

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

APRIL, 1897.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

BIBLIOLOGY.

This chapter of theology was by our earlier dogmatians commonly dealt with in their *Prolegomena*, where they treated of the nature and the principles and source of theology. It was not unreasonable to dwell on the source of doctrine before exhibiting the substance of Christian doctrine as comprised in *Theology proper*, *Anthropology*, *Christology*, *Soteriology*, and *Eschatology*. This was the more pertinent as the principal positions of Bibliology, especially the divine origin and authority of the Bible, were generally conceded, and to impugn the inspiration of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments would have been looked upon as preposterous by theologians of all churches and schools. The great ancestors of modern Protestant theology, Zwingli, Calvin, Melancthon, never theoretically or dogmatically assailed this stronghold of scriptural theology. Even Calixt, the Noah of the present generation of neologists in what is called the Lutheran Church, did no more than plant the first germs of unscriptural Bibliology for future development and would probably have been amazed and appalled at the growth of thorns and thistles gone into seed in these latter days.

Scriptures is to be determined. While the cumulative testimony of the church of all lands, and of the enemies of Christianity, may powerfully corroborate, it cannot supplant or even supplement, the internal evidence of Scripture itself whereby the divine origin, the properties, and the purposes, of the Bible must be established and by virtue of which the Bible itself is the source and norm of theological Bibliology. As from the *Novum Organum* alone we can authentically learn what the *Novum Organum* is, so from the BIBLE alone we can authentically learn what the BIBLE is.

A. G.

(To be continued.)

Exegetical Theology.

THE GENESIS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

(Concluded.)

The changes which languages undergo are of two kinds; they are either structural or functional, the former pertaining to the substance and form, the latter, to the use, of words.

The structural or organic changes of literary languages move in two distinct directions, toward simplification of form and toward increase of vocabulary.

The tendency of languages toward simplification in form may be exemplified from the English language. In Wyclif's time a plural form of the verb was in constant use. We quote: "And after that the hadden scorneden hym, thei unclothiden hym of the mantil, and thei clotheden hym with his clothis and ledden hym to crucifie, and as thei geden out, thei founden a man of syrenen comynge fro the towne, Symound bi name, the constreyneden hym to take

his cros. . . . And affir that thei hadden crucified hym, thei departiden his clothis and kesten lot. . . . And thei seeten and kepten hym, and setten aboue his heed his cause writun. . . . And men that passiden forth blasfemden hym.”¹⁾ The plural form in *e* of adjectives used as nouns was employed as late as the end of the sixteenth century. Chaucer wrote:

And smale fowles maken melodie,
That slapen al the night with open yhe,

the marked letters being pronounced as distinct syllables. The same poet has certain negative forms or compounds now obsolete, as *I nam* for I am not, *I nas* for I was not, he *nould* for he would not, he *nad* for he had not, *I will* for I will not, of which only the form last mentioned is now in use, as in the phrase, *will he, nill he, = nolens volens.*²⁾—This process of simplification is even now going on in our language. Thus the subjunctive mood is being more sparingly used than it was not very long ago and is looked upon by some as passing out of use. The same may be said of the compound past infinitive in connections as, “I intended to have come.” Again, there is a general tendency toward dropping the strong inflection of verbs. We are told by Webster that the past participle *swollen*, and the form *clove* for the past tense of cleave, are obsolescent. Another change of this kind is the substitution of prepositional phrases for the inflected genitive. In writings of the fifteenth century we read, “*the king's* rebels” and *the king's* traitors, where to-day we would say, rebels *against the king*.

The same tendency appears in the Greek language. In later Greek the Dual and the Optative are more sparingly

1) Matth. 27, 31—39.

2) A modern writer has: “The Socinians Crellius and Vorstius deny this latter; asserting that God can will what he once nilled, and nill what he once willed.” Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, Vol. I, p. 351.

used; the use of the Medial forms is also reduced. This applies also to the New Testament. In the writings of St. John not a single Optative occurs, and the Dual is never employed in the New Testament; the Active with *ἑαυτός* sometimes takes the place of the Medium. Conjunctions sometimes take the Indicative instead of the Subjunctive or the Optative. It is true that, on the other hand, certain forms, especially inflections of verbs, not current in earlier Greek literature, occur in the New Testament, and in this respect an increase of forms is noticeable. But this is due to the fact that Greek had been nearly exclusively a spoken language in Palestine without an indigenous Greek literature or an extensive use of books written abroad in that language before the composition of the New Canon. This very naturally led to the adoption of forms heard in conversation with representatives of the various dialects and the introduction of new forms coined by analogy. But these are peculiarities which do not affect the general character of the idiom in a measure to outweigh such sweeping changes as the abolition of the Dual, the reduction of the use of the Optative and, to some extent, even of the Subjunctive, and the comparative simplicity of syntactical structure, whereby a type of Greek was obtained which rendered the New Testament highly adapted to its intended use for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, not to men of polite education only, but to the people at large, to entire congregations of hearers to whom these books were to be read and interpreted and who should themselves be readers searching the Scriptures of the New Testament as well as of the Old.

This tendency to simplification must not, however, be confounded with carelessness or inaccuracy in the use of forms. The cases, voices, tenses, and modes are employed in the New Testament with the utmost care and distinctions so nice that translators have very often failed to grasp them or to find an equivalent in their vernacular. The Medial

form ἐξελέξατο¹⁾ is more than "he hath chosen us;" it says "he hath chosen us unto himself," that we should be his own. The aorist ἐπιστεύσαμεν in Rom. 13, 11 is not properly rendered "we believed," as the English Bible has it, but signifies the beginning of the act or the entrance upon the state, as, "we first believed" or we became believers.²⁾ The rules which govern the use of the Greek *article* are followed out in the New Testament to their very subtlest subtleties, and we know of no Version which has succeeded in fully reproducing the nice distinctions thus secured.

Structural changes in another direction pertain to the *substance* of language, the vocabulary. It has already been pointed out that a literary language is generally one only of a number of cognate dialects, and in most cases the preferred sister will, though elevated to a higher station, continue to live and thrive in her former surroundings. A remarkable exception from this rule we have in the Icelandic language, which emigrated to a distant and secluded sea-bound *ultima Thule*, where it remained almost unchanged for a thousand years. The language of the Eddas is, in the main, spoken and written by the Icelanders of to-day. Meanwhile the Norwegian language at home has undergone changes in form and substance to an extent which leaves the "Great Grandmother" (*Edda*) unintelligible to the Norwegian people of to-day. This change, as far as it concerns the substance of the language, is easily accounted for by the fact that the literary language of Norway has been surrounded by and kept up an intercourse with the indigenous dialects of the country. These dialects, which continue to live and grow in their natural rustic vigor round about their more carefully cultured sister, serve as feeders to her vocabulary. From them she draws an increase of substance

1) Eph. 1, 4.

2) Comp. 1 Cor. 3, 5; where Luther has "ihr seid gläubig worden." Also Acts 19, 2. Gal. 2, 16. 1 Cor. 15, 2.

which enters into her organism without any need of assimilation. Words pertaining to the field and farm, the market, the trades, to marine and military life, are largely derived from this source.

Thus we find in New Testament Greek words from the various Greek dialects. From the *Ionic* dialect it has *ἔκπρωμα*, 1 Cor. 15, 8; *γογγύζειν*, Jo. 7, 32. Matt. 20, 11; and *γογγυσμός*, Jo. 7, 12; *ρήσσω*, *πρηγής*, *βαθμός*, *σοχοπίζειν*, *ἄρηγν*. From the *Doric*, *πάζειν*, Acts 3, 7; *καμύειν*, Matt. 13, 15. Acts 28, 17; *κλίβανος*, *ἡ λιμός*. A few words, as *παρεμβολή*, camp, Acts 21, 34, and *ρόμη*, street, Acts 9, 11, are supposed to be *Macedonic*; *βουνός*, hill, Acts 23, 30, is held to be *Cyrenaic*; *ῥαλος*, Rev. 21, 18, *φιάλη*, *ibid.* v. 8, and others are mentioned as *Atticisms*.¹⁾

The substance of a literary language is, furthermore, augmented from the various foreign languages with which it is brought into contact. Of this no language affords a more striking example than English, a language which is made up of a multitude of elements, among them Scandinavian, Celtic, Latin, Greek, French, Spanish, Hebrew, Hindustani, Arabic, Chinese, Indian, etc., etc. That the English have been from early times and are to-day a seafaring nation is not sufficient to account for this. The Dutch have been great navigators in their day and had acquired possessions in all lands; and yet the Dutch language is more free from foreign admixtures than any other language of western Europe with an extensive literature. But Dutch is as obstinately averse to the absorption of foreign elements as English is disposed and peculiarly adapted to assimilate whatever gets within its reach, a veritable ostrich with a long neck and long legs and an exquisite stomach. Then, again, the intercourse of nations themselves is not a necessary condition of linguistic export and

1) Vid. Winer, *Gramm. d. neutestam. Sprachid.* VII ed. p. 22. Beelen, *Gramm. Graecitatis Novi Test.*, p. 16. Stuart p. 17 f.

import. Foreign literature may be introduced by many and even very circuitous ways, especially among those who contribute most toward the literature of a people, the men of learning and letters, and polite society; and thus the vocabularies of the church, especially of theology, of the sciences, of law and the courts, the fine arts and the liberal arts, are swelled by exotic ingredients even in languages less assimilative in their nature than modern English and ancient Greek.

Greek was the English of antiquity in more ways than one, especially in its later form of the κοινή διάλεκτος. It was not only spoken and read throughout the civilized world, but it was also the language which admitted of saying everything, and saying it in Greek. *Καίσαρος* and *Καίσαρι* was just as good Greek as *βασιλέως* and *βασιλεῖ*. Foreign words were not borrowed, but appropriated, and did not pass as foreign coin at a discount, but as legal tender at par.

All this applies also to New Testament Greek. Such words as *ἀγγαρεύειν*, Matt. 5, 4; 27, 32; 15, 21; *γάζα*, Acts 8, 27; *γαζοφυλάκιον*, Mark 12, 41; *μάγος*, Matt. 2, 1. 7. 16; Acts 13, 6—8; *μαγεία*, Acts 8, 11; *μαγεύειν*, Acts 8, 9; *μεγιστάνης*, Mark 6, 21; *παράδεισος*, Luc. 23, 43; 2 Cor. 12, 4; Rev. 2, 7 are pointed out as of *Persian*, *βαίον*, Jo. 12, 13; *ὀθόνιον*, Jo. 19, 40; *σινδών*, Matt. 27, 59; Mark 14, 51 al. Luc. 23, 53; as of *Egyptian* origin. Words of *Latin* growth are, of course, more numerous. Of such we find *ἀσάριον*, dim. of *as*, *assis*, Matt. 10, 29; *δηράριον*, *denarius*, Matt. 18, 28; 20, 2; 9; 10; 13; 22, 19; Mark 6, 37 al.; *κεντυρίων*, *centurio*, Mark 15, 39; 44; 45; *κῆνσος*, *census*, Matt. 17, 25; 22, 17; 19; Mark 12, 14; *κοδράντης*, *quadrans*, Matt. 5, 26; Mark 12, 42; *κολωνία*, *colonia*, Acts 16, 12; *κουστωδία*, *custodia*, Matt. 27, 65. 66; 18, 11; *λεγεών*, *legio*, Matt. 16, 53; Mark 5, 9; 15; Luc. 8, 30; *λέντιον*, *linteum*, Jo. 13, 4; 5; *μάκελλον*, *macellum*, 1 Cor. 10, 25; *μεμβράνα*, *membrana*, 2 Tim. 4, 13; *μίλιον*, *miliare*, Matt. 5, 41; *ξέστης*, *sextarius*, Mark 7, 4; 8; *πραιτώριον*, *praetorium*, Matt. 27, 27; Mark

15, 16 al.; *σικκίντιον*, *semicinctium*, Acts 19, 12; *σουδάριον*, *sudarium*, Luc. 19, 20; Jo. 11, 44; 20, 7; Acts 19, 12; *σπεκουλάτωρ*, *spiculator*, Mark 6, 27; *τίτλος*, *titulus*, Jo. 19, 19; 20; *φραγέλλιον*, *flagellum*, Jo. 2, 15; *φραγελλώ*, *flagello*, Matt. 27, 26; Mark 15, 15. Words taken directly from the *Hebrew* or *Aramean* are *ἀββᾶ*, Mark 14, 36; Rom. 8, 15; Gal. 4, 6; *ἀμήν*, Matt. 5, 18 al.; *ἀλληλούια*, Rev. 19, 1; 3; 4; 6; *γεέννα*, Matt. 5, 22 al.; *μεσσίας*, Jo. 1, 41; 4, 25; *πάσχα*, Matt. 16, 2 al.; *ρακά*, Matt. 5, 22; *σάββατον*, Matt. 12, 1 al.; *ὠσαννά*, Matt. 21, 9 al.; *ἀκελδαμά*, Acts 1, 19; *σατανᾶς*, Matt. 4, 10 al.

All these words, or most of them, though of foreign origin, are just as good Greek after their naturalization as *Sabbath* and *Satan* and *satanic* and *title* and *membrane* and *legion* and *colony* and *custody* and *census* are good English, and better English than some Germanic words found in English dictionaries, not to speak of such language as this: "Begoneaceae, by their anthero-conectival fabric indicate a close relationship with anonaceo-hydrocharideo-nympheoid forms, an affinity confirmed by the serpentarioid flexuosonodulous stem, the liri dendroid stipules, and cissoid and victorioid foliage of a certain Begonia, and if considered hypogynous, would in its triquetrous capsule, alate seed, apetalism, and tufted stamination, represent the floral fabric of Nepenthes, itself of aristolochioid affinity, while by its pitched leaves, directly belonging to Sarracenias and Dionaeas."¹)

The changes of languages we have hitherto considered, either of form or of substance, are organic or structural in their nature. But there are others, which we term functional changes, pertaining to the *use* of words. Of the word *fellow* Schele de Vere says: "The kindred word *fellow* is even now in a state of transition: it still has its original

1) Quoted from a recent scientific journal by Marsh, *Lectures on the English Language* I Series, IV ed. p. 186.

meaning of companionship when we speak of fellow-sufferers or fellow-citizens, or call a friend a fine *fellow*; but *fellow* alone is no compliment, and shows a tendency of the word to assume an objectionable expression.¹⁾ *Bribery* in old English did not signify secret corruption, but theft or open violence. *Mystery* in the days of Chaucer designated any trade or profession or regular employment. The German *Dirne*, formerly "a young girl," is now an opprobrious term. Changes of this kind are due to various causes, one of them being the application of the words of a language to things never before named in that language. This process is often avoided by the appropriation of words from a foreign language, or by coining new words, processes which have already been pointed out and exemplified as giving rise to structural changes resulting in an increase of the vocabulary of a language. This way has been largely pursued in providing sciences with a nomenclature, and a specimen of English thus obtained has been quoted above. That New Testament Greek has also been enriched by appropriating and assimilating foreign words, has also been demonstrated. But where the choice is equal between import from abroad and resources available at home, the latter deserve the preference. This was fully recognized by the Alexandrine translators of the Old Testament, and the peculiar *usus loquendi* established by the LXX was, on the same principle, generally retained by Christ and the Apostles and Evangelists, who made further adaptations of Greek words to scriptural uses where the Septuagint did not furnish what was needed. In this manner the word ᾗδης, which had by its pagan signification been the name of the mythical abode of departed souls, came to denote *hell*, Matt. 11, 23; 16, 18; Luc. 16, 23. The word ἰλουστήριον, a *means* or *place of propitiation*, became the accepted Greek equivalent for מִזְבֵּחַ, the *mercy seat*, LXX Exod. 25, 18; 31, 7; 35, 12 al.; Rom.

1) Studies in English, ch. 11, p. 216.

3, 25. Other words with a peculiar scriptural *usus loquendi* are Χριστός, κύριος, υἱὸς θεοῦ, λόγος, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἄγγελος, ἀπόστολος, εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελίζειν, βαπτίζειν, βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκκλησία, περιτομή, παλιγγενεσία, καλεῖν, ἐκλεκτοί, ἄγιοι, πιστεῦειν, πίστις, πιστός, οὐρανός, σὰρξ, πνεῦμα, γραφή, ἐπίσκοπος, al. Some of the words thus put to new uses are sometimes employed according to their former common *usus loquendi*. Thus πιστεῦειν is *to entrust*, Rom. 3, 2; ἄγγελος simply a *messenger*, Matt. 11, 10; Mark 1, 2; Luke 7, 27; κύριος, a human *master*, Acts 16, 16; Eph. 5, 9; πιστός, *faithful*, Matt. 24, 45; 1 Cor. 1, 9 al.; ἐκκλησία, a *public assembly*, Acts 19, 39. Others occur only in their special scriptural signification or significations. Thus ἡ γραφή is in the New Testament everywhere *the Scripture*, the written word of God; εὐαγγέλιον, the good tidings of the grace of God in Christ Jesus; βαπτίζειν, βάπτισμα and βαπτισμός are used exclusively of ritual or sacramental application of water; πεντεκοστή is simply *Pentecost*.

What the Greek language has undergone when it was made the medium of divine revelation through the inspired writers of the New Testament has been repeated in hundreds of languages into which the Bible has been translated and which have been in other ways made the vehicles of Christian thought. The English language was in the course of its Christianization enriched by words of foreign origin, such as *baptize, baptism, Sabbath, bishop, psalm, apostle, prophet, angel*, and many others. But most of the Hebrew and Greek words of the Bible were represented by words of domestic English growth, such as *passover, gospel, kingdom of heaven, overseer, the Word, the Lord, holy Ghost, sin, faith, believe*.

To find as nearly as possible a proper equivalent in their language for every word or expression of the original has been the aim of the best translators of the Bible, and in many instances they were aware of having failed to find precisely what they sought. It was for this reason that

Luther was indefatigable in revising his version, and the difference between his first attempt, the translation of the penitential psalms in 1517, and the last edition of his Bible, published in 1545, was remarkable. But there was no need of revision when the Holy Spirit had composed *his* Bible. This must be presumed *a priori*, since the inspiration of the written word was as truly a work of God as the creation of the world, after the completion of which "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was *very good*."¹⁾ But that the New Testament Scripture, also as regards its linguistic character, is a work of superior excellence, is apparent also *a posteriori*. To exemplify, the word πιστεῖν is the New Testament equivalent for the Hebrew יָצַקְתָּ, the Hiph. of יָצַק, to *make firm*, to *establish*, as πίστις is the equivalent for תְּבַחָהּ, *reliance*, *faith*. The English Bible has rendered πιστεῖν to *believe*; Luther has made it *glauben*. Both these terms are equally far from doing justice to the original. In colloquial English we say *I believe* when because of a lack of certainty we are not ready to say *I know*. The same relation exists between the German *ich glaube* and *ich weiss*. But πιστεῖν, on the contrary, is *vi vocis*, by its etymology, expressive of *firmness* and *unwavering confidence*, being derived from the ancient root *bhadh*, *bhidh*, from which we have the Greek πείθω, πεποιθήσις, the Latin *fides*, *foedus*, *funis*, the English *bond*, *bind*, the German *Band*, *Bund*, *binden*, to all of which is common the idea of firmness, reliability and stability expressed by the Hebrew יָצַק and תְּבַחָהּ, and πίστις, *faith*, *der Glaube*, is *vi vocis* in the New Testament language of the Holy Spirit not an uncertain opinion, but a *firm conviction*.²⁾ In like manner many other words of the New Testament vocabulary might be pointed out as most eminently qualified for their scriptural use, such as χάρις, ἐκκλησία, εὐαγγέλιον, ἄγιος, ἁγιασμός, ἁγιοσύνη, δικαίω, δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωμα, δικαιοσύνη, παράπτωμα, παράβασις,

1) Gen. 1, 31.

2) Comp. Heb. 11, 1.

ἀμαρτία, σάρξ, προορίζειν, ἐκλέγεσθαι, προοινώσκειν, καλεῖν, μετάνοια, καταλλάσσειν, ἀποκατάλλάσσειν. In Rom. 4, 25 Luther has *Gerechtigkeit*, but the original is not δικαιοσύνη; it is δικαίωσις, *justification*. We find distinctions in the choice of words so subtle that no translation can do them full justice. Thus ἐνεργεῖν and ἐνεργεῖσθαι are both rendered *to work* in the English Bible; but ἐνεργεῖν is constantly employed to signify *personal action*,¹⁾ while ἐνεργεῖσθαι invariably denotes *impersonal energy*;²⁾ whence it appears that in 1 Thess. 2, 13 the antecedent of θεός is not θεός, but λόγος, the predicate being not ἐνεργεῖ, but ἐνεργεῖται, and again, in Eph. 2, 2 the active form employed by St. Paul indicates that the πνεῦμα there mentioned is a *personal* spirit, not an impersonal evil principle.

Such was the genesis of New Testament Greek, and such the wisdom of God manifested in the choice of a language for, and its adaption to, the purpose of composing the New Testament Scripture, these Books of the last revelation, written chiefly "that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name."³⁾

A. G.

1) Comp. 1 Cor. 12, 6. Gal. 2, 8. Eph. 1, 11.

2) Comp. Rom. 7, 5. Col. 1, 29. 2 Th. 2, 7.

3) Jo. 20, 31.