

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

is love, and who condescends to enter into the most intimate relations with greatly erring men for their highest good.

A. B. BRUCE.

NOTES ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS IN
HEBREW.

WHILE using the latest edition of Spurrell's *Notes on the Book of Genesis*¹ I have collected a number of additional observations, which, I venture to think, will be found interesting to English admirers of that excellent work.

In the very first verse of the first chapter Spurrell decides rightly in favour of the absolute sense of בְּרֵאשִׁית, and disapproves of that construction which treats the word as a *status constructus* with בְּרָא (b'rō or bārā) which follows, on the ground that *v.* 2 forms a parenthesis and the conclusion begins in *v.* 3. He justly remarks that the absolute sense of בְּרֵאשִׁית may be inferred even in the absence of the article in the vocalisation of ב. For other adverbs also are pronounced without the article in spite of their absolute sense. I may add the following to the three examples given by Spurrell:—בְּרֵאשִׁית appears in Isaiah 46.

¹ I regard as a specially valuable part of the *Notes* the materials which Spurrell has provided out of the old versions. In the employment of these old documents he has followed a course which has always presented itself to me as an ideal, one which most commentators have unfortunately failed to take. For the practice in most commentaries has been to state only how a single portion of the text has been presented in the particular version, and possibly to add this or that phrase from the actual language of the version. This secures for the reader of the commentary no true insight into the context of the version, on which, after all, the true understanding of the single expression often depends. It is also praiseworthy that Spurrell quotes here and there the actual language of a mediæval Jewish commentary, as, for example, Rashi (pp. 5, 29), and appends complete literal translations to all his oriental quotations. He has thus adopted the excellent practice of August Wünsche, in his very instructive commentaries on Hosea and on Joel, as well as of Gustav Baur in his able and thorough *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung* (vol. i., 1861).

10 in the absolute sense, "from the beginning"; so **כִּרְאֵשׁ** signifies "from the absolute beginning" in Isaiah 40. 21; 41. 4, 26; 48. 16; Proverbs 8. 23; Ecclesiastes 3. 11. Further, "a tempore occulto, i.e. æterno," is represented *once* by **מִהָעוֹלָם** (Ps. 41. 14), but *nineteen times* by **מֵעוֹלָם** (Gen. 6. 4, etc.; Ps. 90. 2, etc.) and we find *always* **לְעוֹלָם** (Gen. 3. 22, etc.). Further, the expression **הַקֶּדֶם** for "the front" existed (Gen. 10. 30), and nevertheless it was always used in the absolute sense without the article, **מִקֶּדֶם**, locally, = "from before" (Isa. 9. 11), and temporally, = "from of old" (Isa. 45. 21; 46. 10; Mic. 5. 1; Hab. 1. 12; Ps. 74. 12, etc.). In the same way **לְפָנַיִם**, "formerly," was pronounced, Deuteronomy 2. 10, etc.

It is moreover easy to explain psychologically that in formal expressions in common use the omission of the emphatic demonstrative *ha* established itself. We find, for example, for the idea "until morning," alongside **עַד־הַבֹּקֶר** (Exod. 16. 23 f.; 29. 34; Lev. 6. 2; Jud. 6. 31; 19. 25; 1 Sam. 3. 15; 2 Kings 10. 8; Prov. 7. 18; Ruth 3. 13 f.) the form without the article, **עַד־בֹּקֶר** (Exod. 12. 10, 22, cf. 14. 27; 16. 19; 23. 18; Lev. 7. 15; 19. 23; 22. 30; Num. 9. 12, 15), and in poetry, Isaiah 38. 13.

Thus, in order to stamp the absolute sense of **בְּרֵאשִׁית** in Genesis 1. 1, there is no necessity for the pronunciation **בְּרֵאשִׁית**, as it is reflected in the transcription *βαρρησηθ* referred to by De Lagarde (*Symmicta*, i. 113). Moreover the same consideration disposes of the remark of Nestle:¹ "In case that the first word of the Bible indicates by the very act that the article is wanting a late and Aramaic origin for the section, how instructive it would be to have a collation of the Syriac adverbial expressions like that which is given for the *Geoponika* in §§ 2 and 66."

¹ Eberhard Nestle, *Z.M.D.G.*, 1889, p. 705, in a review of Sprenger, *Darlegung der Grundsätze nach denen die Syrische Uebertragung der Griechischen Geoponika gearbeitet worden ist.*

Moreover the accentuators also understood בראשית in the absolute sense. For they separated that word from those which follow by the strong distinctive Tiphcha. Some further light is thrown on this by the course they followed in punctuating Hosea 1. 2, which stands in closest parallelism with Genesis 1. 1. There they punctuated תְּחִלַּת with the strong conjunctive Merka, and so indicated that תְּחִלַּת must stand in closest relation, and be translated along with what follows: "the beginning of that which Jehovah spake to Hosea, consisted herein that He said," etc. On the other hand, in בְּיוֹם דִּבֶּר (Deut. 4. 15) the distinctive Rebia' indicates the meaning "on the day, when He spoke," and not "on the day of speaking." There is no more necessity for a genitive relation between בראשית and ברא in Genesis 1. 1, than there is between ביום and דבר here.

There is a case in which I cannot agree with Spurrell, in Genesis 1. 11. There עֵשֶׂב is not "in apposition" to דָּשָׁא, but forms the second member in the threefold detail of the plant-covering of the globe. The enumeration of the three elements in this covering is asyndetic, as, for example, in 10. 5 (and in the Peshitto), where, however, the LXX. inserts a καὶ, and the Samaritans, not indeed in their text, but in their ordinary reading of Genesis, introduce an "and."¹ Asyndetic in like manner is the enumeration in Genesis 13. 10, where again the Samaritans have the asyndeton in both text and pronunciation,² and only the LXX. and the Peshitto insert an "and" (καὶ, ַּו, w'aikh). That עֵשֶׂב, in 1. 11, should not be taken as in apposition is further confirmed by v. 12, where the very same elements of the plant-world are enumerated syndetically. For while עֵשֶׂב is there linked with וְעֵץ, it is at the same time separated from the foregoing דָּשָׁא, and marked as an independent member of the enumeration.

¹ Petermann, *Versuch einer Hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner* (1868), p. 170: ewgǎji'imma.

² Petermann, ut supra, *kagen šema kaareš mišrēmî bākā šarā*.

I am prepared to agree almost entirely with Spurrell in regard to the grammatical construction of **נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה** in 1. 20a. This expression is not a *Genetivus possessivus*, for the preceding **שְׂרָץ** is a *nomen concretum*, as the LXX. has indicated by *ἐπηρεά*. It is, however, a *Genetivus appositionis*, so that the meaning is "a mass which consists of living creatures." Generally the same genitive of apposition or identity is found in the German expressions, "eine Fülle von Geist" or "eine Menge von Volk," and the same kind of genitive lies in the previous **כֹּלֵי הַגּוֹיִם** (Gen. 48. 19b), "the full whole, which the nations form." This is also the judgment passed upon the words **נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה** by the accentuators. For while they put a Tiphcha after **שְׂרָץ**, they desired to mark it as relatively distinct from the following phrase (this in opposition to Delitzsch). The Peshitto had the same purpose in putting the *status emphaticus, rachša*¹ over against the *status absolutus, רַחֲיִישׁ*, which Onkelos had chosen. Spurrell may have had the very same ideas in his mediating expression, "explanatory apposition." The phrase **נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה** is therefore neither simply "genitive" (Delitzsch and others), nor simply "apposition" (Dillmann and others).

Again, in 1. 21b Spurrell has properly taken **כְּנָף** as a substantive, whereas Delitzsch regarded it as an adjective, "winged" (*alatus*). But Spurrell produces no new material for the decision. One decisive consideration seems to me to lie in the fact that the description **צִפּוֹר כְּנָף** appears four times in the Old Testament, viz. Genesis 1. 21b; Deuteronomy 4. 17; Psalm 78. 27, and 148. 10. Delitzsch founded his rendering of **כְּנָף** above mentioned mainly upon Genesis 7. 14b. Nevertheless, even in **כָּל-כְּנָף** (Gen. 7. 14b, and Ezek. 17. 23) *kānāph* is intended as a substantive, and **כָּל-כְּנָף** as a genitive of

¹ **ܩܚܫܐ**; "reptile," bei Brockelmann, *Lex. syr.*, 1895, s.v.

quality. The proof can be led into the greatest probability by means of these two points. In the first place a comparison of all the passages shows that *kōl-kanāph* occurs in two other places in the Old Testament as genitive of quality, viz., in *כָּל-כַּנְפֵי צִפּוֹר*, Ezekiel 39. 4, 17. It is clear also that the *totality* of winged creatures is meant to be described under the expression *כָּל-הָעוֹף לְמִינֵהוּ* (Gen. 7. 14b), where this expression, according to its context, comprises the third main section of living things. The immediately following apposition *כָּל-צִפּוֹר כָּל-כַּנְפֵי* was only intended to explicate the contents of the previous expression, but *not* to *add* to it a further kind of winged creatures.

I have particular pleasure in signifying my agreement with Spurrell in his interpretation of the passage, Genesis 4. 1b, important as it is for the history of religion. For I can bring forward new material by which the right exegesis of this old *crux interpretum* can be firmly established. The question in 4. 1b is concerning the true sense of the exclamation with which Eve greeted the birth of her first son, "I have obtained a man *אֵת-יְהוָה*."

Spurrell, in the first place, rightly recalls the fact that the phrase in question is reproduced in the LXX. by *διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, in Jerome by "per Deum," and in Onkelos by *כִּן קִדְם יְיָ*.¹ According to these analogies Spurrell claims "with Jehovah," as the most correct translation, but at the same time he does not escape a particular uncertainty. This betrays itself in the words which he adds, which are themselves a fine example of exegetic conscientiousness, such as does not venture to assert more than can be concluded from the available arguments. He says, "Elsewhere, to be

¹ For the understanding of this phrase "from before Jehovah," I may recall the *rôle* which the insertion of the preposition *q'dâm* before the Divine name played in the transcendental development of the Jewish idea of God (cf. my *Einleitung in das A.T.*, p. 101 f.). The idea was to derive operations by means of which God had interfered in the movements of the world not direct from the Godhead itself, but only from its environment.

sure, we find עֵם used in this sense and not אֵת; cf., for example, 1 Samuel 14. 46, כִּי עִם אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה; still אֵת may be regarded as synonymous with עֵם, as may be inferred from its alternative usage with עֵם in the phrase 'to be with one,' *i.e.*, 'help him,' cf. 26. 3, אֵת דָּנֵעֵר with 21. 20, אֵת דָּנֵעֵר; 28. 15, 31. 3, עִם; but 26. 24, 39. 2, אֵת." Pretty much the same justification for this way of taking אֵת יְהוָה, for which Spurrell decides, is given by the other recent commentaries which are known to me. Delitzsch and Dillmann give almost the same words, and Strack does not add a single word to his explanation, "אֵת, by the help of."

I have found some new material, however. I was particularly led to a renewed examination of Genesis iv. 1b through an essay which appeared in 1893 under the title "Der erste Fehler der neuen Bibel."¹ The contentions of this essay find their climax in the following words: "Here (that is in Gen. 4. 1b) all depends upon the little word אֵת, which stands before 'Lord.' Does that signify the accusative, or does it signify 'with'? No doubt it does also mean 'with'; but much more rarely, and never when it could be understood as the accusative."

I grant that at first I could only bring against these positions the formal objection that it was of no importance whether אֵת was found "more rarely" with the signification "with." But before the closing words of this statement I stood defenceless. For, on the ground of the collation which I had made up to that time, I could only point to what follows.

אֵת is used to indicate the point of departure of Divine help in the Massoretic text of Genesis 49. 25a. Nevertheless in that passage it is possible, though not probable,

¹ Döderlein in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (formerly edited by Hengstenberg), 1893, col. 543 f., published a fierce attack upon the translation of Genesis iv. 1b, which was supported by Delitzsch and Dillmann, and has been accepted in the Revised Luther-Version.

that the foregoing וְ ought to be repeated, so that the meaning would be "From the God of thy father—now may He help thee; and on the part of (בְּאֵת) the Almighty—may He bless thee." Thus, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, Genesis 49. 25a is rendered וְאֵל שְׂרִי ,¹ just as the Peshitto gives ܘܐܠܗܝܘܢܝܢ .

Beyond that I had only noted as an exceedingly likely parallel to Genesis 4. 1b; Judges 8. 7b, where Gideon says, $\text{וְדִשְׁתִּי אֶת־בְּשָׂרְכֶם אֶת־קֹצֵי}$, etc. This phrase does not contain the *Nota Accusativi* את . For the causative significance "cause to be threshed" (Bertheau, *ad loc.*) cannot be ascribed to the Qal דִּשְׁתִּי . Oettli on this passage² referred to Psalm 64. 8, $\text{וַיִּרְם אֱלֹהִים חָץ}$, and thought that דִּשְׁתִּי was continued with a double accusative after the analogy of "verbs of clothing." Nevertheless, in Psalm 64. 8, in the first place, the labial *b* may have disappeared after the labial *m*, seeing that in the history of language both these similar sounds often pass over into one another, and as a matter of fact in other passages of the Old Testament they have been commingled either forwards or backwards.³ But even if this assumption may not be made, the poetic construction of וְהִוָּרָה , with an accusative of the instrument cannot without hesitation be transferred to דִּשְׁתִּי , and a word which has את before it, as is the case in Judges 8. 7b. This particular את cannot signify simple "accompaniment," so that the sense would be "together with" (G. Moore, *ad loc.*). For

¹ Pronounced by the modern Samaritans *wil siddi* (Petermann, l.c., p. 217).

² *Kurzgefasster Kommentar* (von Strack und Zöckler), speciell zu Deut. Josua und Richter, bearbeitet von Oettli, 1893.

³ Compare, e.g., alongside the well-known local name Dîbôn (Num. 21. 30, etc.), Dîmôn (Isa. 15. 9), also Dîmôna (Josh. 15. 22); or again, Sanskrit *markata* with *σμάραδος* and *barqat* (Ezek. 28. 13). Further examples in my *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 459. Further, as regards the phenomenon in Hebrew itself, compare, e.g., וַיִּרְצֹו מִיָּם , Exodus 30. 20 (*υψοφοραι υδατι*), or "and Absalom pitched in the land of Gilead" ($\text{וַאֲבִשְׁלֹם אֶרְצוֹ}$), 2 Samuel 17. 16. Many other similar cases will be adduced in my *Syntax*.

the thorns (קוצים) are not linked with the preceding "vestram carnem" as a further object of דָּוַשׁ. There remains, therefore, only the one interpretation, viz., that this אִתְּ indicates the co-operation naturally flowing from fellowship. Gideon said, therefore, "Your flesh will I thresh in union with, and consequently in co-operation with, the thorns of the desert." Thus it appears that this אִתְּ introduces the *intermediary thing*. And, in fact, this אִתְּ was thus interpreted in Judges 8. 7b by the ancients. Compare the εἰς of the LXX., the עַל of the Targum, the וְעַל of the Peshitto, and the "cum" of Jerome.

Nevertheless, Genesis 49. 25a, and Judges 8. 7b, were not, after all, such passages as one could bring to bear against the closing words of Döderlein's statement, quoted above. But after long searching I have found at least one passage such as Döderlein demands, where the word אִתְּ has the sense of "with," although it could there be regarded as a mark of the accusative. Job 26. 4a runs: אֶת־מִי הִגִּדְתָּ מְלִין. Here אִתְּ can just as well be a sign of the accusative, or signify "with." In my judgment, moreover, it has here the former sense. For in v. 4a the one to whom such speeches are addressed is to be represented as incomprehensible, and in v. 4b the source of such utterances is to be described as undiscoverable. So the Targum rightly gives וְיֵת מִן, the LXX. τίνι, the Peshitto, וְעַל. But אִתְּ in this passage has been taken in the sense of "with" by Gesenius in the *Thesaurus linguae Hebraeae*, p. 846b, and by Georg Hoffmann, *ad locum*.¹

Another passage, where there is an abstract possibility of finding in אִתְּ the *nota accusativi*, but where beyond doubt it means "with," may be found in Esther 9. 29a. There it is said of Esther וְהִכְתִּיב... אֶת־כָּל־הַתְּקִיף, "and Esther wrote ...with all authority."

¹ *Hiob nach G. Hoffmann* (Kiel, 1891), p. 74, "Wer hat dir nur solche Rede eingegeben, wessen Hauch stieg aus dir empor?"

Through these instances that interpretation of Genesis 4. 1b which is maintained by Spurrell is shown to be linguistically correct.

If, however, the need is felt of material (*sachlich*) confirmation for the rendering, we require only to raise the question which Döderlein in his zeal has forgotten to raise, namely, *whether Eve or Mary gave birth to the Saviour.*

Furthermore, Luther wavered in his interpretation of Genesis 4. 1b. At first he chose for his translation the words: "Ich habe gekrieget den Mann des Herrn." He supported this translation also in the lectures upon Genesis, which he delivered in 1536-1545, which were published in eleven volumes.¹ This translation is obviously quite irreconcilable with the text. Undoubtedly Luther recognised this too. For subsequently, in the last revision of his translation, he preferred the words, "Ich habe gekrieget den Mann, den Herrn." That this cannot be the sense of the text has just been shown by linguistic and material (*sachlich*) arguments. This wavering evinced by Luther was not unknown in former centuries. Michael Walther, whose "*Officina biblica*" I have often referred to in my *Introduction to the Old Testament*, expressly drew attention to the change of opinion on the part of the Reformer (§ 45. 3).

Many later Lutherans have forgotten this point of history, and insist all the more on assigning to the text a sense which, according to proved linguistic facts, it does

¹ *Martini Lutheri exegetica opera Latina* (Curavit Elsperger, Erlangen, 1829), i. 307: "Ac dixit Heva, 'Acquisivi virum Domini.' Hinc potest causa colligi, cur Heva non vocarit Cain filium, quod scilicet præ nimio gaudio et reverentia noluerit appellare filium, sed cogitaverit de ipso maius aliquid, quasi Cain esset ille vir futurus, qui caput serpentis contriturus esset. Ideo non simpliciter virum sed Domini virum appellat, de quo Dominus Deus promiserat: 'semen tuum conteret caput serpentis.' Etsi autem hæc spes falsa fuit, tamen apparet Hevam fuisse sanctam mulierem et credidisse promissioni de futura salute per semen benedictum."

not *require* to have, a sense which, according to the progress of the Biblical history of salvation, it is impossible to give to it.

ED. KÖNIG.

THE INCARNATION AND DOGMA.

“Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God.”—1 *John* iv. 15.

Our subject is the Incarnation and Dogma. It has not a very attractive sound: one rather draws off from even the thought of thinking about Dogmatism and Dogma. But this very shrinking is proof that we, ourselves, are concerned in asking *why* there has grown up, almost within our own recollection, among people who are intelligent enough, this strong and rather scornful dislike of dogmatic truth. When you say that a man's habit of thought is dogmatic, why have you already condemned him with fashionable and modern thinkers?

After all, a dogma simply means a doctrine, announced as such, put to us as what we ought to believe. Dogmatic theology means positive truth in religion systematically stated; and the only sense in which a man may be too dogmatic is the sense in which he may be too positive. But assuredly there are things about which he cannot be too certain, nor speak too confidently; mischief only begins when one is positive in the wrong place, or in an unbecoming manner. And as one's over-readiness to lay down the law does not prove that there are no laws at all, nor even that I shall not be arrested if I break them, so too, and just in the same way, the over-readiness of some Christians to dogmatize neither proves that there is no dogma nor that I shall be safe in rejecting it.

If you think of it, the most dogmatic statement in the