

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

followed immediately afterwards, shows how quickly he resumed his usual tranquility and his thought for his friends.

J. B. MAYOR.

EXEGETICA.

MATTHEW v. 39.

ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

Why the "right" cheek? When one man attacks another, his right hand generally strikes the left cheek of his opponent. Why does Jesus mention that the first blow falls on the left cheek, then? Because, Professor J. Weismann suggests (*Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft* 1913, pp. 175-176), the blow is inflicted with the back of the hand, not with a clenched fist or with the palm of the hand. It is a blow which means insult rather than injury. He points out that in Talmudic law a blow of this kind was specially punished, quoting from the tractate *Baba gama fol. 90a* to show that the fine for it was double that inflicted on a blow of the other kind. Professor Weismann wonders if this relative estimate was not current as early as the days of Jesus. At any rate, he points out that such an interpretation gives a natural and vivid meaning to the words *στρέψον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην*, for, unless the victim and the contemptuous blow turned his face, it would not be easy for the scorner to strike him on the left cheek with the back of his right hand.

MARK vi. 40.

Καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ, κατὰ ἑκάτὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.

Lagrange's note on π. π. is: "C'est ainsi qu'à Iabnè les

savants étaient rangés שורות שורות comme dans une vigne (j. Ber. iv. 7d. ob.).” In an essay in *Lewy-Festschrift* (1912), p. 22, Dr. S. Krauss, of Vienna, claims to show that the assemblies of rabbis were actually open-air meetings. The “comme” might be omitted. These gatherings, Dr. Krauss argues, were held often “in vineyards, where the sitting in rows was a natural consequence. In the open field such an arrangement of seats is called *πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ* (Mark vi. 40), in Hebrew ערינות ערינות.” In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (July, 1913, pp. 111–114) he finds a third expression for this custom, also in the form of an iterated word. It occurs in a midrashic comment on Cant. viii. 13 (“thou that dwellest in the gardens, the companions hearken to thy voice; cause me to hear it”), where the obscure ננוניות ננוניות is interpreted by Dr. Krauss as the reduplicated plural from a formation based on ננוניתא or גינוניתא, meaning in Aramaic or Syriac “a little garden.” The sense of the midrashic comment is that to the חברים or “companions,” who sit there in the form of small gardens [i.e. arranged in classes or rows], indulging in the study of the Law, God descends, listens to their voice, and hears them.

The phrase π. π. only occurs in Mark, and in the light of this rabbinic explanation it is tempting to connect it with another Marcan touch in ver. 35: *καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλὰ*. But it is not said that the five thousand grouped themselves π. π. in order to listen to Jesus as a rabbi. The arrangement in rows or groups was for the immediate and later purpose of feeding.

#### LUKE xxii. 44.

*καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο. καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.*

In the *Classical Review* (September, 1913, p. 194) Mr. W. R. Paton proposes to translate *ἀγωνία* here by "acute anxiety" (as in Modern Greek : the French, "inquiétude"). "Agony," he thinks, calls up associations of extreme pain which are foreign to the context. The word "is, of course, originally the anxiety of a runner in a race before the start." If it is rendered "agony" in Luke's paragraph, it is apt to suggest "the wrong notion, owing to its associations with acute and paralysing physical or mental pain. That which Christ suffered was exactly *φόβος ἐπὶ ἀδήλου πράγματος*,<sup>1</sup> as He did not know how his prayer would be answered." It follows from this that there was no *ἀγωνία*, in the strict Greek sense, upon the Cross; "the cup had been drunk, the race had been won," by that time. In Gethsemane, on the other hand, there was a real "agony of uncertainty or expectation."

The rendering obviously depends upon the exact shade of meaning. Now *ἀγωνία* meant fear rather than uncertainty, as Dr. Field showed in his note. Thus, when Servius is explaining "dum trepidat" in Verg. *Aen.* xii. 737, he paraphrases by "dum turbatur, festinat, quod Graeci ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐστίν." No doubt, fear and uncertainty are closely allied, but it is not so here. The *ἀγωνία* was not a dread, an agony of uncertainty, about the answer to His prayer; it was rather the terror of a death which He felt to be imminent. As Jesus felt it was the will of the Father that the cup of death should be drunk by Him, He fell into *ἀγωνία*—not because he was uncertain of the approaching issue, but because He was certain of it.

If this is so, the exact rendering would be something like "terror," and possibly the sense of this meaning may have been one of the reasons which led to the omission of the paragraph by some circles in the later church. The English

<sup>1</sup> The Stoic definition in Diog. Laert. vii. 113.

equivalent or transliteration, "agony," which goes back to Wiclif, may be misleading linguistically, but after all it is a word which is coloured by the context in any given case, and it is doubtful whether it does suggest extreme physical pain to most readers or hearers of the Lucan passage. They know the "agony" was not physical but mental, and this knowledge prevents them from misunderstanding.

Besides, does "agony" in English literature invariably connote physical pain? I doubt it. At the moment I can only recall Matthew Arnold's description of Byron's cry:—

"Stormily sweet, his Titan-agony,"

or of Philomela's note resounding

"With love and hate, triumph and agony,"

Coleridge's

"Oh, thou maid divine,  
I loved to agony,"

or Wordsworth's famous lines—

"Thy friends are exultations, agonies,  
And love and man's unconquerable mind."

In none of these is the physical idea prominent, even if it is present at all to the mind of the writer. I think, then, that "agony" is not a misleading term for the Greek word in this passage.

#### LUKE xxiii. 34.

*Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.*

A fresh witness to this text has turned up in the commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse. In the *American Journal of Philology* (1913, pp. 300–313) Mr. H. C. Hoskier calls attention to one Messina manuscript of the commentary, in view of the critical edition which Professor

Deikamp is preparing. It appears that Oecumenius quotes this saying of Jesus, adding that it was current or authoritatively announced (εἴρηται παρ' ἡμῶν), in spite of Cyril's statement in his thirteenth book against Julian. Cyril evidently denied the existence of the saying in the Gospel. Oecumenius in turn denies this, and his denial is a proof that the saying did exist in the church-text of his period or circle.

On the other hand, Herr A. Kahrstedt (in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 1913, 395 f.) appears to imply that it was not current in the second century text of the Gospel. He is discussing the Acts of the Lugdunum martyrs—which, by the way, he values highly as a historical document. When he comes to Eus. v. 2, 8 (“they prayed, like Stephen the perfect martyr, ‘Lord, lay not this sin to their charge’”), he observes that Acts vii. 60 is quoted, because no corresponding word from the cross was known. This is not a necessary inference, however. It hardly proves that the gospel saying was absent from the tradition or books known to the martyrs. The words of Stephen, a human martyr, may have seemed more appropriate to human martyrs than any words of the Lord Himself.

#### ACTS xvi. 25.

Κατὰ δὲ μεσονύκτιον Παῦλος καὶ Σίλας προσευχομενοὶ ὕμνουν τὸν θεόν.

In his recent commentary Windisch quotes a parallel from the Testament of Joseph (viii. 5), which describes Joseph rejoicing in prison. But he rejoices because even imprisonment is preferable to the temptations of Potiphar's wife. A closer parallel is to be found in the words of Epictetus (ii. 6, 26 f.) upon the duty of remaining undismayed even in prison or exile: Καὶ τότε ἐσόμεθα ζηλωταὶ Σωκράτους, ὅταν ἐν φυλακῇ δυνώμεθα παιᾶνας γράφειν. There

is a couplet in Tibullus (ii. 6, 25-26) which verbally resembles this :—

“Spes etiam valida solatur compede vinctum :  
Crura sonant ferro, sed canit inter opus.”

But this seems to mean either his hope of finishing his task or his expectation of gaining freedom. In the latter case, it would be a partial parallel to 1 Cor. vii. 21.

ROM. xiii. 13.

μη̄ κώμους καὶ μέθαις, μη̄ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μη̄ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ.

A contemporary parallel for this collocation of vices may be found in the lines of Petronius, quoted by Fulgentius (*Mythologiae* ii. 6). Petronius, in speaking of the vulture which gnawed the liver of Prometheus, explains that it means inward vice—“cordis mala, livor atque luxus.”

1 COR. xi. 10.

διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

Why did Paul order women at Corinth to wear a covering on their heads during public worship? In *The Quest* (October, 1913, pp. 90-101) Mr. E. E. Kellett proposes a new explanation of the regulation. He takes ἀγγέλους in the sense of good angels; otherwise, we should have had a qualifying adjective. Then he explains that the veil was worn to avert unhallowed desires on the part of the men, since these desires would awaken the jealous rage of the watchful angels who loved the women. The veil was worn as a protection against men, but διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, since the feelings of the latter had to be considered. In proof of this startling theory he asserts that it is certain, during early Christian times, that holy angels fell in love with women, “as the gods of heathenism loved a Danaë

or an Europa"; but the evidence adduced is both late and dubious. There is, of course, the legend of St. Cecilia, which is perhaps the closest parallel, but it seems more than doubtful whether "the main belief, or almost the main belief, of the first two centuries with regard to marriage was that all Christian women had, by the mere fact of accepting Christianity, surrendered themselves to divine or angelic husbands, and that, therefore, marriage with a mere man was void." The context of Paul's reference shows that the veil was worn for the very purpose of emphasising the marriage-right of the husband, and this corroborates the other view that the angels are viewed as evil rather than good, and that it is their wicked, erotic passions against which precautions are to be taken.

## 2 COR. ii. 17.

ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Cp. *Vita Apollonii* i. 13 (the rebuke addressed by Apollonius to Euphrates) ἀπήγε τοῦ χρηματίζεσθαι τε καὶ τὴν σοφίαν καπηλεύειν.

## ΕΡΗ. v. 18.

μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία.

In the light of Test. Jud. xvi. 1 (ἐστὶν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ [οἴνῳ] τέσσαρα πνεύματα πονηρά· ἐπιθυμίας, πυρώσεως, ἀσωτίας καὶ αἰσχροκερδίας, cp. Test. Asher v. 1) we must translate ἀσωτία here by "profligacy." The thought is, that drunkenness leads to sexual vice, not that the use of wine is apt to lead to an excessive use of it. Hence Boswell's remorseful application of the passage to himself (*The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, Sept. 26) is true to the English rather than to the meaning of the Greek text.



## ΕΦΗ. v. 26.

ἵνα αὐτήν ἀγίαση καθάρισας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.

In an essay on baptism in the New Testament (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1914, pp. 44 f.) Herr G. Kittel feels himself obliged to have recourse to conjectural emendation, in order to explain this difficult passage. He conjectures αἵματι for ῥήματι. The conjecture had been already made, not only by Venema (as he found out subsequently), but by van de Sande Bakhuyzen.

## HEB. xiii. 17.

ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσונτες.

Chrysostom (*de Sacerdotio* iii. 18, cp. vi. 1) uses this passage to enforce a sense of responsibility upon Christian ministers : εἰ γὰρ τῶν οἰκείων πλημμελημάτων εὐθύνας ὑπέχοντες φρίττομεν, ὡς οὐ δυνασόμενοι τὸ πῦρ ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκεῖνο, τὴν χρῆν πείσεσθαι προσδοκᾶν τὸν ὑπὲρ τοσοῦτων ἀπολογεῖσθαι μέλλοντα. But the writer of Hebrews assumes that the ἡγούμενοι are doing and will do their duty. The sadness which may come over them as they render their final account is not the result of their own shortcomings ; it is due to the wilfulness of their charges.

JAMES MOFFATT.