

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

S (hiat C) 'in the time of fruits'. In both places syr. vg. has only 'in the time'.

To the Syriac examples of aposiopesis given towards the end of No. III may be added one of the same type in *Julian* p. 132 ll. 9-10: 'And if they have repented, and their repentance be pleasing in the eyes of thy divinity: and if not, their blood be upon them'.

R. H. C.

A PARALLEL TO A N.T. USE OF σῶμα

A PARTIAL parallel to the N.T. use of σῶμα in the phrase τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ is given by an edict of Augustus dated 7/6 B.C. published in the *Zeitschrift d. Savigny-Stiftung* XLVIII (1928), *Rom. Abt.* p. 426. The relevant portion of the text (ll. 56-60) is as follows:

εἴ τινες ἐκ τῆς Κυρηναϊκῆς ἐπαρχή-
 as πολιτῆαι τετείμηνται, τούτους λειτουργεῖν οὐδὲν ἔλασον ἐμ μέρει τῶ τῶν
 Ἑλλήνων σώματι κελεύω ἐκτός τ[ο]ύτ[ι]ων, οἷς κατὰ νόμον ἢ δόγμα συνκλή-
 (του ἦ)
 τῶι τοῦ πατρός μου ἐπικρίματι ἢ τῶι ἐμῶι ἀνεισφορία ὁμοῦ σὺν τῆι πολιτῆαι
 δέδοται.

Professor von Premerstein in his commentary on the edict (*ib.* p. 467) suggests that the phrase λειτουργεῖν . . . σώματι represents something like *munera praestare per vias corpori Graecorum*, and illustrates the use of *corpus* from *Cod. Theod.*: 3. 5. 18: *Iudaeorum corpus*. We may also compare τὸ σῶμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν in the Rescript of Milan (*Eus. H. E.* X. v. 10, 11, 12).

It is thus no longer possible to say that σῶμα is never used in pre-Christian Greek for a 'body' of people or a society. The uniqueness of the N.T. phrase resides not in the word σῶμα but in the qualifying genitive. The body is not τὸ σῶμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν but τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

T. W. MANSON.

TWO PSALM NOTES

(1) 'They pierced my hands and my feet', Ps. xxii 16 (Heb. 17)

Mea Culpa! May I confess a fault? Overpersuaded by the all but unanimity of ancient translators in finding a verb in the third person plural in this clause I wrote in the Westminster Commentaries (*Psalms*, page 114, note) that the Masoretic text contains no verb and that כָּאֲרִי makes no sense. But there is no unanimity in the meaning the translators assign to this verb: ᾤρνξαν LXX: *foderunt* Vulg.: ִאָּרְנָו

(‘laceraverunt’) Peshitta: $\eta\chi\sigma\upsilon\alpha\nu$ Aquila: *vinxerunt* Jerome *iuxta Hebraeos*. The Targum is a witness for the final Yod of בארי , for it renders with a participle: נכתי , ‘they are wounding’. Lastly Symmachus as we now know agreed with the M.T., in rendering $\omega\varsigma \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$.

The modern commentators not unnaturally follow the Versions and propose to read a verb in the third person plural B. Duhm (1922) *Entstellt sind meine Hände und Füße*, reading בארו or בערו : A. Weiser (1935) *Es schmerzen mich Hände und Füße*, reading באבו : Hans Schmidt (1934) by a transposition makes ‘Dogs’ the subject of the verb and renders, *Zerfleischen mir Hände und Füße*, mentioning קרעו as a possible reading.

My suggestion is that it is the occurrence of a rare meaning for a word of familiar form which makes this passage difficult. If we keep ארי , must it mean ‘a lion’? The margin of R.V. on Isa. xxix 1 records that אריאל may mean ‘hearth of God’ (cf. B.D.B. *s.v.*); then is it not possible that ארי by itself, like the Arabic إِرَاه (*irah*), means ‘hearth’ or ‘altar-hearth’? If we render, ‘my hands and feet are as a hearth’ (בארי) i.e. burnt up with fever—no verb is wanted in the Hebrew—we have a satisfactory parallel in Ps. cii 3 (4), ‘My bones are burnt up as a hearth’: so A.V. and the American Jewish Version of 1917 for במוקד . The parallel is not seriously weakened, if the last word is rendered ‘as a fire brand’: so R.V. restoring the P.-B. rendering.

It remains to be seen how the proposed rendering fits into the context of Ps. xxii. *Vs.* 15-17 (R.V.: Heb. 16-18) with the correction proposed run thus:

15. ‘My strength is dried up like a potsherd;
And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws;
And thou hast brought me into the dust of death.
16. For dogs have compassed me:
The assembly of evil-doers have inclosed me;
My hands and my feet are as a hearth.
17. I may tell all my bones;
They look and stare upon me.’

Why can the Psalmist ‘tell all his bones’? Surely because his flesh is dried up and shrunken upon them. In verses 16 c 17 a he returns to the thought of verse 15 a. His distracted mind hovers between his own fevered state and the malicious pleasure of the enemy.

(2) Ps. xcv 6

Psalm xcv surely had an interesting history. It opens with a joyful invitation to worship addressed to a procession which is approaching

the Temple. 'Enter ye, let us worship and bow down,' says the Psalmist in verse 6 *a*, but in 6 *b* according to LXX (and Vulgate) he continues his invitation with *κλαύσωμεν*, *ploretus*, 'let us weep before JEHOVAH our Maker', as though the Hebrew had been נבכה. Did the Greek translators thus misread the נברכה which M.T. has retained?

The matter cannot be so easily dismissed. Though *κλαύσωμεν* does not suit the joyful outburst with which the Psalm begins, no word could go better with verses 8-11 with which the Psalmist closes in grave warning. The people of Israel did practise public 'Weepings' for their own sins and for those of their ancestors. In Zech. vii 3 the post-exilic congregation enquires, 'Shall I weep in the fifth month purifying myself as a Nazirite (הַנְּזִירִית)?' There is another allusion to the practice in Joel ii 17, 'Let the priests weep (יבכו) between the porch and the altar'.

The Psalmist in xcv 6 invites the congregation to be warned by their Fathers' disobedience and to bewail it. Through the solidarity of the Hebrew race they and their Fathers are one. Following LXX we find that the invitation, 'Let us weep', is appropriate to the conclusion of the Psalm, but the word brings into clearer relief the weakness of the connexion between the earlier and the later verses.

On the other hand M.T. with נברכה read as a Kal, 'Let us kneel', is open to serious objection as it stands in its own verse. This invitation comes as an anticlimax after the more urgent invitation, 'Let us worship ("prostrate ourselves") and bow down'. But M.T. is probably mistaken in its pointing: נברכה can be read as a Piel, 'Let us pronounce a blessing in the presence of JEHOVAH'. The Peshitta gives the sense more distinctly, 'Let us bless the Lord who made us'. The blessing is a salutation of homage paid to JEHOVAH, as in Ps. c 4) 'Enter his gates . . . bless his name'.

The two parts of the Psalm do indeed stand apart: The Psalm seems to be composite in structure. The first seven verses down to 'sheep of his hand' form a general Invitatory to worship, as they are used indeed in the Prayer Book of 1928: and to them belongs as the suitable reading נברכה, 'Let us pronounce a blessing'. But when the warning call to a remembrance of the disobedience of their Fathers in the wilderness was added, then the alternative reading נבכה, 'Let us weep', became appropriate. We judge from the textual evidence that the last four verses were joined to the first seven at a date before the LXX translation of the Psalms was made, and thus early a warning note was given, נבכה, *κλαύσωμεν* in at least some MSS. of the Hebrew.

W. EMERY BARNES.