp. 63, 70, translates, "in love I have more pleasure than in sacrifice"; Marti, *Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.*, 1880, p. 310 (cf. *supra*, p. 211) gives as his translation of 6a, "I have more pleasure in the manifestation of love than in sacrifice"; T. K. Cheyne, *Hosea, with Notes and Introduction* (The Cambridge Bible), 1884, p. 79, interprets, "and not sacrifice=rather than sacrifice"; Orelli also (*ad loc.*, 1896) understands 6a in accordance with 6b. Nevertheless, according to the considerations advanced on pp. 151-209, this assimilation of 6a to 6b can be regarded even less than the converse procedure, discussed under ( $\beta$ ), as one actually consistent with Hebrew diction. For the Hebrew possessed an expression for comparative negation, and Hosea himself makes use of it in 6b. And so it cannot but be an unsafe exposition which reads this comparative negation into 6a also, where the speaker himself has not employed it.

ED. KÖNIG.

(*To be concluded.*)

*IS SECOND PETER A GENUINE EPISTLE TO  
THE CHURCHES OF SAMARIA?*

IV.

EXTERNAL ATTESTATION TO 2 PETER.

IF it can be shown that the Epistle of Jude is indebted to 2 Peter, this is the earliest and by far the strongest attestation to its genuineness; but this is a very complicated problem, especially because the estimate of the arguments is so often dependent on what each deems probable. That there is a connexion is not doubted; and a strong case can, I think, be made out for the priority of 2 Peter.

If the analysis that has been made of the literary affinities of 2 Peter be correct, some of the imagery which is often