

Two Exegetical Notes on St. Paul.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc., D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

I.

A Special Use of *ἐν*.

PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON has called the preposition *ἐν*, as used in later Greek, 'a maid-of-all-work' (*Prolegomena*, p. 103). The description is so true that it is often difficult to say at what point one nuance of meaning shades off into another. Hence, the definite interpretation of particular instances must in many cases be hypothetical, and any sensible exegete will hesitate to dogmatize. Still, it may not be labour lost to group together some passages in the Pauline Epistles which seem to gain in clearness and force in the light of a particular explanation of this preposition.

Let us begin with its background. It is well known how often *ἐν* is used in the LXX as the equivalent of the Hebrew *בְּ*. Deissmann, even in the course of a restricted investigation, refers to 253 cases in which this is so. In 174 of these he regards *ἐν* as 'a mechanical non-Greek imitation' of the Hebrew word. The other usages he classifies under various headings (*Die neutest. Formel 'in Christo Jesu'*, pp. 55, 56). That with which we are concerned does not come within his purview. In all the passages to be cited from the LXX, *ἐν* is the equivalent of *בְּ*. But I should hesitate to call this usage either 'mechanical' or 'non-Greek,' as, although exact parallels outside the N.T. may be difficult to find, it is intimately associated with more or less familiar senses of *ἐν*.

(a) 2 S 3²⁷: ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἀσαήλ: 'he died for the blood of Asahel.'

(b) Dt 24¹⁶: ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀποθανείται: 'every man shall be put to death for his own sin.'

(c) Ps 68: ἐπαλαιώθην ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς μου: 'I [Heb. mine eye] waxed old because of all mine adversaries.'

(d) Ps 31¹¹: ἠσθένησεν ἐν πτώχει [LXX evidently read עני instead of Massoretic עני] ἡ ἰσχύς μου: 'my strength failed because of my wretchedness' [M.T. 'iniquity'].

(e) Ps 42⁹: ἵνα τί σκυθρωπάζων πορεύομαι ἐν τῷ ἐκθλίβειν τὸν ἐχθρόν μου: 'why go I mourning because of the oppression of mine enemy?' In all these examples, *ἐν* = 'on account of.' When we

consider the close affinity of the meanings 'on account of' and 'by means of,' we need not condemn the usage as non-Greek, even if its Hebrew prototype has not been without influence in suggesting it.

I shall not attempt to discuss Deissmann's confident assertion that Paul was practically free from the influence of the [Hebraistic] syntax of the LXX (*op. cit.*, pp. 67-69). Probably his position is, on the whole, accurate. Yet it would be precarious to leave no room for qualification. That would be to claim a knowledge of Paul's mental habits which is beyond our reach. Let us be content to admit that the Apostle is accustomed to use legitimate Greek constructions, leaving room for the proviso that a usage having a natural kinship with the LXX will not, for that reason, be the less likely to occur.

The following passages from the Epistles become, I think, more luminous if we interpret them in the light of the data set down above.

(a) Ro 1²⁴: διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν: 'wherefore God, because of [R.V. and Moff. 'in'] the lusts of their hearts, delivered them over unto uncleanness.' This rendering explains the psychological sequence of the process far more forcibly than the ordinary one. There seems no need to refer to the exegesis which connects *ἐν* directly with *παρέδωκεν*. It is unlike Paul's usage and would be tautological side by side with *εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν*.

(b) Ro 1²¹: ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν: 'they were made futile because of their speculations' [R.V. 'in their reasonings'; Moff. 'they have turned to futile speculations']. It gives point to the statement to ascribe the futility of their position to their empty cogitations. Although Sanday and Headlam give no hint of taking *ἐν* as above, they quote a parallel to the passage from Enoch 99⁸, which remarkably confirms the usage: 'they will become godless by reason of the foolishness of their hearts.'

(c) Ph 1¹³: ὥστε, τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ: 'so that throughout the whole praetorian guard it has become evident that my imprisonment is for Christ's sake [and not for any misdeed].'

This seems immensely preferable to R.V.: 'my bonds became manifest in Christ.' Dr. Moffatt's rendering really amounts to the same thing as mine, for whether he would be willing to give *ἐν* the precise force I suggest or not, he evidently feels that some such interpretation is necessary: 'it is recognized that I am imprisoned on account of my connexion with Christ.'

(d) 1 Co 7¹⁴: ἡγιάσται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀπίστος ἐν τῇ γυναίκί, καὶ ἡγιάσται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀπίστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ: 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified on account of his wife, and the unbelieving wife on account of her husband.' R.V. renders: 'the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife' ['consecrated in the person of his wife,' Moff.]. The ordinary interpretation is associated with Paul's phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ, and suggests that there is between husband and wife, even when one is a heathen, an intimacy of spiritual union similar to that which subsists between Christ and those united to Him by faith. I agree with J. Weiss (*ad loc.*) that it is exceedingly daring to attribute to Paul the equating of ἐν γυναίκί with ἐν Χριστῷ. Weiss believes ἐν γυναίκί to be a case of brachyology, and explains: 'owing to the fact that the wife is sanctified, the husband is sanctified along with her. . . . Their life together as a whole is the occasion of his being drawn in this way into the sphere of holiness.' This tallies with my suggestion. I do not discuss the conception of holiness which Weiss ascribes to Paul. That does not affect the present question. All that need be added is that one has at least as much right to translate ἐν here by 'because of' as (with Weiss) by 'with.'

(e) 1 Co 4⁴: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμὰντῷ σὺνοῖδα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι: 'for I have no consciousness of blame, but I am not on that account justified.' In this simple instance there is nothing to discuss.

(f) In the following group of examples, the preposition in every case follows the verb *καυχᾶσθαι*, which, in common with other verbs of emotion, like *χαίρειν*, *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι*, *εὐφραίνεσθαι*, often takes *ἐν* and (much more rarely) *ἐπί* with dative. The corresponding usage in Hebrew, in which the similar class of verbs is followed by *אֶל*, is regarded by Brown, Briggs, and Driver as probably a special case of that which lies behind the use of *in* in the LXX discussed above. At any rate, when Paul declares in Ro 5⁸: ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, the statement gains fresh significance when we render: 'we actually glory because of our tribulations.' And so do the parallel assertions in 2 Co 12⁶: οὐ καυχῆσομαι εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις: 'I shall not glory except on account of my frailties,' and 2 Co 12⁹, which is virtually a reiteration of 12⁶.

I have not attempted to collect instances of this use of *ἐν* in the N.T. outside the Pauline Epistles. But obvious examples are Mt 6⁷, Jn 16³⁰, Ac 7²⁹. Nor have I had access to Rossberg's dissertation *De praepositionum graecorum in chartis aegyptiis ptolem. aetatis usu* (1909), which might illustrate the usage from the Papyri. W. Schmid in his exhaustive study, *Der Atticismus*, vol. iv. p. 449, refers to Philostratus (II.), *Vitae Sophistarum* 33²¹, where, in the phrase ἐν οἴνῳ σπασούμεν, he interprets *ἐν* in a causal sense, as has been done throughout the present discussion. In grammars and lexicons only the fringe of the subject has been touched.

Contributions and Comments.

Literary Authorship.

THE processes of higher criticism are most frequently associated with their use in destroying existing notions of literary authorship, but being true processes their use in a constructive sense is equally legitimate. And being literary, or rather evidential, processes their value can be tested by their application to modern as well as to ancient literature.

To my mind the familiar differences both in vocabulary and in style between Mr. Carlyle's earlier and later writings have always seemed to be warnings against the popular canon that variety of style and diction necessarily implies variety of authorship.

But I do not write merely to trouble you with these personal and subjective commonplaces. I thought you might be interested by an example from the current number of the *Law Reports* upon