



# The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1918

## LUTHER AND THE PROBLEM OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

### PART II\*

Having in Part I of this article given some account of the development, in Luther's religious experience and his career as a Reformer, of the principle of the supreme normative authority of the sacred Scriptures, we shall now try to indicate the main features of his teaching in regard to the nature of this authority.

It is well to recall—indeed, the significance of the fact cannot be overestimated—that it was by a singularly deep and rich experience of the grace of God in Christ Jesus that Luther had come to the double conviction that he was himself a saved man, and that the subject matter of the Bible, culminating in the assurance of the free gift of eternal life through faith in the Son of God, is true and trustworthy. In this experience lay the germ of his power to refashion the religious life of his age.<sup>1</sup> Inheriting the medieval ideas concerning the relative functions of the Scriptures and the Church, he presently found himself constrained, by the logic of his spiritual necessities, to oppose one after another of the traditional authorities that kept thwarting his advances toward full evangelical freedom. One of the greatest conservatives that ever lived,

---

\* For Part I, see this REVIEW, October, 1917, pp. 553-603.

<sup>1</sup> Preuss, *Die Entwicklung des Schriftprinzips bei Luther bis zur Leipziger Disputation*, p. 6, aptly remarks: 'Es ist der Ausgangspunkt und mit ihm das ganze weitere Werden des Reformators ein religiöser, kein humanistischer, ein positiver, kein negativer, ein erlebter, kein erdachter, ein errungener, kein übernommener.' On the importance of interpreting "the whole Luther" in the light of his formative evangelical experience, cf. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, iii<sup>4</sup> p. 835.

at once demanded as sin's appropriate punishment? In a word, has not sin so changed conditions that what the holiness of man as well as of God once forbade it now requires? In violating the Sixth Commandment therefore God only does what as God he has the right to do and what the changed conditions induced by sin call for.

(4) What God may thus do for himself in the interest of holiness he may delegate men to do, and thus he may make right for them what would otherwise be wrong because against his constitution of things. This is the explanation and the vindication of killing in capital punishment, in self-defense and in war. These are all justified, and they can be justified, only on the ground that he who alone has the right to do so requires them. The nation declares war as the minister of God for the defense of its own rights or of the rights of weaker nations; and only as this actually is the case may it do so. Just when this is the case each nation must judge for itself. Herein lies its responsibility. Accordingly as it judges rightly or wrongly will its entrance into war and its continuance in it be right or wrong. In a word, war has not absolute character. If waged for a righteous end, therefore, the nation acts rightly because it acts as God's delegate. This is not the doctrine that a good end justifies the use of wrong means. It is the doctrine that a right, because God appointed, end imparts its own moral character to the use even of such moral means as in relation to God are without absolute character.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

*Princeton.*

#### מִנָּה, "TO APPOINT," IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The following note is one of a number which it is the purpose of the writer to publish as a discussion of the philological premises and assumptions of the critics of the Old Testament. The discussion will be based especially upon statements made in Dr. Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*<sup>1</sup>, not merely because it is more accessible than many other works on Old Testament introduction, but because it is in the writer's view the ablest, most cautious, and most specious, and hence the most insidious and dangerous of all the works that have been written

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviated LOT.

in the past generation against the historicity and authority of the Old Testament. Attention will also be paid to DeWette-Schrader, Wellhausen, Cornill, and others, when they present matter additional, or supplementary, to what is found in LOT. In this note will be considered what LOT has to say on page 506 about the verb *minna* "to appoint," in Daniel 1:5, 18, 2:2. Of the word in this sense Dr. Driver remarks that "the earlier language would use **צוה** or **הפקיד**. Elsewhere in Heb. only, Ps. 61:8, Job 7:3, Jno. 2:1, 4:6, 7, 8. Common in Aramaic."

## ASSUMPTIONS

We have here two assumptions:

I. That in the later Hebrew writings of the Old Testament we find **מנה** employed where the earlier writings have **צוה** or **הפקיד**.

II. That the use of **מנה** in Aramaic as an equivalent of **צוה** and **הפקיד** is common.

## ANSWER TO ASSUMPTIONS

I. The first assumption can be tested only by an appeal to the Hebrew concordance. As a basis of this test we present the following table showing the number of times the three verbs occur in each book of the Old Testament.

	צוה	פקד	מנה		צוה	פקד	מנה
Genesis .....	27	9	2	Job .....	2	5	1
Exodus .....	53	18	0	Proverbs .....	0	1	0
Leviticus .....	33	3	0	Ecclesiastes ....	0	0	1
Numbers .....	48	101	1	Isaiah .....	10	15	2
Deuteronomy ..	87	2	0	Jeremiah .....	39	48	1
Joshua .....	43	2	0	Lamentations ..	4	1	0
Judges .....	6	6	0	Ezekiel .....	6	2	0
Ruth .....	3	1	0	Minor Prophets	8	18	4
Samuel .....	29	23	1				
Kings .....	38	18	4	Ecclesiasticus ..	6	9	3
Chronicles ....	20	9	5	Zadokite Frag-			
Ezra .....	2	0	0	ments .....	11	12	0
Nehemiah .....	7	2	0				
Esther .....	8	1	0	J E .....	39	15	2
Daniel .....	0	0	3	D .....	106	2	0
Psalms .....	15	8	3	P H .....	139	113	?

I. From the above concordance it is evident that **צוה** was in use from the earliest document of the Old Testament to the latest and that it was used in Ecclesiasticus which was

written about 180 B.C., and in the Zadokite Fragments from about 40 A.D. It is to be noted further that it occurs 291 times in the Hexateuch and 248 times in the Pentateuch, 116 times in the Former Prophets, 63 in the Latter, and 57 in the Hagiographa. In the Hexateuch, it occurs 39 times in J and E combined, 106 times in D, and 139 in P. In the Psalms, it occurs 3 times each in Books I and II, twice each in Books III and IV and 5 times in Book V. Of the 15 times that it is used in the Psalms, one is in a psalm that Dr. Driver thinks to be pre-exilic, one in an exilic, twelve in postexilic psalms (3 of them Maccabean) and two in psalms of doubtful date. It is found only 6 times in Judges as against 8 times in Esther and 9 times in Ezra-Nehemiah, 10 times in Isaiah as against 39 times in Jeremiah. In the poetical books it is not found in Proverbs, occurs twice in Job and 6 times in Ecclesiasticus. In the smaller books, it is found in but four of the Minor Prophets, does not occur in Ecclesiastes, nor the Song of Songs, but is found 9 times in the Zadokite Fragments.

Moreover, מצוה *commandment* occurs 63 times in the Pentateuch and 66 times in the Hexateuch, 26 times in the Former Prophets, 11 in the Latter Prophets, and 81 times in the Hagiographa. In Samuel it occurs but once as against 23 times in Chronicles; in Isaiah and the Minor Prophets twice each and in Ezekiel no times as against 17 times in Ezra-Nehemiah. It is found twice in Daniel as against no occurrence in Ruth, Ezekiel, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah. It occurs 26 times in the Psalms, 22 of which are found in the 119th Psalm alone. Moreover, it occurs 8 times in Ecclesiasticus and 14 times in the Zadokite Fragments.

Both the verb and the noun are used in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

And lastly, the classical Hebrew has no other verb, strictly speaking, to denote *command*. The verbs "to say" and "to speak" are sometimes used as equivalents for it, but only because the *word* of God or of the king is considered to be the same as a *command*.

Nor is Dr. Driver supported by the evidence when he asserts that כנה is an Aramaic equivalent of צוה. This

latter verb, as we have shown above, is used 248 times in the Pentateuch. The Targums of Onkelos, of Jerusalem, and of the Samaritans, never once render it by *manni* but always by פקד.

2. Nor is it true that the later writings of the O. T. use מנה when the earlier use פקד. In the English Bible the verb פקד is never translated by *command*, but by, (1) *visit* with its synonyms, punish, do judgment, avenge and hurt; (2) *number* and its synonyms, count, reckon, muster, and bestow; (3) *miss* and its synonyms want, wanting, lack, lacking, and deprived; (4) *appoint* and its synonyms make, charge, set, commit, deliver to keep, oversee, laid up, make overseer, make governor, and make ruler; and (5) once each by *see*, *look*, *remember* and *call to remembrance*. In the sense of (1), it is used 93 times; in the sense of (2), 134 times; in the sense of (3), 16 times; in the sense of (4), 55 times; and in the senses (5), 4 times; *i.e.*, 301 times in all. Of these 301 occurrences there are 135 in the Pentateuch; 56 in the Former, and 83 in the Latter Prophets; and 27 in the Hagiographa. Of the 135 cases in the Pentateuch 15 are in J E, 2 in D, 113 in P, and 5 doubtful. Of the eight found in the Psalms, 3 are in Book I, 2 in Book II, 1 in Book III, and 2 in Book V. There are 2 in the second part of Isaiah, 48 in Jeremiah and 2 in Ezekiel, 2 in Joshua and 10 in Chronicles. Of the 55 cases under (4) (*i.e.* *appoint* and its synonyms) there are 13 in the Pentateuch, 2 in Job, 1 in Joshua, 1 in Samuel, 11 in Kings, 7 in Chronicles, 1 in Ezra, 2 in Isaiah, 15 in Jeremiah, 1 in the Psalms and 1 in Esther. Of the 14 in the Hexateuch, 5 are in J E, 1 in D, and 8 in H P. Of the 55 cases, 18 are in the Kal, and 37 in the Hiphil. Of the 18 in Kal, 1 is in J E, 1 in D, 4 in P, 3 in Kings, 2 in Chronicles, 1 in Ezra, 4 in Jeremiah, and 2 in Job. The Kal is not found in Exodus, Leviticus, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, nor Daniel. Of the 37 cases in the Hiphil, 4 are in J E, 3 in P H, 1 in Samuel, 8 in Kings, 4 in Chronicles, 2 in Isaiah, 11 in Jeremiah, 1 in Esther, and 2 in the Psalms; and none in Exodus, Leviticus, Judges, Ruth, Ezra-Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Proverbs, Job, Lamentations, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets and Daniel. That is, in eleven books out of the 24 as enumerated by the Hebrews as embraced in the Old Testament, this word does not occur.

Of the derivatives, *a*, פקדה is found 31 times; *b*, פקדון, 3 times; *c*, פקדת, once; *d*, פקודים, 24 times; *e*, פקיד, 13 times; *f*, פקוד twice; and *g*, מפקד, 5 times; or all together 79 times. Of these, the Pentateuch has 9, the Former Prophets, 4, the Latter Prophets, 22, and the Hagiographa, 44; *d* occurs only in the Psalms and 21 out of its occurrences are in Psalm 119; *b* occurs only in the Pentateuch; *c*, only in Jeremiah; *f*, in Jeremiah and Ezekiel alone; *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*, and *g* do not occur in the Pentateuch. The following table will show the books in which they respectively occur.

	<i>a</i> .	<i>b</i> .	<i>c</i> .	<i>d</i> .	<i>e</i> .	<i>f</i> .	<i>g</i> .	Totals
Gen. ....		1			1			2
Lev. ....		2						2
Nu. ....	5							5
Jud. ....					1			1
Sam. ....							1	1
Kings ....	1				1			2
Chron. ....	8				2		2	12
Ne. ....					4		1	5
Pss. ....	1			24				25
Job. ....	1							1
Es. ....					1			1
Is. ....	3							3
Jer. ....	8		1		3	1		13
Eze. ....	2					1	1	4
Ho. ....	1							1
Mi. ....	1							1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	31	3	1	24	13	2	5	79

From this table we see that these derivatives are found at most 24 times in the literature before the captivity and 55 times in that written afterwards; or twice at most in J E, against 7 in P; 4 times in the Former Prophets, against 17 in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah; 3 times in Isaiah, as against 13 in Jeremiah and 25 in the Psalms. In other words, the use of these derivatives is increasing with the lateness of the literature. That Daniel has none of these intimates, therefore, that the book was early rather than late. This is more apparent when we consider that Ecclesiasticus has the verb nine times and מפקד once; and that the Zadokite Fragments have the verb 12 times and the derivatives 6 times; and further that the verb and three of the derivatives are found in the Hebrew of the Talmud. Besides, since Dr. Driver suggests that the use of מנה

was common in Aramaic, the same may be said of פקד and also of its derivatives. The Aramaic of the Targums of Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Samaritans always employs פקד as a rendering of צוה. Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan render the Hophal of פקד by the Ethpe'el in Numbers 1:47, 2:33, 26:62 and the Samaritan version has פקד for the same original in Genesis 21:1, Exodus 20:5, Numbers 1:44, 14:18, 31:49. The Syriac and Mandaic dialects both use the verb and several derivations and the Phœnician and Aramaic inscriptions have both the verb and the nouns from the same root. The Assyrian also uses the verb frequently in the senses found in the Scriptures and has about half a dozen derived nouns in use.

That Hebrew, however, pursued an independent course in the development of the root idea is shown by the fact that its verbal and nominal forms differ from those of the other languages and dialects and even from Talmudical Hebrew; as also by the fact that the Aramaic versions use a number of other verbs to express the nuances of the Hebrew original. This Onkelos renders it by פקד, מנא, דבר, סער, שנא and its derivatives by מנין, מהימן, פוקדן, ננין, מסר, מסרה, and סעורה; and the Samaritan renders the verb by פקד, דבר, מנה, חסן, מסר, סער, and the derivatives by מהימן, מסתרה, מרחסה, מסרוין and סרכן.

CONCLUSION ON ASSUMPTION I. The verdict on the evidence from the use of צוה and פקד must be that there never was a time from the earliest Hebrew document of the Old Testament to the latest of the Talmud when they might not have been used by any writer. That Daniel did not use them, is, therefore, no evidence of the date of his writings; but shows simply that he did not find it convenient, or necessary, to use them to express his ideas. In this respect his work stands on a par with the writings of Exodus, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Proverbs, Lamentations, Joel, Jonah, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and 145 of the Psalms,—writings that according to critics of all schools extent from the earliest to the latest of the documents of the Old Testament.

II. The second assumption is that מנה is used in Daniel

1:5, 18; 2:2 in an Aramaic sense and that consequently Daniel is later than the sixth century B.C. There are ten objections to this assumption.

1. In the Aramaic dialects that were developed independently of Jewish influence, the verb does not have the meaning of *appoint*. In Syriac the verb is rendered by Brockelmann by *enumeravit, tribuit, attribuit* and it is a synonym of קלל, to *divide, apportion*. The derivatives denote *part, number, numeration, arithmetic*, etc. The Syriac has 20 different words for *command* and *appoint*; but *manni* is not among them. In Mandaic, Norberg renders it by *numeravit, distribuit* and the derivatives by *pars, portio, sors, numerus*, etc. The Aramaic dialects of the Egyptian papyri, of the Targums, and of the Talmud use it in this sense; but they were dialects spoken by Jews. It is more likely, therefore, that the Aramaic speaking Jews took over the meaning from the Hebrew than that the earlier Hebrew writers should have taken the meaning from Aramaic speaking Jews who wrote so long after the biblical writers were dead.

2. The meanings of the verb as found in the Old Testament are all found for the same verb in Babylonian. Muss-Arnolt defines *manu* by *count, reckon, number, allot* and *designate*,—definitions that will cover all the occurrences of the verb in the Hebrew Bible and in the Aramaic of Daniel as well.

3. Since most of the critics date every passage in which *minna* occurs either in or after the exile, it would, therefore, be more scientific for them to assume that the Hebrew writers were influenced by the Babylonian than by the Aramaic, seeing that Nebuchadnezzar carried the Jews captive to Babylon.

4. Even if the word in the sense of *appoint* were derived from, or influenced by, either the Babylonian or the Aramaic, this would not prove that the Hebrew writing containing it was late. For from the time of Abraham, or at least from that of the Amarna letters, the Hebrews were always in contact with Arameans and with the Assyrians and Babylonians. The Amarna letters contain both Hebrew and Aramaic words. Genesis and later Hebrew records have Babylonian and Aramaic words, or at least words whose form and meaning are more common in Aramaic than in Hebrew. The assumption that the presence of Aramaic words in a Hebrew document



indicates lateness of composition is contrary to the evidence of the history of Western Asia and especially of Palestine and its surrounding countries.

5. The verb *minna* is found in Hebrew in the sense of *allot* four times in Jonah, once in Job, once in Chronicles, once in the Psalter, and three times in Daniel. The critics argue that these documents are late because they contain *minna* and other like words and then claim that these words are late because they are found in these documents. Until they can determine the lateness of one or the other by some conclusive testimony, they will be guilty of arguing in a vicious circle, and should convince no one of the truth of their contentions.

6. By asserting on page 385 of LOT that Psalm 61 is pre-exilic, Dr. Driver excludes himself from arguing, as he does, with regard to Jonah, Daniel and Chronicles that they are late because this word is in them. For Psalm 61:7 contains the word.

7. If the presence in any given document of the Old Testament of a word that is found no where else but in New Hebrew or in Aramaic indicates a late origin of the document, it would prove even more than the critics claim; for such words are found in almost every chapter of the Old Testament. For example, חֲסֵן, *to be hoarded*, is found only in Isaiah 23:18, but it is used in Biblical and New Aramaic. Is this chapter of Isaiah to be considered late because of this word's being in it? חָסַד, *to revile* (Piel), is found only in Proverbs 25:10, but it occurs in Syriac and the Aramaic Targums. Is Proverbs, or this chapter of Proverbs to be put late on this account? Dr. Driver believes this chapter to have been considered ancient in the days of Hezekiah and Isaiah 23 to be from before 700 B.C.<sup>2</sup>

8. It is equally true that a word found once or twice in two or more different documents and besides only in post-biblical Hebrew or Aramaic cannot be claimed to indicate a late origin for these documents without proving more than the critics claim. Thus חֲסֵן, *strength, riches*, occurs in Proverbs 15:6, 27:24; Isaiah 33:6, Jeremiah 20:5, and Ezekiel 22:25, and besides only in post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. Yet, Dr. Driver considers the parts of Proverbs in which the word

<sup>2</sup> LOT 407; 218.

occurs to have been looked upon as ancient in Hezekiah's time, the chapter in Isaiah to have been written in 701 B.C. and the chapters of Jeremiah and Ezekiel to be genuine.<sup>3</sup> Consistency is a jewel; but in this case what is food for the goose is death to the gander.

9. One would naturally suppose that if, in the later literature, *mana* had supplanted the ordinary verbs for *command* and *appoint* that were used in the earlier books, this supplanting would have been evident in works which are known to be late such as Ecclesiasticus and the Zadokite Fragments. But such is not the case. For in Ecclesiasticus *צוה*, to *command*, occurs 6 times, *פקד*, to *appoint*, 9 times and *מנה* in the sense of *appoint* but once and never in the sense of *command*. In the Zadokite Fragments *צוה* occurs 11 times, *פקד* 12 times and *מנה* never.

10. Dr. Driver says that Psalm 61 "will be presumably pre-exilic."<sup>4</sup> *i.e.*, before 586 B.C., that Job was written either during or shortly after the Babylonian captivity,<sup>5</sup> *i.e.*, about 538 B.C., that a date for Jonah "in the 5th century B.C. will probably not be far wide of the truth,"<sup>6</sup> and yet argues that Daniel cannot have used *minna* at about 535 B.C. in the same sense as we find it used in the Psalm, in Job and in Jonah, but that its use in Daniel and Chronicles "differentiates them from all previous Hebrew writers and makes them to resemble in their Hebrew vocabulary the age subsequent to Nehemiah."<sup>7</sup> The inconsistency of these statements is so manifest, that it needs no evidence or argument to refute them. How can a man of Dr. Driver's ability have been guilty of such contradictions?

#### CONCLUSION

The conclusion from the above induction of facts and evidence can only be that the assumptions of the critics as put forth in LOT, page 506, with regard to the use of *מנה* in Daniel are false, because they are based on untenable philologi-

<sup>3</sup> LOT 218, 258, 286, 407.

<sup>4</sup> LOT 385.

<sup>5</sup> LOT 432.

<sup>6</sup> LOT 322.

<sup>7</sup> LOT 506.

cal premises. We have shown also that there is no reason known why David may not have employed מנה in the sense of *appoint*, or *set apart* in Psalm 61 which the heading ascribes to him; nor why Jonah may not have used it in the 8th century B.C., nor Daniel in the sixth; nor Chronicles in the fifth; nor the author of Job at whatever time that book may have been written. Nothing but inexcusable ignorance or wilful presumption, or a contemptible desire to find fault with the Scriptures without regard to the facts or in spite of the facts, can account for the way in which the assailants of the Old Testament make use of the argument from language. That the case of מנה is not a unique and extraordinary instance of the philological vagaries of the critics will be shown in future notes.

*Princeton.*

ROBERT DICK WILSON.