

# The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1918

## THE TERMINOLOGY OF LOVE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

### II\*

The story of the Septuagint usage of the terms for love is almost told by the simple statistics. The verb *ἀγαπᾶν* occurs in the Septuagint about two hundred and sixty-six times, *φιλεῖν* about thirty-six times, *ἐρᾶσθαι* only three times, and *στέργειν* just once. Even this does not give the whole state of the case, for in the majority of its occurrences *φιλεῖν* is used in the sense of "to kiss." It occurs only sixteen or seventeen times with the meaning of "love." That is to say, this word, the common word for love in the classics, is used in the Septuagint in only a little more than five per cent of the instances where love falls to be mentioned: in nearly ninety-five per cent *ἀγαπᾶν* is used. Here is a complete reversal of the relative positions of the two words.

In more than a third of the instances in which *φιλεῖν* is used of loving, moreover, it is used of things—food or drink, or the like (Gen. xxvii. 4, 9, 14, Prov. xxi. 17, Hos. iii. 1, Is. lvi. 10), leaving only a half a score of instances in which it is employed of love of persons. In all these instances (except Tob. vi. 14, where it is a demon that is in question) it is a human being to whom the loving is ascribed. The love ascribed to him ranges from mere carnal love (Jer. xxii. 22 [paralleled with *ἐρασταί*], Lam. i. 2, Tob. vi. 14, *cf.* Tob. vi. 17), through the love of a father for his son (Gen. xxxvii. 4), to love for Wisdom (Prov. viii. 17, xxix. 3, Wisd. viii. 2). Cremer drops the remark: "In two passages only does *φιλεῖν* stand as perfectly synonymous with *ἀγαπάω*,

\* The first portion of this article was published in the number of this REVIEW for January 1918: pp. 1-45.

## THE AUTHENTICITY OF JONAH

### ARTICLE I.

In this and succeeding articles it is the intention of the author to investigate the premises of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, especially in the sphere of philology. Many of these premises were propounded in the 18th century and have long been so venerable because of their age and the use that has been made of them by successive generations of Biblical critics, that one feels like a Vandal in attempting to assail their supposedly firm foundations. Nevertheless, the war will be carried into Africa and if possible Carthage itself will be destroyed. The weapons will be the grammars, concordances, and dictionaries, especially of the Semitic languages, the ancient versions of the Scriptures, and the literary products of any age with which the writer is acquainted. As far as in him lies, the author will keep himself out of sight. It will be a real logomachy and a battle of the books; but it will be an offensive-defensive and a counter attack with all the force that can be mustered. No opprobrious names will be called and no intentionally unfair advantage will be taken. The object is to confirm those who still believe in the trustworthiness of the divine oracles and to convince and convert the wavering and the disbelieving; and to do all this fairly, logically, and scientifically. If the writer fails in his attempt, his conviction is that the failure will be due, not to the weakness of his cause, nor to the paucity of the resources at his command, nor to the strength of the opponent's position; but to some defect in his plan, or mishandling of his material.

The method to be pursued in these articles will be to state in their own words the premises of the critics and the evidence given in support of their premises; then, to present further evidence tending to show that the premises are not justified by the evidence that has been produced in their favor; and lastly, to state the conclusions which seem to follow from the evidence.

This article is one of two treating of the objections to the authenticity of the book of Jonah.

### I. THE OBJECTIONS STATED.

On page 322 of Dr. Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*, it is said that the Book of Jonah cannot "have been written until long after the life time of Jonah himself." This is said to appear first of all "from the style, which has several Aramaisms, or other marks of a later age." These marks are the following words:

"(1) ספינה 1:5 [*deck or ship*].

(2) התעשת 1:6 "*to think* (= Heb. חשב, Isa. 40:18)  
cf. עשתנת Ps. 146:4."

(3) ש for אשר 1:7, 8.

(4) שתק 1:11, 12 Prov. 26:20, Ps. 107:30.

(5) מזה 2:1, "*to prepare, set apart*" as Dan. 1:10, 11.  
I Ch. 9:29 and in Aramaic.

(6) טעם 3:7 [*decree*] as in Aramaic, Ezr. 6:14, 7:23.

(7) עמל 4:10 "*to labor*" 4:10 (in ordinary Hebrew יגע).

(8) באשר למי 1:8 *on account of what to whom*, "for whose cause."

(9) The title "God of heaven" as in Neh. 1:5 and other post-exilic writers."

Of these marks De Wette-Schrader in their *Introduction to the Old Testament*<sup>1</sup> give six marks that are the same as those in L. O. T. and add six; to-wit; (10) רב 1:6, (11) רבו 4:11, (12) העביר 3:6, (13) ל 4:6, and (14) קרא 1:2, 3:2.

Cornill<sup>2</sup> gives five marks, that are the same as Driver's and three that differ from his; whereas he agrees in four with De Wette-Schrader and adds three new ones. Cornill, De Wette-Schrader and Driver agree only in four marks, i.e. in the words for "ship," "think," "prepare" and in the use

<sup>1</sup> *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, p. 464.

<sup>2</sup> *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, 351.

of the relative. The words added by Cornill are: (15) לִשְׁבֹּל 1:4, (16) קְרִיאה 3:2, and (17) טַעַם "to taste" 3:7.

## II. THE EVIDENCE.

The evidence given above will be examined in the order of the specifications.

1. *Sefina* is a noun from the root סָפַן found six times in the Old Testament in the sense of *cover*, to-wit, in De. 33:22, Je. 22:14, I K. 7:3, 7, 6:9, and Hab. 1:4—all in what the critics call the older literature. Jonah apparently preserves the correct derivative form of the word and means by it a part of the ship that is covered, i.e. the covered part, or "below decks." For ship he employs אֲנִיָּה in 1:3, 4, 5 the ordinary word in the Old Testament for ship, being found thirty-two times in all. In Gen. 49:13 and Deut. 28:68, Onkelos renders it by *sefina*. The Pseudo-Jonathan has *sefina* in Gen. 49:13, and 'ilpa in Deut. 28:68. The Syriac uses 'elpa' as well as *sefina*. The former comes from the Babylonian *ilpu* and the latter probably from the Hebrew *safan*. "to cover," or a Phenician equivalent. Its original sense, therefore, would be a decked or covered ship. The root *sefan* is not found in Syriac and in the Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud it means (to quote Dalman) *achten, befruchtet, gereinigt*. It is found several times in the Sachau papyri.

Hence, derivation, use and time of its employment elsewhere all favor its independent origin in Hebrew and permit its employment in the lifetime of Jonah as well as in 500 or 300 B.C.

2. הִתְעַשַׂת 1:5 "to think" is found but here in the Old Testament, though its derivative is found in Ps. 146:4. The root does not occur in Assyrian, Syriac, Mandaic, or Arabic. It is only found in Aramaic in the three dialects which were used by Jews who adopted Aramaic, e.g. in the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets and in the Aramaic of

the Egyptian papyri.<sup>3</sup> It would seem from this that the word, with scores of other good Hebrew words, was probably taken over from the Hebrew into the Aramaic by the Jews. The word does not occur at all in Syriac, though that language has sixteen different words to express the idea of thinking. Jewish Aramaic employs it but very seldom and has four other words to denote the idea. New Hebrew does not have the word at all. The common word in Aramaic, as in Heb., is חשב. What the differentiation between the two words may have been we do not know. The Targum of Onkelos never uses עשת; but renders חשב eighteen times by the same word, three times by 'illif and once by dîn. The Samaritan Targum always transliterates the Hebrew חשב, and never uses Jonah's word. In the Sachau papyri we find also *hekam* and *istekal* in the sense "to think."

3. As to the use of ש before 700 B.C. to denote the relative pronoun, the following may be said:

- (1) It is not Aramaic, never being found in any dialect, age, or document, except twice in the inscription of Nerab from the 7th century B.C.<sup>4</sup>
- (2) It is the usual relative in Assyrio-Babylonian from the earliest document to the latest.
- (3) If we follow the critics in their dating of the component parts of the Old Testament, it is found in Jud. 5, which they usually call the earliest document in the Old Testament and in Ecclesiastes, which they commonly date as one of the latest,<sup>5</sup> and in Gen. 6:3, which belongs to J (*id.* 43) and in Gen. 49:10 which Driver gives to J.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Thus in the Sachau papyri, p. 151. "(My son) whom I have nurtured, *think* (עשת) on me."; p. 157, "do as thou *thinkest*" (active stem); p. 4, "If it seems good to our lord, *think* (אתעשת) upon the temple and build it."

<sup>4</sup> Lidzbarski: *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, 371, 445, and *Ephemeris* I 366.

<sup>5</sup> Cornill: *Introduction* pp. 160 and 452.

<sup>6</sup> L. O. T. p. 17.



- (4) If we follow the traditional view of the date of the books, it is found in the Pent., Jud., Kings, Eccles., Song, Psalms, Job, Chron. and Ezra.<sup>7</sup>
- (5) It is the usual relative in the Hebrew of the Talmud, having almost completely displaced אשׁר.<sup>8</sup>
- (6) It is found at times in Phœnician in place of the more usual אשׁר.<sup>9</sup>
- (7) According to all the evidence, therefore, אשׁר may have been used in any Hebrew document from the earliest to the latest, and is actually

---

<sup>7</sup> אשׁר is found in Gen. 6:3 and 49:10, both attributed by the critics to J., whose date they all place before 750 B.C. It is found also in Jud. 5:7 (which is considered by many to be the earliest, or among the earliest, compositions in the Old Testament) and in Jud. 6:17, 7:32, 7:26, and in 2K.6:11, Job 19:29, Song of Songs 1:6, 7, 5:2, 6:5, Lam. 2:15, 16, 4:9, 5:18, Ezra 8:10, 1 Chron. 5:20, 27:27, Pss. 122:3, 4, 123:2, 124:1, 2, 6, 129:6, 7, 133:2, 3, 135:2, 8, 10, 136:23, 137:8, 9, 144:15, and 146:3, 5 and 68 times in Ecclesiastes. It does not occur in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus nor in that of the Zadokite Fragments; nor in Daniel or Esther; nor in Psalms 44, 74 and 79, which the critics generally think to be from the Maccabean times; nor in Psalms 54, 55, 60, 62, 64, 71, 76, 77, 86, 88, 89, 90, 98, 102, 116, 118, 142, 143, nor in any of the others which Reuss assigns to the Maccabean period and in only five of those that Cheyne assigns to the same time. If those writers of the Old Testament books could only have shown some consistency in the use of this little relative, how easy it might have been to determine the date of the document by means of its evidence; or, if the critics could only agree to put either early or late all documents having it; or if those provoking Assyrians, Babylonians, Phœnicians, Carthaginians and Nerabites had never used it at all, or had all of them used it always! It seems that with the evidence before us at present we must admit that no argument from the use of אשׁר can be made as to the *date* of a document. It may indicate that a document was written under Northern Palestinian or Assyrian influences. The idiosyncrasy of the writer, metre and poet's license, may account for its frequent use in Ecclesiastes and in some of the psalms. One might be pardoned for suggesting that there may be some humor in the changes in the text, the author wishing to exhibit the differences between the Hebrew and the Phœnician; or it may represent the serious attempt of two foreigners to make themselves understood.

<sup>8</sup> See article on Mishnaic Hebrew by Rev. Moses Segal in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xx. 659.

<sup>9</sup> Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, p. 227 and *Ephemeris* I, 360, 366, II, 410.

found in documents of all ages. *Why* it has been used in such an erratic manner, cannot be explained. *That* it has been so used is certain; and hence that its use in any given document cannot determine the date of that document, is also certain.

(8) As to the phrase *למי באשר*<sup>10</sup> several pertinent remarks may be made:

(a) The whole sentence purports to be a quotation of what the sailors said to Jonah. These sailors may have been Jews, or Phenicians, or Cypriote, or Greeks; but it may justly be concluded that like sailors in general they were uneducated men and that like Marryatt's and Cooper's tars, they had their own peculiar lingo. It is not necessary to suppose that they spoke the language of the prophets and of the recorders of the royal archives in which the books like Hosea and the Kings are written.

(b) What is said makes good sense: "On account of what (or whom) is this evil to us?" No one certainly can misunderstand it. It is admitted that such a phrase is found nowhere else in the Old Testament; but neither is the idea. And if the idea is not found elsewhere, will some one of the critics of Jonah, or of the sailors, tell us how it could be expressed better? It is clear, precise, and suitable to the situation.

(9) The other phrase meaning the same thing, viz. *בשלימי*, is probably the language of the author. At any rate, it is a variation such as we often find in all dialectic dialogues.

(10) As to the *ש* in chapter 4:7, its use may have been due to the fact that Jonah was imitating the Assyrian usage. At the time he was overlooking

<sup>10</sup> See number 8 below.

Nineveh and waiting for its anticipated doom. Besides, he must have known Assyrian, or he would scarcely have been able to preach to the Ninevites. Like many modern critics, he may have shown his *amour propre* by showing that he was a *connoisseur* of Assyrian and no mere *ciceroni* or *dragoman*.

4. שָׁתַק is found in the Old Testament outside of Jonah only in Prov. 26:20, Ps. 107:30. In neither of these places is it used in connection with the sea. As to the use of the word as an indication of the age of a document, Prov. 26:20 belongs to the proverbs that were transcribed by the men of Hezekiah and which Dr. Driver says "were reputed in Hezekiah's age to be ancient."<sup>11</sup> Since Hezekiah was born about the time that Jonah died, we leave it to the critics to show how a word used in a document reputed to be old in Hezekiah's age could not have been used in the lifetime of Jonah.<sup>12</sup>

It is to be observed, further, that Jon. 1:11, 12 is the only place where the idea of the sea being at rest is ever mentioned in the Old Testament, although the word for sea occurs 362 times and its plural 30 times. It is evident, therefore, that no one can know that *šathak* was not at all times the proper word in Hebrew to express the quieting of the sea after a storm.

5. סָנָה occurs twenty-five times in the Old Testament. In its meaning "to number, measure, reckon" it is found eleven times, viz. Gen. 13:16 *bis*, Num. 23:10, Is. 53:12, Jer. 33:13, 2Sa. 24:1, Dan. 5:28, 2Ch. 5:5, Ecc. 1:15, Ps. 89:13, and Ps. 146:5. In the sense of "prepare, apportion, set apart, or appoint" it occurs eleven times also, viz. Jer. 2:1, 4:6, 7, 8, 1 Chron. 9:29, and Dan. 1:5, 10, 11, 2:24, 49 and

<sup>11</sup> L. O. T. p. 407.

<sup>12</sup> It is singular that the Aramaic versions of Jonah do not render this verb by *shathak* but the Targum of Jonathan by the Aphel of *nûh* and the Peshitto by the Peal of *shelâ*. The Arabic renders it by *sakana*. *šhathak* is found in the Sachau papyrus, p. 116:11 in the sense of keeping silence.



3:12. In other senses, it is found in Job 7:3, Is. 65:11 and IK. 20:25. It will be observed:

- (1) That it occurs in the second sense only in works admittedly written under Assyrian and Babylonian influences.
- (2) The word is used in Assyrian in the second sense long before the time of Jonah exactly as it is employed in Jonah and Daniel.<sup>13</sup>
- (3) It is not true that in the late works of the Old Testament it crowded out, or took the place of צוה and פקד; for the former is used in Chronicles 17 times; Ezra-Nehemiah, 10; Esther, 7; Prv., 14; Lev.-Num., 70; and the latter in Chronicles 8 times; Ezra-Nehemiah, once; Esther, once; Prov., 9; and Lev.-Num., '2. Whereas מנה occurs in Chronicles twice; Ezra-Nehemiah, no time; Esther, no time; Prv. two times; and Lev-Num., once only, and that in the Balaam passage. In the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus from 180 B.C. צוה is found six times, פקד nine times, and מנה three times, once perhaps in the sense of appoint. In the Zadokite-Fragments from a work written about 40 A.D., צוה occurs eleven times; פקד, eleven; and מנה never occurs at all, in any sense.
- (4) That Jonah and Daniel, under the influence of Aramaic, used מנה where the earlier Hebrew would have used צוה (as Dr. Driver asserts in L.O.T. 506) hardly seems possible in view of the fact that the translators of the Aramaic versions of the Pentateuch never render the latter by the former. The Aramaic *pekad* corresponded to the Hebrew צוה and is always used for it in Onkelos, and apparently in the other Targums, and in the Peshitto.

<sup>13</sup> Thus "thou hast allotted disease" (ZA, V. 67, 42 *tumannima murša*) "whom the king had designated" (ZA, VI. 234, 11 *sha sharru . . . umannu*.)

(5) Nor is it fair to say that Jonah uses מָנָה instead of an earlier פָּקַד and that this is a sign of late date or of Aramaic influence. Whatever opinion we may hold with regard to the scholarship of the translators of the Old Testament into Aramaic, no one will be rash enough to say that they did not know the meaning of common Hebrew and Aramaic terms much better than is possible for the best of us today. Now, if Jonah used *mana* in the Aramaic sense, is it not remarkable that here in Jonah 2:1, and 4:6, 7, 8 the Targum of Jonathan should have rendered it by *zammen* to prepare, as we find it also in Jerome? The Syriac version has *tayyeb* in 2:1 and *pekad* in 4:7, 8, 9, reversing what Dr. Driver asserts with regard to the two words. Apparently, these translators thought that Jonah's *mana* did not exactly correspond to their conception of what the Aramaic *mana* meant.

(6) If we take the three verbs in the meanings "to command," "to oversee," and "to set apart," the distinction of synonyms in the writers of Old Testament Hebrew will be found to be clear and appropriate, whether the literature be early or late. According to Jonah, God "set apart" or "designated" a great fish to swallow Jonah, and he set apart a particular gourd to spring up and shelter him, and a worm and a dry east wind to smite it. Is not this more beautiful and appropriate than the more stately words for command and appoint especially when we are dealing with gourds, worms, and fish?

6. טָעַם is a common verb in Syriac in both the simple and causative stems, active and passive, and has at least nine derivatives in use; but in no case does it appear in the sense of decree or command. The same is true of the Arabic, the Mandaean (at least in Norberg) and of the Sa-

maritan Targum and Onkelos. Levy, in his *Dictionary to the Targums and Talmud* gives no example of its use in the sense of decree. Nor is it found in any Phœnician or Aramaic inscription. In the Biblical Aramaic a noun from this verb is used twenty-six times in the sense of decree. This, also, is its uniform meaning in the papyri from the colony of Jews at Elephantine. This meaning of the word seems to have been derived chiefly from the *usus loquendi* of the Assyrians. It is noteworthy that the Assyrians have the noun in the sense of command but not in that of taste; neither does the verb seem to have been used by them.

It will be noted, further, that the verb is found in 1Sa. 14:24, 29, 43 and 2Sa. 3:25, 19:36, in the same sense as in Jonah 4:7, and that the noun in the sense of *command* is found in the Old Testament only in those works which are written under Assyrian or Babylonian influence, i.e. nine times in Daniel, nineteen in Ezra, and once in Jonah 4:7. In the Aramaic dialects and documents, also, it is found only in those written under Babylonian influence. The Aramaic-speaking Jewish colony at Elephantine in Egypt was founded before the time of Cambyses, perhaps by Nebuchadnezzar himself. At any rate, the number of names of Babylonian origin found in the papyri indicates that at some time the Jews of the colony had been under Babylonian dominion and influence. The noun in the sense of *command* occurs in the Sachau papyri in three places; first on page 44, line 22, of Sachau's work: Your ship-carpenters shall make the ship as the *command* has been made (*šim*); secondly in line 25 where the last clause of the preceding sentence recurs: and thirdly, on page 63: No further *command* will be given them (lit., *put to them*).

7. Dr. Driver asserts that the use of עָמַל in 4: to indicates a late date and that the older Hebrew would have used יָנַע. There is absolutely no proof in support of such an assertion; but the evidence shows that the author of Jonah used the only Hebrew word that would exactly express his

meaning. The Hebrew has four words for "to work." The most general is עָשָׂה "to do or make," which is used in a few cases in the special sense of "work or labor," as in Ex. 5:9: "Let heavier work be laid upon the men that they may *labor* therein." Ex. 5:9 belongs to J (LOT 23) which dates before 750 B.C. (LOT 120). This sense is found also in Neh. 4:15. A second and more special term for work or labor is עָבַד, used also in J, as in Gen. 2:5, 15, 3:23, 4:2, 11, Ex. 5:18 and in E in Ex. 20:9, Prov. 12:11, 28:19, Is. 19:9, 30:24, Zech. 13:5, Ezek. 36:9, 34, 2 Chron. 2:18. The third, more specific still, is עָבַל. It is used in Prov. 16:26 which is in the part of Proverbs which is "generally referred to the golden days of the monarchy" (LOT, 405). It is found, also, in Ps. 137:1 and eight times in Ecclesiastes. The fourth word is יָנַע which is the most special of all and always involves the idea of weariness, or exhaustion. It is found in Prov. 23:4 and Jos. 7:3 (JE) only, of the works which the critics place in the period before 700 B.C. (LOT, 106, and 405). In the period from 700 B.C. to the end of the captivity it occurs in Jos. 24:13, 2Sa. 23:10, Hab. 2:13, Jer. 45:5 and 51:58, Lam. 5:5, and twelve times in Is. 40-66. In the actual or alleged post-captivity literature, it is found in Mal. 2:17 *bis*, Ecc. 10:15, Job 9:29 and Pss. 6:6 and 69:3. The conclusion from the above induction of facts is that every one of the four verbs was used in each of the three periods into which the Hebrew literature is divided by the critics.

If we examine the use of the nouns for work, we find that the same is true. מַעֲשֵׂה occurs in Hosea, Amos, Micah, in Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; in Haggai, Chronicles, the Psalms, and in nearly every other work. עֲבוּדָה in the sense of work is found, among other places, in Gen. 30:26 (J) and 29:27 (E), in Is. 28:21; and in Ps. 104:23; and in Neh. 3:5, 10:37. עָבַל is found in Gen. 41:51 (E), Num. 23:21 (?), Deut. 26:7, Jud. 10:16, Prov. 24:2, 31:7, Is. 10:1, 53:11, 59:4, Hab. 13:13, Jer. 20:18, and eight times in Job, four-

teen times in the Psalms, and twenty-two times in Ecclesiastes. **יניע** is found in Gen. 31:42 (E) and Hos. 12:8 from the early period; in Deut. 28:33, Jer. 3:24, 20:5, Ezek. 23:29, and Is. 45:14, 55:2 from the middle period; and in Hag. 1:11, Neh. 5:13, Job 10:3, 39:11, 16 and Pss. 78:46, 109:11 and 128:2 from the late period. All four verbs, or derivatives of the same, appear in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus. The noun **עמל** is found two or three times and **יניע** and **יניע** five times. Ben Sira distinguishes the two nouns in 11:11 when he says: "The labor (**עמל**) of the rich is to acquire wealth, and the overwork (**יניע**) of the poor is for the needs of his family." In the Zadokite fragments verbs and nouns from the first two are found and **יניע** occurs twice; but **עמל** does not occur, either as noun or verb.

Singularly, the last two of these roots are found in Assyrian but not the first; and the second only in borrowed terms. In Arabic the second and third are common and used in a sense similar to that employed in Hebrew, and the fourth has the meaning "to be in pain." In Syriac the second and third are common but the first and last do not occur. In Mandaic only the second is found in Norberg. In the Aramaic inscriptions, the verb **עמל** occurs only in the *Building Inscription*, from the time of Tiglath-Pileser III, who began to reign in 746 B.C. In the Sachau papyrus 55:2 we find both verb and noun **עמל** in the sentence: "I have heard of the *labor* which thou hast *done*."

From the above data it will be seen:

- (1) That any writer of Hebrew might have properly used any one of the four verbs or nouns for *work* at any period of the literature.
- (2) That the word to which objection is made is the only one of the four that is found in Assyrian, Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew. It was therefore, a primitive Semitic word and no argument as to the date of a document can be based on it; nor can it be said that one of the above four great families of Semitic languages borrowed it from the other.



- (3) Even if it had been borrowed from the Aramaic by Jonah, it could have been borrowed as early as the middle of the eighth century, as the Bar Rekeb building inscription shows.
- (4) That Dr. Driver's assertion that older Hebrew would have used ינע and later Hebrew עמל is controverted by the fact that Ecclesiasticus uses the former five times, thrice in the noun form and twice as a verb and the latter but three times: and by the fact that the Zadokite Fragments use ינע twice, but have not the other word at all.
- (5) That the Targums of Onkelos and the Pseudo-Jonathan do not transliterate עמל (except Onkelos in Gen. 41:12) but render it by some form of לאה or סנה showing that the translators considered that the Aramaic word with the same radicals did not correspond exactly with the original Hebrew.
- (6) Jonah may have labored at a gourd as the book says, but he could scarcely have become exhausted or weary with the exercise, as Dr. Driver implies.

8. באשר למי, "for whose cause"—See under 3, above.

9. The phrase "god of heaven" is not a sign of a late date. We must remember that Jonah uses the phrase in an answer to the presumably Phenician sailors who had asked him to call upon his god 1:6, 8, and questioned him as to who he himself was. He replied: 1:9: "A Hebrew am I, and Jehovah the God of the heavens I revere, who made the sea and the dry land." The Phenicians worshipped בעלשם "the Lord of Heaven."<sup>14</sup> In the Tel-el-Amarna letters Ishtar is called the "mistress of heaven."<sup>15</sup> Tiglath Pileser I (1100 B.C.) speaks of Shamash the judge of heaven<sup>16</sup> and the phrase "gods of heaven" is found in the Sumerian texts<sup>17</sup>. Under the circumstances in which Jonah

<sup>14</sup> Lidzbarski: *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, pp. 153, 39.

<sup>15</sup> Winckler: *Tell-el-Amarna Letters*, No. 20:26.

<sup>16</sup> Lotz: *Tiglath-Pileser I.* 7.

<sup>17</sup> See Muss-Arnolt under *Shamū*.

was placed, who could have made a more sensible and perspicuous response to the question of the sailors?

10. רב החבל 1:6. This is the only place in which a captain of a ship is mentioned in the Old Testament. חבל occurs five times in Ezekiel's account of Tyre, so that no argument from the date can be made from this *hapax legomenon*. *Rab* is used in the O. T. in the sense of captain in the Assyrian title *rabsaris*, 2 Kgs. 18:17 and *rab tabbahim* 2 Kgs. 25:8 and perhaps also in 2 Sa. 23:20 of the chief of the workmen. In Assyrian *rab mallahe* chief of the sailors is found, as also in the Syriac version (*rab mallehe*). The Targum Jonathan has *rab sappane*.

11. רבו for myriad is found in Hos. 23:7 from the 8th century B.C.

12. העביר is found nowhere else in the O. T. nor in Aramaic, nor in Assyrian, in connection with a word for clothing. It is found in I Kings 15:12 in connection with *Sodomites* and in 2 Ch. 15:8 with idols; and frequently of the taking away of sins.

13. ל 4:6 introducing the accusative is found no where else with the verb used by Jonah except in Dan. 8:7 where it occurs with the participle. The employment of this ל before the pronominal object is not necessary in Aramaic, since in Dan. 3:29, and 6:15 the object is affixed to the infinitive. In the Psalms, which critics place late, at least 33 cases of the verb with the object occur and no one of them employs ל with the object. It is passing strange that such a reminiscer as Jonah is said to have been should have departed from all his predecessors and contemporaries in such a matter. As to Jonah's having imitated Daniel, it is clear that to have been imitated Daniel must have been written first. Therefore, if Jonah hails from the 5th century, Daniel must be at least a little earlier. Or, if Daniel was written in the 2nd century (to be exact, according to the critics, in June 164 B.C. or thereabout), then, Jonah must have been written at the earliest after 164 B.C. But as, according to the critics the canon of the prophets was closed before the

writing of Ecclesiasticus i.e. at about 180 B.C., and since Ecclesiasticus mentions the Twelve as existing when he wrote, the theory of the critics as to the close of the prophetic canon would fall. One is tempted to think that in both Jonah and Daniel the  $\text{ב}$  has been doubled by dittography in the process of transmission. It is more probable, however, that the *lo* is used here, as frequently in Hebrew,<sup>18</sup> like the ethical dative in Latin.

14.  $\text{קרא}$  is the most common word in Hebrew for *proclaim* and is used in I Kings 13:4, 32, 21:9, 12, Is. 30:7, Mic. 3:5, 6:9, Am. 4:5, Prov. 1:21, 8:1, Joel 4:9, Jeremiah 2:2, 36:9, Is. 40:5 and Ex. 32:5 (P). No other Hebrew or Aramaic word would have been suitable for Jonah's proclamation. He could not have used *basar*, for it ordinarily means to "proclaim or bring good tidings" as in I Sam. 31:9, 2 Sam. 4:10, 18:19, 31, I Chron. 10:9, Ps. 40:10, 68:12, Is. 60:2.<sup>19</sup> The corresponding Arabic verb means "to announce good tidings," and the noun means "good news." In Syriac the root does not occur in this sense; but in the Aramaic of the Targums, it is generally used just as in Hebrew.<sup>20</sup> In Assyrian, also, it is used of good tidings.<sup>21</sup> The conclusion, therefore, is that Jonah in using  $\text{קרא}$  employed the usual and most appropriate word known to either Hebrews or Arameans with which to express his idea.

15.  $\text{השב ל}$  1:4, This is found no where else in this sense, either in Hebrew or in any other Semitic language. What standard of comparison have we for determining its date? (See further under 2 above).

16.  $\text{קריאה}$  3:2 is found no where else in the O. T. Hence

<sup>18</sup> Gesenius-Kautzsch *Heb. Gr.* § 119, s.

<sup>19</sup> The only exceptions to this use of "good tidings" are I Sam. 4:17 and 2 Sam. 18:20. In I King 1:42 and Is. 52:2, the idea of good is strengthened by the use of *tôb*.

<sup>20</sup> E.g., of good news in Num. 25:12, Ps. 96:2, Is. 40:9; of bad news Gen. 41:26, 27.

<sup>21</sup> E.g., in Annals of Ashurbanipal x. 68 "good tidings of the conquest of my enemies was announced to me continually." KB. II. 232.

no argument for date can be based upon it. It is not found in any Aramaic dialect. The root is good Hebrew and also the form (Gesenius-Kautzsch § 84 a, l.)

17. On the verb טעם, see 14 above.

### III Conclusions

1. Recapitulating the results of the above investigation of the words peculiar to Jonah, we find:

- (1) That three of them רב, טעם, and מנה are found in Assyrian in the sense employed in Jonah. Since it is probable that Jonah knew Assyrian, seeing that his message was delivered to the people of Nineveh, it is easy to see how he may have come to use some Assyrian words and nuances in his writings.
- (2) That one of them, שתק is used in a sense peculiar to Jonah, but exactly fitting to the connection, and that this word is apparently not used in this connection in any other Semitic language.
- (3) That one of them, עמל, is a good Hebrew word and the most proper one to use in the place where it is employed.
- (4) That one of them קריאה, is a good Hebrew form from a common Hebrew root; and that it is not found in Syriac.
- (5) That two of them השב and העביר are used in a sense not found anywhere else either in Hebrew, or in the cognate languages, and hence may have been used at one time as well as at another.
- (6) That ך is found sporadically in all periods of Hebrew literature, that it is the ordinary relative in Assyrian; that it is found in Phœnician; and that it occurs in Aramaic, but only in an inscription from the 7th century, B.C.
- (7) That the use of the ל proves nothing as to the age of the document.

- (8) That **ספינה** is probably Phenician, its root being found only in Hebrew; and that in Jonah it is used in its original and proper sense of *hold* or *decked* part of the ship.
- (9) That **עשת** is rather a Hebrew word in Aramaic than an Aramaic word in Hebrew, seeing that outside of Jonah it is found only in Aramaic documents which were written by Jews who had adopted that language.

2. That Jonah should have a number of *hapax legomena* is no proof of late date. Six such words are found in Jonah, it is true: but Hosea has twenty-five of them; Micah, thirteen; and Amos, twenty-four. Are they also late?

3. That Jonah should have a few words used by him in senses found elsewhere only in Aramaic is no proof of late date. Hosea has 65 words which occur in the Old Testament five times or less, twenty-one of which are found in Aramaic; Amos has fifty, of which fifteen are found in Aramaic, and Jonah fifteen of which five are found in Aramaic. That is, of the sporadic Hebrew words found in Hosea, 32 per cent occur in Aramaic; of those in Amos 30 per cent; and of those in Jonah 33 per cent.

4. The use of a few words in Jonah in a sense found nowhere else in the Old Testament, or even in all Semitic literature, cannot be used as a proof of date. Milton in *Samson Agonistes* alone uses 54 words beginning with *a* that are not found in any other of his poetical works.<sup>22</sup> Since Dr. Driver wrote his LOT., documents from the 3rd to the 6th century B.C. have been found which contain at least seven of the words discussed above.

5. Many words found in Jonah do not occur in any of the Psalms. This is true not merely of the *hapax legomena* but of the words "raging" 1:15, "to be faint" 4:4, "strength" 3:5, "on the morrow" 4:7, "tempestuous" 1:11, "to vomit" ii. 11, "robe" iii. 6, and others, all of which are found in the

<sup>22</sup> See the *Lexicon to the English Poetical Works of John Milton*, by Laura E. Lockwood, Ph.D.



literature which the critics assign to the period before 700 B.C.

6. Words in Jonah are used in special senses not found in any of the Psalms. Such are "captain" 1:6, "to row" 1:13, "raging" 1:15, "decree" 3:7.

7. On the other hand, 78 out of 85 verbs found in Jonah are used in the same sense and form in the writings which the critics admit to have been written in or before the 8th century. Of the seven remaining, three are found in senses never found elsewhere, one is found in a sense met with in Assyrian as well as Aramaic, the root of the fifth occurs in J, the sixth is a *hapax legomenon*, and the seventh is found in 2 Sam. 22.

Of the 122 nouns, all but eleven occur in writings antedating 700 B.C., and of these eleven, three are *hapax legomena*, three are in Ezekiel, two in Assyrian, two are found in the early literature but are used in a special sense by Jonah, and the last occurs in 2 Sam. 22:5.

Of the 43 particles, all are found in the literature placed by the critics before 700 B.C.

8. Without counting pronouns, Jonah used 85 verbs, 122 nouns, and 43 particles. For one hundred and fifty years the critics have been searching this vocabulary for evidence of a late date. Up to the present, they have found at most, five nouns, two particles, and nine verbs, which are either peculiar to Jonah, or used by him in a sense different from that found elsewhere in the Old Testament. In Milton's poetical works there are nearly 600 such words beginning with *a* alone. Every book and almost every chapter of the Old Testament has as large a percentage of such words as Jonah has.<sup>23</sup>

9. After 200 years of thorough investigation the critics can find only about a dozen words which in their opinion indicate a date later than 700 B.C.; and as to these indicative


<sup>23</sup> Hosea has 14 words occurring in it alone in the Old Testament and not found in New Hebrew or Aramaic; Amos has ten; Micah, eleven. Of words occurring 5 times or under in the Old Testament, Hosea has 65, Amos 50, Micah 49, Nahum 36, Habakkuk 34, and Zephaniah 31.

words they are agreed only in the case of the two verbs עשת and בנה, the noun for *ship* (ספינה) and the particle ש.

Having finished the examination of the linguistic evidence produced by the critics and the summation of the results thereof, we confidently leave the verdict to the jury of our readers, believing that they will agree that the case against the authenticity of the Book of Jonah, so far as it is based upon linguistic premises, has not been proven.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

*Princeton.*



# The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1918

## “THE VICTORIOUS LIFE”

It appears to have been early observed that the mills of the gods grind very slowly: and hasty spirits have been only partially reconciled to that fact by the farther observation that they do their work exceedingly well. Men are unable to understand why time should be consumed in divine works. Why should the almighty Maker of the heaven and earth take millions of years to create the world? Why should He bring the human race into being by a method which leaves it ever incomplete? Above all, in His recreation of a lost race, why should He proceed by process? Men are unwilling that either the world or they themselves should be saved by God's secular methods. They demand immediate, tangible results. They ask, Where is the promise of His coming? They ask to be themselves made glorified saints in the twinkling of an eye. God's ways are not their ways, and it is a great trial to them that God will not walk in their ways. They love the storm and the earthquake and the fire. They cannot see the divine in “a sound of gentle stillness,” and adjust themselves with difficulty to the lengthening perspective of God's gracious working. For the world they look every day for the cataclysm in which alone they can recognize God's salvation; and when it ever delays its coming they push it reluctantly forward but a little bit at a time. For themselves they cut the knot and boldly declare complete salvation to be within their reach at their option, or already grasped and enjoyed. It is true, observation scarcely justifies the assertion. But this difficulty is easily removed by adjusting the nature of complete salvation to fit their present attainments. These impatient souls tolerate more readily the idea of an imperfect perfection than the admission of lagging perfecting.

# THE AUTHENTICITY OF JONAH

## ARTICLE II

Having in the preceding article<sup>1</sup> considered the words and phrases which the critics have adduced as linguistic peculiarities indicating a post-exilic date for the Book of Jonah, we propose to examine in the present article the other marks which are alleged in favor of this date.

### OBJECTIONS STATED

Dr. Driver claims that the Book of Jonah cannot have been written "until long after the life time of Jonah himself." He tells us:

"This appears (1) from the style which has several Aramaisms, or other marks of a later age . . .<sup>2</sup> (2) from the Psalm in c. 2, which consists largely of reminiscences of other Psalms (in the manner of Ps. 142, 143, 144: 1-11), many of them not of early origin (comp. v. 2 Ps. 18: 6, 5, 120: 1; v. 3 Ps. 18: 4, 42: 7; v. 4 Ps. 31: 22, Lam. 3: 54; v. 5a Ps. 18: 4, 116: 3, 69: 1; v. 6 Ps. 30: 3; v. 7 Ps. 142: 3, 18: 6; v. 8 Ps. 31: 6; v. 9 Ps. 50: 14, 116: 17 f., 3: 8): a Psalm of Jonah's own age would certainly have been more original, as it would also have shown a more antique coloring. (3) From the general thought and tenor of the book, which presupposes the teaching of the great prophets (comp. esp. 3: 10 with Jer. 18: 7 f.). (4) The non-mention of the name of the Assyrian king, who plays such a prominent part in c. 3, may be taken as an indication that it was not known to the author of the work. The title "king of Nineveh" (3: 6) is one, remarks Sayce (*Monuments* p. 487), which could never have been applied to him while the Assyrian empire was still in existence."<sup>3</sup>

De Wette-Schrader say that Jonah 2: 3-10 "from be-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, April, 1918, p. 280-298.

<sup>2</sup> This subject has been fully treated in Article I.

<sup>3</sup> L O T, p. 322.

ginning to end is pieced together from passages out of the Psalms, borrowed here and there without regard to suitability."<sup>4</sup>

Cornill says: "To see in it any genuine work of the old historical Jonah . . . is, in view of its literary character, which marks it as belonging to the latest lyrical poetry, quite impossible."<sup>5</sup> Prof. Cornill asserts that the character of the whole representation accords with the linguistic characteristics to point to the latest period of Hebrew literature, since the book is dependent on older models: "thus Jonah 3:9 = Joel 2:14; Jonah 4:2 = Joel 2:13, Ex. 34:6, Ps. 86:15, 103:8; and the story in Jonah 4 of the marvellous tree is obviously imitated from the narrative, in 1 Kings 19, of Elijah under the juniper tree in the wilderness. The manner, too, in which, 3:3, Nineveh is spoken of, as a marvellous city of legendary times which had long since disappeared, is inconceivable in the case of an author of the time of Jeroboam II; finally the piling up of marvellous features is quite in the style of Chronicles and Daniel."<sup>6</sup>

#### ASSUMPTIONS

These statements of the critics involve the following assumptions:

I. That Jonah is a patchwork consisting largely of reminiscences of the psalms and prophetic writings.

II. That in the same manner psalms 142, 143, and 144: 1-11 consist of reminiscences.

III. That a psalm of Jonah's own age would certainly have been more original.

IV. That, if written by Jonah, chapter 2 would have to have a more antique coloring.

V. That chapter 2 has marks of the latest lyrical poetry.

VI. That the general thought and tenor of the book presupposes the teaching of the great prophets.

VII. That the manner in which Nineveh and its king are

<sup>4</sup> *Einleitung*, p. 464.

<sup>5</sup> *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, p. 339.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, p. 337.



spoken of is inconceivable in an author from the time of Jeroboam II.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

I. Before entering on the examination of the phraseology of Jonah's psalm (chapter 2), a few remarks may be made about the alleged character of psalms which might have been written in "Jonah's own age." The latest critics who assert that all the psalms in the Hebrew Psalter, except possibly the 18th, are post-exilic, have left to themselves few standards of compositions with which to compare the originality and antique coloring of Jonah's poem. Even Dr. Driver thinks that only fifteen of the psalms may be pre-exilic<sup>7</sup> and that very few are earlier than the 7th century.<sup>8</sup> In general, the poetical portions of the Pentateuch, such as Gen. 49, Ex. 15, parts of Num. 21-24, and Deut. 32, 33, are supposed to antedate the 8th century B.C. As to J. and E. the critics "agree that neither is later than 750 B.C."<sup>9</sup> Judges 5, and the poetical parts of Samuel are all dated before the 8th century. Large parts of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings<sup>10</sup> are the work of the Deuter-

<sup>7</sup> L O T, p. 385-6.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*, p. 384.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*, p. 123.

<sup>10</sup> As to Joshua, Dr. Driver says: "First, the compiler of JE (or a kindred hand), utilizing older materials, completed his work; this was afterwards amplified by the elements contributed by D<sup>2</sup>: finally, the whole thus formed was combined with P" (LOT. 114). Since P "belongs approximately to the period of the Babylonian captivity" (LOT. p. 136) or to "the century from 570 to 458" (Cornill, p. 112), Joshua could not have been composed till this late period. Judges, also, according to Cornill, was a combination of preëxisting materials by J and E, with a Deuteronomic framework, enlarged by a later hand dependent on P (*Introduction*, pp. 177, 178). Samuel is more largely the work of J and E (Cornill, *id.*, p. 189, 201) "with the exception of a small residuum, the contents can be apportioned between J and E" (*id.*, p. 201) "though a time limit for the fixing of the present form of Samuel is furnished by Chronicles" (*id.*, p. 202). The books of Kings consist of an "Epitome," which is the work of the compiler about 600 B.C. (LOT. p. 188, 199) and derived by him from the chronicles of the Kings, and of narrations, whose "authors were in all probability prophets," and which "appear in most cases to have been trans-

onomic or prophetic compilers of the times near the exile, or even of later redactors. Practically all of Hosea and Amos, and parts at least of Micah, Isaiah and Proverbs are also admitted to be from the 8th century B.C.<sup>11</sup>

To sum up, the only literature in the Old Testament that the critics admit to be from or before the 8th century B.C. are J and E, Hosea and Amos; and parts of Micah, Isaiah, Judges, Samuel, Kings and Proverbs.

In the second period, from 700 to 540 B.C. they, for the most part, put Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the so-called Deutero-Isaiah, Deuteronomy, the Holiness Code; most of Joshua; parts of Micah, Judges, Samuel and Kings; Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, and some of the Psalms.

In the late period, they put the priestly part of the Hexateuch (P); parts of Micah, Isaiah, and Proverbs; Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Haggai, Malachi, Joel, Jonah, Job; most of the Psalms; Esther, Daniel, Ecclesiastes; and part or all of Zechariah. As to Ruth and the Song of Songs, they vary between the second and third period in fixing the time of their production.

The readers of this article will be kind enough to keep in mind that its arguments are made upon the basis of the assumption that the dates assigned by the destructive critics to the various parts of the Old Testament are correct. It should be hardly necessary for the writer to state that he does not himself hold this presumption to be true. IF, WITH THEIR OWN ASSUMPTION AS TO DATES IN THEIR FAVOR, THE CRITICS HAVE ONLY ONE LEG TO STAND ON, THERE IS NO LEG IN SIGHT FOR THEM IF WE ARGUE ON THE BASIS OF THE PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF DATE PRESENTED BY THE BOOKS THEMSELVES.

After these preliminary remarks, we will now proceed to the discussion of the objections made by the critics to the early date of Jonah on the ground of the alleged reminiscences.

ferred by the compiler to his work without material alteration" (*id.* p. 188, 189).

<sup>11</sup> LOT. pp. 302, 316, 326-334, 205-230, and 405.

A. The *evidence* for reminiscences. The only evidence for reminiscences, or for the dependence of Jonah upon his predecessors, which the critics have to present, is found in the citations given above in the statements quoted from them. In order to set clearly before our readers the exact character and amount of this evidence, these passages in Jonah and their alleged prototypes will first of all be cited in full.<sup>11a</sup>

JONAH 2:3a.  
I called out of my anguish unto Jehovah, and he answered me.

Ps. 18:7a.  
In my anguish I used to call.

Ps. 120:1.  
Unto Jehovah in my anguish I called and he answered me.

JONAH 2:3b.  
(From the helly of Sheol) I cried, thou hast heard my voice.

Ps. 18:7a.  
And (unto my God) I used to cry, he used to hear (from his temple) my voice.

JONAH 2:4b.  
And a river used to be around me.

Ps. 18:6.  
The cords of death went around me.

JONAH 2:4c.  
All thy breakers and thy rollers over me passed.

Ps. 42:8.  
All thy breakers and thy rollers over me passed.

JONAH 2:5a.  
And I said: I have been driven out (*nir-gashti*) from before thine eyes.

Ps. 31:23.  
And I said in my haste: I have cut off (*nigrasti*) from before thine eyes.

LAM. 3:54.  
I said: I have been cut off (*nigzarti*).

JONAH 2:6a.  
Surrounded me waters unto soul.

Ps. 69:2.  
Came waters unto soul.  
Ps. 18:5.  
Surrounded me cords of death.

Ps. 116:3.  
Surrounded me cords of death.

JONAH 2:6h.  
(An) abyss used to go around me.

Ps. 18:5.  
And the wadys of Belial used to terrify me.

Ps. 69:2.  
I dipped in the mire of the depth.

JONAH 2:6c.  
Sea-weed (was) hound to my head.

Ps. 18:5.  
Cords of Sheol went round me.

Ps. 116:3.  
And the pains of Sheol gat hold on me.

JONAH 2:7h.  
And thou hast brought up from destruction my life.

Ps. 18:6.  
In my anguish I used to call.

Ps. 30:4.  
O Jehovah, thou hast brought up from Sheol my soul.

<sup>11a</sup> The numberings of verses in these citations are those of the Hebrew Bible.

JONAH 2:8a.  
*At the overwhelming of my soul Jehovah I remembered.*

JONAH 2:8b.  
 And *came* unto thee my prayer unto the temple of thy holiness.

JONAH 2:9.  
*They that observe vanities of nothingness, their mercy are wont to forsake.*

JONAH 2:10a.  
 And I *with the voice of thanksgiving will sacrifice* to thee.

JONAH 2:10b.  
 What I *have vowed*, I will *pay*.

Ps. 142:4.  
*At the overwhelming of my spirit, thou knowest my path.*

Ps. 18:6.  
 And my cry before Him *used to come* in his ears.

Ps. 31:7.  
 I hate them that *observe vanities of nothingness*; but I trust in Jehovah.

Ps. 42:4.  
 I led them to the house of God *with the voice of joy and thanksgiving*.

Ps. 116:17.  
 To Thee I *will sacrifice* a sacrifice of *thanksgiving*.

Ps. 50:14.  
 And *pay* to the Most High thy *vows*.

Ps. 50:14.  
 Sacrifice to God a *thankoffering* (same word as in Jonah 2:10a).

Ps. 116:18.  
 My *vows* to Jehovah will I *pay*.

To these "reminiscences" given by Dr. Driver may be added the following marks of dependence from Cornill's *Introduction*, page 337.

JONAH 3:9a.  
*Who knoweth whether God may return and repent.*

JONAH 4:2c.  
 Thou (art) a God *gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness and repenteth thee of the evil*.

JONAH 4:5, 8.  
 And Jonah went out of the city *and sat on the east side of the city and made him a booth and sat under it in the shadow till he might see what would become of the city . . . and he wished in himself to die*, and he said: It is *better* for me to die than to live.

JOEL 2:14a.  
*Who knoweth whether he may return and repent.*

JOEL 2:13.  
 He (is) *gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness and repenteth him of the evil*.

Ps. 86:15.  
 Thou Lord art a God *merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness and truth*.

1 KINGS 19:4.  
 And he went into the wilderness a day's journey and came *and sat under a juniper tree and he wished in himself to die*, and he said: I am no *better* than my fathers.

Ex.34:6.  
 Jehovah (is) a God *merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness and truth*.

Ps. 103:8.  
*Merciful and gracious is Jehovah, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness*.

JONAH 3:10.

They turned from their evil way and God repented concerning the evil which he had spoken to do to them.

JER. 18:8.

And shall turn the nation from its evil which I had spoken concerning it and I will repent concerning the evil which I thought to do to it.

## B. Discussion of the evidence for reminiscences.

I. As to the assumption, that Jonah 2 "consists largely of reminiscences of the Psalms," the following answer may be made.

(1) The tendency shown by the critics, as pointed out above, to assign the Psalms to a date as late or later than that at which they place Jonah, is not favorable to the theory that Jonah 2 "consists largely of reminiscences of the Psalms." Thus, many of the psalms cited by Dr. Driver in his section on Jonah<sup>12</sup> are asserted by him in his section on the Psalms<sup>13</sup> to be "post-exilic, some perhaps late in the post-exilic period." Many of the critics of the Wellhausen school put Pss. 42, 116, 120 and 142 in the Maccabean times. Most of them regard all the others, except the 18th, as of post-exilic origin. Even the 18th is said by Cheyne and others to belong to the post-captivity times. At any rate common justice demands that before the critics assert that Jonah copied from one or more of these psalms they should prove that on the basis of their own theory they have good reason for maintaining that the psalms in question were written before the book of Jonah. In view of the great variety of opinion among literary critics as to the date of the psalms from which the author of Jonah 2 is said to be so full of reminiscences, we are reminded of the words of Dr. Driver: "In case of two similar passages, the difficulty to determine which is the one that is dependent on the other, when we have no other clue to guide us is practically insuperable."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> LOT. p. 323.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, p. 385.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*, p. 383.



On the other hand from the conservative point of view we should be quite prepared to find reminiscences in Jonah's psalm, without thereby questioning its originality or early date. The headings ascribe Pss. 3, 18, 30, 31, 69 and 142 to David. At whatever date we place these headings, it must be acknowledged that they represent the opinion of the scribes by whom they were prefixed. Further, of the headings in general it may be said that they must have been affixed long before the date of the earliest versions of the psalms; because the meaning of many of the terms employed in them was already unknown when these versions were made. When such eminent literary critics as Ewald, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, DeWette, Schrader and Schultz with just the same evidence before them as that which we possess today, admit that Ps. 18 is a composition of David, the seven alleged reminiscences which Dr. Driver produces from this psalm as showing the late date of Jonah 2 may justly be ruled out of court. Eleven out of the fourteen reminiscences which Dr. Driver cites are in Psalms which the titles claim as Davidic.

(2) But while we believe that Jonah 2 was written after most of the psalms indicated by Dr. Driver we also believe that it would be difficult or impossible to prove, except possibly in one or two instances, that he was consciously or unconsciously influenced by the earlier psalms. In order to show this clearly to our readers, the alleged reminiscences and marks of dependence will now be discussed *seriatim*.

Jonah 2:3. This verse seems to contain a formidable array of reminiscences. It will be seen that they are all based upon the fact that the author of Jonah makes use of the same words and phrases that are found in certain psalms, or elsewhere. A closer examination, however, will disclose the further fact that most of the resemblances noted are not reminiscent of particular passages of Scripture, but that they are due to the limitations of the vocabulary of the

Hebrew language. For, surely, no intelligent critic would assert that the early Hebrews did not address their gods, or God, in prayer. And, if they did, it is no less certain that they must have had the language of prayer. Among such words are those for pray, ask, call unto, and cry unto, and their corresponding words for hear and answer. In ordinary prose, one only of the words for pray and one of those for hear would be used; but in poetry, owing to the parallelism (i.e. repetition of the same idea in different words) which characterizes Hebrew poems, we would expect to find two synonymous words to denote the request and two to denote the response.

Now, this is exactly what we find in the beginning of Jonah's poem. He calls and God answers. He cries and God hears. Of the four words used, the words for call, answer and hear are the commonest of all words in Hebrew to express these ideas. The fourth word *shiwwa'* "to cry" is used in Hab. 1:2, Isa. 58:9, Lam. 3:8 and elsewhere only in the Psalms and Job,—in the former nine, in the latter, eight times. In the Psalms, it is used in 18:7, 42, 22:25, 28:2, 30:3, and 31:23, all of which, the headings ascribe to David. And, it is a fact arising from the nature of Hebrew psalmody, consisting largely of prayers, that both the other words for "to cry" are used in one or more of the psalms (קע three times and קעצ five times). The common words for pray and ask are also used in these psalms. Since to write Hebrew poetry at all, therefore, it was necessary to use two words, it is evident, that Jonah would seem to be reminiscent of the psalms no difference what word he selected. He could not have written a prayer in the best Hebrew poetry without using two words because of the parallelism, and he could not find two common words that do not occur in the psalms. This absurd conclusion is reached if we follow the writing of the critics that prayers in Hebrew poetical form cannot have been composed as early as the middle of the 8th century B.C.!

The alleged evidence of reminiscence in the phrase "by reason of my affliction (or better, "anguish") is even less apparent. This is the only place in the Hebrew Bible that it occurs. As to its use here, it is exactly descriptive of the circumstances, and perfectly clear as to meaning. It was not merely in his anguish, as Ps. 18:7 and Ps. 120:1 express it; but out of his "narrow quarters" (R.V. "by reason of my affliction") that he called and cried. Further the word for affliction is felicitously chosen. Of the nine or ten words translated in the English Bible by "affliction," this is the only one in Hebrew that expresses just exactly the situation of Jonah.

Verse 4 a, b. The only reminiscence found here by the critics is in the use of the one word "to go around" or "surround." This verb occurs in the literature which the critics themselves place in the 8th century, or earlier, in Hos. 7:2, 12:1, Gen. 2:11, 13, and elsewhere; and the form itself in Deut. 32:10. In no place in the O.T. is it used in the same sense as here. The nearest to it is Gen. 2:11, 13 where it speaks of rivers going around a certain land.

Verse 4c. The sentence, "all thy breakers and thy rollers passed over me," is exactly the same in Jonah as in Ps. 42:8, a psalm of the sons of Korah. Owing to its peculiar fitness to the experience of Jonah, it would seem most likely that Jonah is the original and the psalm the copy; though of course both may describe the common experiences of swimmers in the surf. The word for "pass over" is found in Hosea, Amos, Micah and the parts of Isaiah which the critics call early. The word for "roller" is the common word for "wave" in Assyrian, Aramaic and Hebrew, and hence may be considered as the primitive Semitic word. The word for "breaker" occurs in the song of David recorded in 2 Sa. 22:5 and besides only in Pss. 88:8 and 93:4.<sup>15</sup> It is not found in Arabic, Assyrian, Aramaic or New Hebrew.

<sup>15</sup> Ps. 88 is ascribed to the sons of Korah; Ps. 93 has no heading.

Verse 5. The phrase "and I said" occurs in Ho. 2: 25, Deut. 32: 40, and in J in Gen. 24: 43 and in E in Ex. 3: 13; all from the 8th century or before, according to the dating of the critics.

Verse 5a. "I am (or, have been) cast out" seems in English to represent the same word in Hebrew as that which is found in Ps. 31: 23 and in Lam. 3: 54. But in Hebrew the word is different in all three places. Jonah has *nigrashti*: the psalm *nirgasti*; and Lamentations, *nigzarti*. The verb *garash* occurs in early literature among other places in Gen. 4: 14 (J), Ex. 23: 31 (E), Deut. 33: 27, Ho. 9: 15, Mi. 2: 9 and Prov. 22: 10; and in the same form as in Jonah in Am. 8: 8 and Isa. 57: 20. The form is never found in the Psalms, and the root only in Pss. 34: 1, 78: 55 and 80: 9.

The phrase, "from before thine eyes," is found in Isa. 1: 16 and Amos 9: 3, both writers contemporaries of Jonah, and in Jer. 16: 17. It is never found in the Psalms, but in its place we find "to before the eyes" in 5: 6, 18: 25, 26: 3, 36: 2 and 107: 3, 7.

Verse 6a. The verb 'āfaf "to surround" is found only in Jon. 2: 6, Pss. 18: 5, 40: 13, 116: 3 and 2 Sam. 22: 5 which is the same as Ps. 18: 5. In Ps. 40: 13, the object is preceded by the preposition 'al; in all the others it is suffixed and the forms are exactly alike. All but Ps. 116 are attributed in the headings to David.

It is worthy of remark also that the author of Jonah 2 was compelled in expressing the idea of "compass or surround" to use verbs which are found in the psalms; for all of such verbs occur there. What would the critics have had him do? He had either to invent or borrow a new word, or use one in current use. In accordance with the rule laid down in all rhetorics, he chose a good Hebrew word, one that expressed his meaning clearly, fully and picturesquely.

The phrase, "waters unto soul," is found in Jonah 6a and Ps. 69: 2 alone. The heading ascribes this psalm to

David. It seems to be descriptive of a drowning man, and is certainly most appropriate to one in Jonah's position while in the sea. "Unto soul" (the noun being without the article) occurs also in these two places alone.

Verse 6b. "The abyss (or sea) kept going around me" has its nearest parallel in Ps. 18: 5 "the cords of Sheol went around me," where, however, the subject and the verbal form are both different. The verbal form occurs in Deut. 32:10; but in Jonah only with the subject here found. The two verbs for "go around" in this verse are the only two known to the Hebrew language and poets in every age must have used the two in parallel clauses, unless they repeated one of them, or used an antonym.

Verse 7b. The sentence, "and Thou hast brought up from destruction my life," is said to be a reminiscence of Ps. 30: 4, "O Jehovah, Thou hast brought up from Sheol my soul" in which one word only is the same. This word seems in English to be exactly the same in both, but in Hebrew one is in the perfect and the other in the imperfect with *Waw*. This word is met with in all the works of the 8th and preceding centuries, as is also the word for "life." The Hebrew word for "destruction" occurs in Isa. 38:17 and 51:14, Prov. 26:27, and in Ezek. 19:4 and 28:8, in addition to seven times in Job and nine times in the Psalms, seven times in Psalms attributed in the headings to David. The phrase "brought up from Sheol" occurs only in Job 33:30, though "going down to the pit" is found in Job 33:28, Ezek. 28:8 and three times in the Psalms.

Verse 8. In verse 8, only the separate words are found anywhere else in the O.T. The phrase "at the overwhelming" is found only in Lam. 2:12 and in four psalms, two of them ascribed in the headings to David. The root translated *overwhelm* is found in Babylonian and in Gen. 10:42 (J). All the other words of the verse are used certainly in or before the 8th century B.C., but not one of them in connection with the verb "to overwhelm." In 8b only the ordinary word for "come" and the conjunction "and" are the same.



Verse 9. In verse 9a, "they that observe lying vanities" looks exactly like a clause in Ps. 31:6; but in the Hebrew only the last two words are the same. In Jonah the first word is in the intensive participle and in the Psalm it is in the participle of the simple stem. The words for *lying vanities* are found together only in these two places; though each of the words separately is found in the earliest literature. Besides, Ps. 31 is ascribed in the heading to David.

Verse 10. The words used by Jonah in this verse are all found in the literature of the 8th century or before. Their combination into phrases is unique, and the ideas expressed are appropriate to the occasion and embodied in the most approved classical form. If this kind of writing is *reminiscent*, then all good writing is reminiscent. It means no more than that a writer uses the vocabulary and style that are suitable to his age, his language, and his ideas.

Reviewing, then, the style of Jonah 2 on the ground of what the critics say, we find that only one sentence of four words and one clause of two words are the same as those found elsewhere in the literature of the Old Testament. The sentence referred to is from a psalm ascribed to the sons of Korah and may be a citation from Jonah; the phrase is from a psalm ascribed to David and may have been adapted from it by Jonah. The situation and the context both argue in favor of the origination with Jonah of the sentence "all thy breakers and thy rollers have passed over me." The phrase, or compound word, "lying vanities," recalls the third commandment of the Decalogue, given by the critics to E, and Hosea 10:4, 12:11 and Isa. 1:13 from the lifetime of Jonah.

It would not be right to close this discussion of the style of Jonah 2 without calling attention to the peculiarities which the critics ignore. We refer to the wonderful manner in which the author makes use of well known words to express his new and varied ideas and experiences. The critics speak only of the resemblances to other writings. Let us look at some of the differences.

Phrases that are found in the O.T. in this chapter only are: "belly of Sheol," "in the heart of the seas," "a river compassed me," "I have been cut off," "I will add to look at thy holy temple," "waters have compassed me into (the) soul," "sea-weed is bound to my head," "the abyss (*t<sup>e</sup>hom*) compassed me," "thou hast cast me into the pit" (*m<sup>e</sup>şula*), "my prayer came unto thee," "those observing lying vanities," "forsake their own mercy," "the clefts of the mountains," "the bars of the earth," "brought up from destruction my life," "when my soul was overwhelmed (fainted) within me," "I will sacrifice with the voice of thanksgiving," and "that which I have vowed I will pay."

That is, only one sentence of Jonah 2 is ever found elsewhere.

Less evidence of plagiarism, imitation, or reminiscence can scarcely be found in any literary production written in the same language as another. Like well made clothing, the words and style of the author fit his subject so closely and harmonize so beautifully, that attached to any other subject they would have seemed out of place and out of harmony with their age and surroundings.

II. We turn now to Prof. Cornill's additional marks of dependence.

Jonah 3:9a. As to whether the writer of this verse borrowed the phrase "who knoweth etc." from Joel 2:14a or *vice versa*, may justly be left in abeyance as long as critics differ by about five hundred years as to the time when either of them was written. Moreover, even if the dates could be fixed with certainty, how can we be sure that one or both of them may not have borrowed from a third writer whose work has been lost? The critics all argue as if we had in our possession all of the literature that was known to the writers of the canonical books, and this in spite of the fact that the canonical books contain references to many works that have long since perished. Besides, such phrases as this one in Jonah 3:9a may well have been common in any liturgical system, where the gods were

approached in prayer.<sup>16</sup> The Assyrian king may have used it just as well as the Hebrew prophet.<sup>17</sup> Why else did he, or any one, pray at all, if not in the hope that his god would confer a favor, or turn from his wrath?

Jonah 4:2c. It is true that in several phrases this passage in Jonah agrees exactly with Joel 2:13, Ex. 34:6, Ps. 86:15, and Ps. 103:8; but until the date of these verses in Joel, Exodus, and the Psalms has been fixed, it is unreasonable to affirm who borrowed from the others. Since Dr. Driver assigns Ex. 34:6 to JE<sup>18</sup> a work which was finished by 750 B.C.,<sup>19</sup> Jonah may certainly have borrowed from it. But, on their theory, he could not have borrowed from Ps. 86:15, since Reuss and Cheyne place this psalm in the Maccabean period.<sup>20</sup> The narrative of Exodus says that these words describing the character of Jehovah are a revelation by Himself of Himself, and that this revelation took place at Sinai. Even if this were not the fact, it would most probably be a very old description of Jehovah by his worshippers, and one known to all his priests and prophets. Does Prof. Cornill really think that, if this description of Jehovah was not revealed by Himself at Sinai, he or any other man knows enough to tell us who invented or imagined it? Can he not see that even if we could determine the date at which each portion of the canonical Scriptures in which it occurs was written, this would not show that every phrase in the description had not been used for hundreds of years before it was ever written down at all? Let us get rid of the absolutely unscientific view of

<sup>16</sup> The two principal words of this phrase נָחַם and שָׁב are found together in Isa. 12:1; and the idea expressed in the two words is found in Mi. 7:19 in the phrase, turn away and have compassion.

<sup>17</sup> Especially if this king was Adad-Nirari and his religion was, as Winckler says in his *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 232, quite different from the prevailing state religion, and a monotheistic one whose essential tenet was expressed in the inscription of his *major-domo*: "Put thy trust in Nebo; trust not in another God."

<sup>18</sup> LOT. p. 38.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* p. 123.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* p. 387, 388.

the Hebrew language and literature which would lead us to believe that new words were invented by the writers in whose works they first appear, that present day critics can determine the date and origin of every extraordinary phrase, and that the boundaries of the literary horizon of the Old Testament writers must be limited to the narrow circle of the canonical books.

Jonah 4: 5-8. When we come to Prof. Cornill's statement that "the story in Jonah 4 of the marvellous tree is obviously imitated from the narrative in 1 Kings 19 of Elijah under the juniper tree in the wilderness," one can scarcely decide whether Prof. Cornill means to be serious or facetious. The two stories are alike in that both the prophets were displeased with Providence, both sought shelter from the sun, both wished to die, and both were rebuked and assisted by God. It is true, also, as Dr. Driver remarks, that "in form and contents the book of Jonah resembles the biographical narratives of Elijah and Elisha."<sup>21</sup> But these resemblances are due to likeness of circumstance and perhaps to sameness of authorship, and not "obviously" to imitation. Similar events in different men's lives may be due to imitation, but more commonly they are owing to the fact that they both belong to the *genus homo*, or some species of the same, and that they are subject to the same, or a similar, environment. A spider may just as well have spun its web for Tamerlane and Robert Bruce as for Muhammed. Jerusalem and Babylon were many times besieged. Herodotus, the Koran, Victor Hugo,—all are full of scores of similar events in the lives of men and nations, without any *obvious* imitations being involved. Human nature and physical nature within the same limitations of time and place often produce very similar results. This does not prove imitation but is simply the effect of likeness of nature and similarity of circumstance.

So, with the similar events in the lives of Elijah and Jonah. Both were men of the same class and time, called

<sup>21</sup> LOT. p. 322.

upon to perform disagreeable duties. Both were disappointed in the results of their mission. Both sought to escape from an unwilling service. Each found himself under the mid-day sun and sought for shade beneath a convenient shelter. Neither could escape from God and duty. God intervened in the case of each and taught through them for all time and to all men the great lessons of his providence and grace. Yet in all this there is no "obvious imitation." There are simply two similar descriptions of similar causes producing similar effects.

Jonah 3: 10. That Jonah presupposes the thought and teaching of the great prophets is alleged to be shown by the fact that 3: 10 reflects the thought and tenor of Jeremiah 18: 7f. It is admitted that the teaching of Jonah 3: 10 and that of Jer. 18: 7 is the same and that it is expressed in much the same phraseology. But does this show that one copied from the other or that Jonah copied from Jeremiah? The question is whether Jonah is older than Jeremiah, or Jeremiah older than Jonah. This can be shown, from the standpoint of literary criticism, not by the points in which they agree, but by those wherein they differ. In the points in which they agree each may have adopted his ideas from his predecessors. As has been shown in the preceding section, the idea of supplicating the gods that they might change their evil intentions with regard to their suppliants must have been common to all who prayed. So, also, must have been the idea that the suppliants would cease from the evil that had offended the deity. That two of the prophets should have expressed these ideas in similar language is not surprising. It is more surprising that it is not more frequently so expressed.

II. A full answer to the second assumption that "Pss. 142, 143 and 144: 1-11 in like manner consist of reminiscences," would require an article of itself. Suffice it to say that since Dr. Driver makes all of these psalms post-exilic and perhaps late post-exilic<sup>22</sup> and other critics place them in

<sup>22</sup> LOT. p. 385.



Maccabean times,<sup>23</sup> it is absurd to argue that a psalm composed in the fifth century (among the earliest of all the psalms according to the judgment of the critics) should have been composed in the same manner as the latest. One can understand how late writers may have had reminiscences of the earlier; but it is asking too much when we are required to believe that the earlier are full of reminiscences of the later!

III. We would like to know what grounds Dr. Driver had for asserting that "a psalm from Jonah's own age would certainly have been more original." For him and his followers, there are no other psalms from Jonah's own age. Their grounds of *certainty*, therefore, are entirely subjective, and hence not worthy of consideration in a serious discussion where we are getting at the facts through *evidence*. As to what degree and kind of originality he expected to find in such a composition, we are at a loss to conjecture. The evidence shows that few passages in the Old Testament are so full of extraordinary phrases and *apex legomena*. The subject is absolutely unique. The personal experiences of the author are unparalleled in literature or history. Many of the statements and figures are met with nowhere else in any language or literature. In our opinion, there is nothing more original in all the range of literature from the composition of the Book of the Dead to some of the pre-war productions of Mr. H. G. Wells. The stories about the creation, the flood, Joseph, Moses in the bulrushes, Samson, the romantic courtships of Rebecca and Ruth, the treasons of Rahab and Jael, the lament over Saul, the paeans of Miriam, Deborah and Isaiah, may all be paralleled; but the idea of a descent to the bottom of the sea inside a fish and a description of the experience of the recumbent and unwilling denizen of its narrow quarters is without parallel, preëxistent similitude, or imitation.

IV. As to Dr. Driver's expectation of more antique coloring in a poem from the eighth century B.C., it is en-

---

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*, p. 387-8.

tirely without justification. The eighth century was the age of Hosea, Amos, Micah and Isaiah, and Dr. Driver says that many of the best critics date J and E just before 750 B.C.<sup>24</sup> Now, of the 24 verbal forms found in Jonah 2, every one is found among his contemporaries; as, also, every root to which these forms belong except one. As to the nouns, moreover, every form occurs in other literature from the same century, except one, and all of the very words except one *hapax legomenon*, and two or three other words at most. The words for *waves* (lit. *breakers*) and *billows* (lit. *rollers*) would not be mentioned in the other literature of the 8th century, because neither seas nor storms of the seas are even mentioned; the word for *vanities* occurs in 2 K. 17 which gives a history of the fall of Samaria in the 8th century B.C.; and the word for *destruction*, in Prov. 26<sup>25</sup> which Dr. Driver ascribes to a period before the time of Hezekiah i.e. before 700 B.C. The particles also of Jonah 2 are all used in early literature.

Consequently, only three words or forms in Jonah 2 are not to be found in the literature which Dr. Driver ascribes to the eighth century or before, *תַּעֲטֹף*, *קִצֵּב*, and *יְשׁוּעָתָה*. The first of these is found twice besides in the description of the temple in 2 Kings 6 in the sense of *extremity*, or *end*. If taken in the sense of *cleft* it is a *hapax legomenon*, and no argument as to date can be based upon it. The root of the second word is found twice in J in Gen. 30: 42; but in the form and figurative sense employed in Jonah, it occurs only in four psalms, two of which, the 142nd and 143rd, the critics put in post-captivity times (even as late as the Maccabean); but the Bible headings ascribe to David. In the 77th, 142nd and 143rd Psalms, the spirit is said to have been faint or overwhelmed within one; in Ps. 107 and Jonah 3 the same is said of the soul.

<sup>24</sup> LOT. p. 123.

<sup>25</sup> Of the passage in Prov. 25-29, Dr. Driver says (LOT. p. 407): "The title (25: 1), the accuracy of which there is no reason to question, is an indication that the proverbs which follow were reputed in Hezekiah's age to be ancient."

Only one other word is used in the Old Testament for "faintness of soul," to wit, מוּג in Ps. 107:26;<sup>26</sup> and only one other כָּהָה<sup>27</sup> (Ezek. 21:7 Isa. 61:3) for "faintness of spirit," the latter not used in the psalms.

Evidently, then, there is not much choice of vocabulary in Hebrew in which Jonah could express his feelings. He uses the more specific and the stronger word of a possible two. Surely his situation justified the use. Surely, also, no one would claim that the use of this strong word to express the predicament of his soul while he was in the belly of the whale was not appropriate to the circumstances. It is a reminiscence not of some other man's thought, but of his own poignant feelings, and it took no 300 years to make it up.

The third word יוֹשַׁעְתָּה is found already in Ex. 15 and in the same connection and sense as in Jonah 2. The only difference is in the ending which has what grammarians used to call the Hê paragogic or what is now more properly called the accusative ending. The reader may know that originally all of the Semitic languages had case endings, such as are still to be found in the Arabic of the Koran. The Babylonian has preserved these endings in a more or less chaotic condition, and the Old Testament in like manner gives us sporadic examples of their use in the endings ô, î and ā. This last ending was originally an accusative. In the literature of the eighth century it is found in Hos. 8:7, 10:13, Ex. 15:16 and Isa. 8:23. The "coloring" therefore of the word is just antique enough for the eighth century B.C. when Jonah is said to have lived as a contemporary to Hosea and Isaiah.

The use of the relative *še* in Jon. 2 can hardly be considered as a mark indicative of a late or post-captivity date, inasmuch as it occurs in Jud. 5 which the critics generally

---

<sup>26</sup> This word is commonly employed for "faintness of heart" for which we find also four other words.

<sup>27</sup> Commonly used to denote "dimness of the eyes." A different word from all these is employed for "faintness of hand."

assert to be the oldest literary composition in the Old Testament.

So then in view of the above facts, we conclude that the Hebrew of Jonah is of the proper coloring for the life-time of Jonah, the son of Amittai, who prophesied in the age of Jeroboam II about 750 B.C. Its vocabulary and grammatical peculiarities are in harmony with Hosea, Amos, Micah and Isaiah, the other great writers of that century whose works have come down to us. The style is classical, and neither antique nor late. If anyone would differ, let him bring up the proofs.

V. The fifth assumption, that Jonah 2 shows "marks of the latest lyrical poetry" is made by Prof. Cornill at the close of his section on Jonah.<sup>28</sup> Since in his long discussion he gives us none of these "marks," it is impossible for us to investigate them. We can only say that since Prof. Cornill himself asserts that there are lyrical portions of the Psalter from the Maccabean times and since he further asserts that only in Chronicles and the latest parts of the prophetic writings do we meet with the psalm-style,<sup>29</sup> he should logically place Jonah in Maccabean times. But, as a matter of fact, he puts the date of Jonah towards the end of the Persian, perhaps even in the Greek period.<sup>30</sup> Again, if it is "only in Chronicles and the latest part of the prophetic writings" that we find a psalm-style, how can Jonah show marks of the latest lyrical poetry, since for the date of Chronicles we are "carried with absolute certainty into the Greek period—perhaps, the first half of the third century"?<sup>31</sup> Lastly, if with Reuss and Cheyne Ps. 86 is put in the Maccabean period, how can Jonah 4:2 have been written in the fourth century, as Prof. Cornill says, and have been "dependent" on a psalm written in the second?

VI. "The general thought and tenor of the book, which presupposes the teaching of the great prophets." This is a

<sup>28</sup> *Introduction*, pp. 336-339.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*, p. 399.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*, p. 339.

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*, p. 228.

favorite argument of the critics of the Old Testament.<sup>32</sup> It is, however, at best but an *opinion*. It is stated in different words by Dr. Driver when he attempts to show that Isaiah 24-27 could not have been written by Isaiah because "there are features in the representation and contents of the prophecies which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's"<sup>33</sup> In Micah 6: 1-7: 6 "a difference of tone and manner" tell against the identity of author.<sup>34</sup> In Zechariah, the "dominant ideas and representations" of Chap. 1-8 are thought to militate against the identity of authorship of the rest of the book.<sup>35</sup> Such allegations leave out of sight the experiences of literature and the divine element in revelation. As to dominant ideas, compare the lives of Paul, Augustine, Luther and Romanes before and after their conversion. As to change of manner and representation, compare the different works of Browning, Carlyle and Johnson. As for a "different vein of thought," most people expect and prefer a slight occasional change in an author. As the proverb says: Shakespeare never repeats. Some may like the composition of those who are always harping on one string; but most prefer the instrument of ten strings, the organ with many pipes and stops, the orchestra and the Philharmonic. When Carlyle's gospel of work becomes tiresome, one turns to the *French Revolution*. The variety of Boswell is more delightful than the monotonous sameness of *Rasselas*. The new veins that are supposed to lie hid in Browning keep the observant reader in joyful anticipation of the expected find. Why should we expect none but biblical writers to be dull, monotonous, and commonplace? Why may Isaiah not have had a "new vein of thought" occasionally, just to relieve the monotony of existence? Why should all of the prophets have thought only the same thoughts that they always had thought?

My dear readers, this sounds ridiculous, does it not?

<sup>32</sup> See above, p. 444 f.

<sup>33</sup> LOT. p. 220.

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*, p. 333.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*, p. 354.



But just drop your reverence for learned professors for a moment and think for yourself. Is it not laughable that self-appointed inquisitors and judges should attempt to decide what the prophets of Israel may have thought about some two or three thousand years ago? Is it not absurd that they should attempt to assign these thoughts to an appropriate half century of birth? Is it not presumption approaching blasphemy for them to attempt to decide on the ground of tone, manner and veins of thought, as to when and how God's messages of light and love may first and best have been made known to man?

VII. "The non-mention of the name of the Assyrian King who plays such a prominent part in c. 3, may be taken as an indication that it was not known to the author of the book."

This argument depends upon a very superficial reading of the book. Jonah was not sent with a message to a *particular* king as Elisha was sent to Jehu and to Hazael. He was not even sent to the *King* of Assyria. He was sent to warn *Nineveh*, that great city with 120,000 souls that knew not their right hand from the left. Jonah did not warn the king especially, as Elijah did Ahab, or Nathan, David, or Jeremiah, Jehoiakim. His message was: Yet 40 days and Nineveh shall be destroyed. It was the Ninevites who heard and repented. It was the nobles as well as the king who decreed the fasting and sackcloth. It was as king of Nineveh, and not as a king named *So and So* that the king acted. Analogies to the omission of the name of the king can be found in the story of Naaman, where the king whom he served is called simply the king of Syria (2 K. 5: 1, 5) and in the fact that Isaiah frequently refers to the "king of Assyria" without mentioning his name, as also does Nahum (3: 15). The king is most probably called simply the king of Nineveh because the message was to Nineveh especially, and because Nineveh with its palaces and walls and moats and temples was the capital, "the house of the kingdom," the visible representation of the glory and pride and sin of the whole kingdom.

Or, it may be that at the time of Jonah's mission, the kingdom of Assyria had been practically reduced in size until it comprised little more than the city of Nineveh. Jonah, the son of Amittai, lived in the reign of Jeroboam II who reigned from about 780 to 740 B.C. This fell in the period between Adad-Nirari III and Tiglath-Pileser III who began to reign in 745 B.C. During the time from 783 to 745 four kings are known to have reigned over Assyria, but the Assyrian records from this time consist only of a lion's weight and one contract tablet, and a list from the time of Ashurbanipal of the eponyms of Nineveh. The eponym list shows that from 765 to 743 B.C. the kingdom of Assyria and the city of Nineveh were in a state of almost continuous insurrection, pestilence and commotion.<sup>36</sup>

Besides, the Hebrew word for king may mean no more than governor,<sup>37</sup> but the main point is that the name had nothing to do with the messages nor with the results, nor with the purpose and teaching of the prophecy.

It must be remembered also that in the eighth century B.C., most kings were entitled after their capital city. From Hammurabi down the kings of Shumer and Accad, whatever the extent of their kingdom, were called usually by the simple title, "king of Babylon." The Israelites called the kings of Damascus, kings of Aram; but the Assyrian documents call them kings of Damascus.<sup>38</sup> The prophets call Ahab, Jehu, Menahem, *et al.*, kings of Israel; but the Assyrian documents commonly call them kings of the city of Samaria.<sup>39</sup> Pharaoh Necho is always called king of Egypt in the documents from Egypt and Israel, but

<sup>36</sup> This list (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* I. 210-213; Rogers *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 233 f) records a pestilence (*mutanu*) in the year 765; an eclipse of the sun in 763; insurrections (*sihu*) in 763, 762, 761, 760, 759, 746, 745, and a massacre (*diktam*) in 743.

<sup>37</sup> See articles by the writer on the *Titles of Kings in Antiquity* in this REVIEW for 1905-6, and special articles on the *Titles of the King of Persia* in the *Denkschrift Eduard Sachau*, Berlin, 1915, and in this REVIEW for January, 1917.

<sup>38</sup> KB. I. 140, 142, 172.

<sup>39</sup> *Annals of Tiglath Pileser* (KB. II. 51) but *Shalmaneser* III (KB. I. 173) calls Ahab, king of Israel.

Ashurbanipal in his Annals calls him, king of the city of Memphis. The book of Ecclesiastes speaks of Solomon as king in (or over) Jerusalem, though the other records call him king of Israel.

Further, it is not said that the king of Assyria or his subjects called him king of Nineveh. It is a title given him by a foreigner who was a Jew. It is not necessary to suppose that the emperor of the East, residing at Constantinople, called himself king of Rome, nor that the Mukaikus in Egypt called himself king of Alexandria, because Muhammed addressed letters to these rulers calling them respectively by these titles.<sup>40</sup>

Further, the manner in which Nineveh is spoken of in 3:3 is said to be inconceivable in the case of an author of the time of Jeroboam II, i.e., about 750 B.C.

Two questions are involved in Jonah's statement; first the size of Nineveh, and secondly, the use, by the author of the book, of the Hebrew perfect form of the verb "to be" (היה) in his description of the city.

(1) Already in the eighth century<sup>41</sup> Nineveh is used as always in the Old Testament as the name of the capital of Assyria. This name included *Calhi* and the other parts of that great four-fold city which served the great kings Shalmaneser I, Ashurnasirpal and Shalmaneser II as the seat of their empire,—a position which it still held in the time of Adad-Nirari, whom, in the words of Winckler,<sup>42</sup> "Jonah found at Nineveh when he went there."

(2) As to the use of the perfect form, the question is whether it could mean "has been and is," or must mean "was." We have the authority of De Sacy, the greatest of grammarians of Arabic, for affirming the former<sup>43</sup> of *kâna*, the Arabic equivalent of היה and his opinion is supported by Lane, the greatest of the lexicographers, who makes the

<sup>40</sup> Ibn Hisham's *Life of Muhammed*, p. 971.

<sup>41</sup> Gen. 10:11 is assigned by the critics to J.

<sup>42</sup> *History of Babylon and Assyria*, p. 232.

<sup>43</sup> *Arab. Gram.* I. S. 196.

statement: the "*kâna* divested of all signification of time, is often used as a copula."<sup>44</sup>

This usage of the perfect for "has been and is" is common in Hebrew usage as well as in the Arabic. Gesenius defines its use as "expressing facts which were accomplished long before, but of which the effects still remain in the present."<sup>45</sup> Thus, Ps. 10:11 "he hideth his face." Perfects of verbs denoting a state or condition are frequently used in this sense.<sup>46</sup> The verb *hāyā* "to be" is used in this sense in Jud. 17:13, 2 Sa. 13:35, 1 K. 6:17, 8:18, Isa. 1:21, 22, Ps. 22:15, 89:42 *et al.*

However, as this verse consists of a compound nominal sentence and is introduced by *Waw explicativum*, (i.e. explanatory *and*), it is possible that it is a later note interpolated into the original text by an editor or scribe. The simple or compound nominal sentence is the form in use in Hebrew to denote a parenthetical note, or description. Such parentheses are common in the Hebrew literature of all periods.

It is a noteworthy fact, moreover, that most of the statements that the early critics of the Pentateuch considered to be objections to its Mosaic origin, are to be found in sentences of this kind, such as "these remain unto this day," "and the omer is the tenth part of an ephah," "his bedstead was a bedstead of iron," "Moses was very meek."<sup>47</sup> Compare also, the compound nominal sentences in Deut. 2:10 (describing the Emims), and in Num. 31:53.

Certainly, those who, like the critics of the Wellhausen school, believe in so many editors and redactors for nearly all the books, will scarcely insist on impugning the authenticity of Jonah because of one little verse! Nor will those who have studied Old Testament textual criticism deny the probability of some such additions to the original text of Jonah. Nor will those who admit the insertion into the

<sup>44</sup> *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 3004.

<sup>45</sup> *Gram.* § 116. 2. g.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*, e.g. Ps. 104; 1 *gādaltā*, thou art great.

<sup>47</sup> *Comp. Ex.* 6:26, 27.

New Testament of the passages concerning the three witnesses, the woman taken in adultery, and the last verses of Mark, without thereby impugning the integrity and genuineness of the rest of the works that contain these insertions, presume to assail the whole book of Jonah, because one short sentence may have been inserted into it by a later hand. Like the addition to Mark and the story of the woman taken in adultery, the addition may be just as true as the original. No one will dispute the trustworthiness of the statement that in the time of Jonah "Nineveh was an exceeding great city."

#### CONCLUSION

This detailed examination of the evidence produced by the critics in support of their allegations that the Book of Jonah cannot have been written in the lifetime of Jonah, the son of Amittai, has shown that in not a single specification is the evidence convincing. Not a single statement as to diction, style, ideas, or historical allusions, will stand the test of a complete induction and comparison. The most that can be said for any single item is that it is possible, but not one is supported by even one assured witness. The testimony of the Book of Jonah as to its origin and facts stands unimpeached. Its diction, its style, its ideas, and its historical references, agree with what we know of the eighth century B.C. and with what the book affirms as to the time of its composition. Those who assail it must confine themselves to its accounts of miracles, predictions, and divine interventions. At all such assaults the Christian will sniff and He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh. For in these days of surgeon's wonders and submarines' achievements and Burbank's experiments, it is a bold man who will attempt to set limits to the subtleties of the All-wise or to affix bounds to the Almighty Maker and Preserver of all things. Christus creator, Christus revelator, Christus consummator! "Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven, or canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?"

*Princeton.*

ROBERT DICK WILSON.