

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]

The picture of church order in the *Didache*, so far from satisfying the antiquarianism of the second and third centuries, created considerable difficulties. This is shewn by the treatment of the second half of the document by later writers: (a) the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* evades the difficulty by reproducing the original with elaborate and skilful interpolations; (b) the author of the *Apostolic Church Ordinances* does so by *substituting* a church order of the kind approved in his day; (c) the author of the Latin version does so by *omitting* the whole of the second part of the *Didache* and rounding off 'The Two Ways' with a few words of exhortation, thus turning it into a kind of homily.

The Latin version so emended is probably the work alluded to by Rufinus. The list of canonical books of the New Testament, which was ultimately accepted, first appears in the 39th Festal Letter of Athanasius (A.D. 367). It is generally believed that this represents an agreement between Rome and Alexandria; and an identical list is given by Rufinus. Now Athanasius and Rufinus agree in adding—as a kind of sub-canonical appendix—two, and only two, other works, viz. *Hermas*, and a work which Athanasius calls *Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων*, and which Rufinus calls *Duae Viae vel Judicium Petri*. The burden of proof surely lies with any one who wishes to deny that the *Duae Viae* of Rufinus is this Latin version of 'The Two Ways', which, in the Greek, constitutes the first part of the *Didache*.

If that be so, there is an important corollary. In the Gospels it often happens that the Old Latin preserves a true reading which has disappeared in the Byzantine text of the Greek. Similarly, we should expect that the true reading in the *Didache* will frequently be found, not in our one eleventh-century Byzantine MS of the Greek, but in the Latin version.

B. H. STREETER.

SYRIACISMS IN ST LUKE

A RESPECTABLE tradition has it that St Luke was a native of Antioch. This is stated in the ancient Prologue to his Gospel which there are strong reasons for assigning to the second century,¹ by Eusebius *H.E.* iii 4, and by St Jerome *de Vir. illustr.* Further, the appearance of the first person plural in the 'Western' reading of Acts xi 28 presupposes that the writer of the book was at Antioch before SS Paul and Barnabas set out on the first missionary journey. Eusebius may be dependent on the Prologue, and Jerome may depend on Eusebius or the Prologue; but the Prologue itself and the 'Western' reading of Acts are in all

¹ See de Bruyne, 'Les plus anciens prologues latins des évangiles', in *Rev. Bénédicte* xl (1928) 193 ff.

probability independent witnesses. Possibly also we may detect a note of pride in the memorandum that 'the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch' (Acts xi 26). On the other hand there is no tradition, nor anything in the Acts to suggest it, that St Luke was a native of Palestine.

But if he was 'a Syrian of Antioch', as the Prologue states, the chances are that he was bilingual, and that his second language was Syriac.¹ And if also he was of gentile stock, which seems to be the more common view, the likelihood of his being familiar with the Palestinian or Jewish Aramaic would be small. His knowledge of Syriac might enable him to read and even converse in the other dialect, but any personal Aramaic colouring in his writings (if such can be proved) would naturally be derived from his own second tongue.

Is St Luke's Gospel marked to any noticeable degree by Aramaisms? And if so, are any of these attributable to himself rather than to the employment by him of written Aramaic sources? I have little hesitation in answering 'Yes' to both of these questions. And by St Luke's Gospel I here mean in the first place sections which have no parallels in the other Synoptics, but also certain passages where, while the matter is common to one or more of the others, the manner of its introduction is peculiar to the Third Gospel. I am not therefore concerned with any of the Aramaisms (real or alleged) which may be shared by Lk. with Mk. or 'Q'. The Greek of this Gospel presents certain peculiarities, in the sense of departures from Greek idiom, which, with one partial exception, are not found elsewhere in the New Testament. One of these (see under No. IV below) occurs four times in Lucan introductions to incidents related also in Mt. and Mk., and must therefore be credited to St Luke himself; another (No. II) is, I understand, quite incapable of explanation by reference to Jewish Aramaic; a third (No. I) might possibly be matched from Jewish Aramaic if the original literature of that dialect were more extensive than it is: whether an example can be brought from any existing source of that kind I do not know, and it seems doubtful; a fourth (No. III), which occurs three times, is unsupported by the usage of the Targums in fourteen passages examined. But all are shewn to be genuine Syriac idioms not only by their literal reproduction in the Old Syriac Gospels, and retention in many cases by the Syriac Vulgate, but also by parallels to be found in original Syriac writings.

It is reasonable to assume that a fair proportion of the matter peculiar to St Luke's Gospel was collected by him during the two years or so

¹ In the Introduction to his *Syriac Grammar* (trans. by J. A. Crichton, p. xxxii) Nöldeke speaks of 'the semi-Greek Antioch' in contrast with the purely Syriac-speaking Edessa.

that he spent in Palestine while St Paul was detained a prisoner at Caesarea. But through what medium he received this additional information, whether orally or in the form of written documents, remains uncertain. It is here suggested that he received much of it orally, and afterwards developed it in his own way from notes which he had taken. This at least appears to me to be a line of enquiry which deserves to be followed up.

To the four instances of 'Syriacisms' in St Luke's Gospel I have ventured to add as a possible fifth (No. V) one from Acts xxii 25. This stands on a different footing from the others inasmuch as there is nothing in the Greek itself to suggest Semitic influence. But the word in question (the verb *προτείνω*) is employed in an unusual sense, is found only here in the New Testament, and is rendered in the Syriac as literally as may be by what is practically a technical term.

I

Lk. xii 49: *καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη;*

'A passage of well-known difficulty, the translation of which remains doubtful' (Plummer). '... and what will I, if it is already kindled?' (R. V.).

In the Curetonian Syriac (*C*) this is represented word for word thus:

ܠܘܟܢ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

which Burkitt translates: 'and how I would if already it had been kindled'. It is to be noted, however, that the verb at the end is not a pluperfect but a simple 'perfect', answering exactly to *ἀνήφθη*. The word ܠܘܟܢ (*mā*) can mean either 'how!', or 'what?', or 'what' (rel.). The Peshitta (syr. vg.) agrees with *C* except that it omits *mā*, beginning 'and I would if'. The Sinai palimpsest (*S*) begins differently: ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, 'and *what* he would [*sic*] (is), if'; but, as Burkitt observes, ܠܘܟܢ here is probably only a slip for ܠܘܟܢ, 'I would' (as *C*, but with contracted spelling), since the third person gives no sense. But the insertion of a ܕ (*dā*) before this verb has the effect of altering the sense of the preceding *mā* ('how') to 'what' or 'that which', thereby modifying the construction and requiring us to supply a copula in translating: 'and what I would (is), if already it had been kindled'. For the rest, however, *S* is identical with *C* and syr. vg.; in other words, all three have the same rendering of *εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη*, wherein lies the chief difficulty of the Greek.

It may seem from the literal translation given that the Syriac is no more intelligible than the Greek, of which it appears to be a mere slavish copy. But this is not the case. Nöldeke in his *Syriac Grammar*

(§ 375 B) points out that the word ܐܠܘ, 'ellū, ('if', in unfulfilled conditions) sometimes passes from the notion of a hypothesis to that of a *wish*. He begins by citing this very passage of Lk., as in C, but adds independent examples. One of these is, constructionally, almost an exact replica of our text, yet without any sign of reference to it:

ܘܥܠܡܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܗܘܢܝܢ ܐܠܘ ܗܘܝܬ ܘܢܫܘܢܝܗܘܢ

'and how much you would if already it had set.'

Here the only difference in form is that instead of *mā*, 'how', we have *kēmā*, 'how much', and that 'would' is differently expressed, by the imperfect instead of the present (but the same verb is used). The phrase is from the so-called 'Romance of Julian' (*Julianos der Abtrünnige*, ed. Hoffmann p. 23 l. 22). The author of this work paints Julian the Apostate in the darkest colours, and is bitterly hostile to the Jews; but he is regarded as a master of Syriac style and is constantly quoted as an authority by Nöldeke. In the passage cited he represents the Jews as abetting Julian and saying to the Christians that the star (lit. 'joy') of the Jewish people is now at last in the ascendant: 'but how glad you would be if even now it had set!' That is the force of the Syriac expression. It is true that this writer frequently introduces scriptural phrases; but even if we grant that he may have had the phraseology of Lk. xii 49 in his mind, it is improbable that he would model a sentence upon it if the Syriac there offered the same difficulty as the Greek. And this illustration does not stand alone: there are other similar examples of the use of 'ellū ('if') to express a wish, as may be seen by consulting Nöldeke *loc. cit.*¹

Prof. Burkitt in his discussion of the grammar and syntax of the Old Syriac Gospels (*Evang. da-Mepharreshe* ii 78) has a note on the rendering of Lk. xii 49 from which it is clear that he, too, accepted the Syriac version as good and idiomatic; but curiously neither he nor Nöldeke goes on to remark that the Syriac therefore offers an obvious explanation, and solution, of the difficulty in the Greek.

¹ See especially *Julian* 55²²⁻²³, 81²⁵, 104²⁷; and from another writer: 'thou wishest now if thou hadst seen him' (perf.). Nöldeke has already said (§ 375 A) that 'ellū 'is generally followed by the perfect, which is so much used for hypothetical clauses (§ 259), or by the participle with ܐܘܪܝܢܐ (§ 277).' Thus ܘܥܠܡܝܢ (= ἀνθρώπων) is quite normal. The perfect is used also in other modes of expressing a wish. Thus, where Hebrew says 'Who will give?' (= 'O that!'), Syriac says, oddly but characteristically, 'Who has given?' (equal to 'Who will have given?'), or, with participle and ܐܘܪܝܢܐ, 'Who would be giving?' See Nöld. § 259, where many examples are cited, including Mk. xvi 3, τὴν ἀποκλίσαι—rendered in S and syr. vg. (C is lacking here) 'Now who has rolled (away) for us the stone?' i.e. 'O that someone would roll . . .!' Three excellent examples in succession (not cited by Nöld.) may be seen in the *Acts of Judas Thomas*, ed. Wright p. 286 ll. 10 ff (of the text).

It is remarkable (though I can offer no explanation of the fact) that St Jerome, who in his Commentary on St Matthew finds occasion to cite Lk. xii 49 no less than seven times, quotes it in the form 'Ignem veni mittere super terram, et *quam* (al. quem) *volo ut ardeat*'—'against all other authorities', says Dom Chapman (*J.T.S.* xxiv 121).¹ The Vulgate has 'Ignem veni mittere in terram, et quid volo nisi ut accendatur?'

II

Lk. xiv 18: καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μιᾶς πάντες παραιτέσθαι.

Here is another *crux interpretum* provided by St Luke. Of this use of ἀπὸ μιᾶς Plummer says that it is 'unique in Greek literature'. 'And they all with one consent began to make excuse', R.V. It is commonly held that some word like γνώμης or φωνῆς or ψυχῆς is to be understood. But a simpler solution is offered by the identity of the phrase with the Syriac *men hēdhā*, lit. 'from one' (fem.), which usually occurs as one word in the contracted form *mehēdhā*, with elision of the *n*, though the full form is also found—e.g. in *S* at Mk. vi 47. This is the commonest rendering of εὐθύς, and means *not* 'all together' or 'with one accord', but 'immediately', 'straightway'. In our present passage *C* and *S* render ἀπὸ μιᾶς πάντες by *mehēdhā* simply (πάντες being neglected); whence it is evident that the earliest Syriac translators saw their own idiom in ἀπὸ μιᾶς and treated the expression as equivalent to εὐθύς.² Syr. vg. has *men hadh kullhōn*, 'from one (masc.) all-of-them', which probably means 'all one by one', or 'one and all' (coming under the distributive uses of *men*, as to which see Payne Smith). Now if ἀπὸ μιᾶς is an Aramaism, it is a Syrian Aramaism, for *mehēdhā* is not found in Jewish Aramaic.

III

(a) Lk. xiii 7: ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι.

(b) Lk. xiii 16: ἦν ἐδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη.

(c) Lk. xv 29: ἰδοὺ τσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι.

The presence of ἰδοὺ in these texts answers to a characteristic Syriac usage according to which *hā*, 'lo', is constantly inserted (in *direct speech*, not in ordinary narrative) before expressions of *time*. In this Syriac differs from Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic (at least that of the biblical Targums), which in similar cases use 'this', usually in the sense of 'now', *iam* (Heb. *zeh*, Aram. *dēnān*). Thus Hebrew says 'this three

¹ Did St Jerome know Syriac? I think I have seen somewhere that he did not; yet by some means he has arrived at the right sense.

² The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, edited by Mrs Lewis and Mrs Gibson, has 'And they began all-of-them *immediately*' (*men hēdhā*, with full spelling): p. 116.

times', 'this 40 year' (with sing. noun after the larger numbers); while the Targums have 'this three times', 'this 40 years'. But Syriac in such cases invariably says 'lo, three times', 'lo, 40 years'; and indeed any expression of time in direct speech tends to attract a 'lo': e.g. at Mk. ix 21, 22 *S* and syr. vg. have 'How long time (is it), lo, since (*lit.* from that) he was thus? . . . Lo, from his childhood'¹; again, at Mk. x 20 *S* has 'These things I have done, lo, since (from that) I was a child'; and so *C S* at Lk. xviii 21 (*C* is wanting in the other two places). Similarly at Lk. xi 50 *C* and *S* have 'lo, since (from that) the world was created'. It now goes without saying that in (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*) above, where St Luke has ἰδοῦ, the Syriac has 'lo'; and in (*a*) *C* has it twice: 'Lo, three years (it is), lo, since (from that) I come.'

The following O.T. passages will suffice to illustrate the difference between Syriac and the Hebrew and Targums with regard to this idiom: Gen. xxvii 36, xxxi 38, 41, xlv 6, Nu. xiv 22, xxii 28, 32, Deut. ii 7, viii 2, 4, Jos. xxii 3, 2 Sam. xiv 2, Zech. vii 3, 5. In all these places Heb. and the Targums have 'this', and the Syriac 'lo'. In nine of the 14 places the LXX has τοῦτο or ταῦτα for Heb. *zeh*, and once ἡδη (Zech. vii 3); but three times we find ἰδοῦ—ἰδοὺ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη (Deut. ii 7, viii 4: in Deut. viii 2 the same number is omitted altogether), and ἰδοὺ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη (Zech. vii 5). These are, I think, the only places where LXX uses ἰδοῦ for *zeh* before time data. In Tob. v 3, however, we find in cod. N (only) καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἔτη εἴκοσι ἀφ' οὗ παρεθέμην τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦτο ἐγώ, a construction closely resembling that in (*a*) above.²

There are, of course, a good many cases in which Heb. and the biblical Aramaic place 'lo' before *numbers*; as in the account of Pharaoh's dream, his own rehearsal of it, and Joseph's interpretation (Gen. xli): 'And, lo, there came up out of the river seven kine . . . And, lo, seven other kine' (*v.* 2-3); and in the interpretation we have 'lo' before a number of years: 'Lo, there come seven years of great plenty' (*v.* 29). See also Dan. vii 2 (Aram.), xi 2, xii 5—none of which have reference to *time*. But all these cases are quite different from those noted in the last paragraph; for here the force of 'lo' is to emphasize, or lend vividness to, the whole phenomenon, not to focus attention on a particular *number*: and most of them are not temporal. To apply a simple test: Heb. *zeh* would not be possible in any of these passages. To the same class belong Lk. xxiv 4 (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς),

¹ 'Lo, from my childhood' occurs in *Julian* 46¹¹, and 'lo, since (from that)' at 120⁸.

² It should perhaps be noticed that the Latin Vulgate has 'en altera vice' at Gen. xxvii 36, 'ecce iam tertio' at Nu. xxii 28, and 'en quadragesimus annus est' at Deut. viii 4. But Latin *ecce* and *en* have a wider use than Greek ἰδοῦ.

xxiv 13 (καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν . . . ἦσαν πορευόμενοι), and Acts xi 11 (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξαυτῆς τρεῖς ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν). The genuine idiom appears to be used once by St Paul, 2 Cor. xii 14: ἰδοὺ τρίτον τοῦτο ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς: though even this does not offer an exact parallel to any of the three passages in St Luke, and in xiii 1 the ἰδοὺ is dropped in the corresponding phrase τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

To shew *ex abundantia* how intensely characteristic of Syriac is this insertion of *hā*, 'lo', before statements involving *time* in *direct speech*, many more examples could easily be collected. I will add only three: 'and lo, (it is) three days, lo, since (from that) all these things took place' (*C S* syr. vg. at Lk. xxiv 21, where ἰδοὺ is not used); 'four days there are until now, lo, since (from that) I am fasting' (Acts x 30. without ἰδοὺ); 'and lo, (it is) seven years, lo, since (from that) I was joined in wedlock with a woman' (*Acts of Judas Thomas*)¹.

I must now leave it to others to decide whether the three occurrences of ἰδοὺ in the LXX for Heb. *zeh*, in the sort of contexts we have been discussing, are sufficient to account for the idiom found three times in the Greek of St Luke, and whether it is likely that (*a*) in particular reflects knowledge of the *ℵ* text of Tobit v 3; to say also whether St Luke could have got the idiom from the Greek *κοινή*, or whether it has any parallel in Jewish Aramaic.

Before passing on I would point out that in the context of (*a*) above (viz. at Lk. xiii 9) there is another idiom characteristic of, though not peculiar to, Syriac—the aposiopesis in *κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον· εἰ δὲ μὴγε, ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν*. This is duly reproduced by *C S* and syr. vg., which all have 'and if it has (= shall have) made fruit: and if not, next year thou shalt cut it down'; where, it may be observed, *εἰς τὸ μέλλον* is most neatly turned by the single adverb *ἔμνηται*. In Ex. xxxii 32 the Heb. has: 'Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book' (R.V.). This is rendered literally in the Peshitta Syriac and also in the Targum of Onkelos; but the LXX supplies an apodosis after 'their sin', inserting *ἄφες*. Two examples will shew that this idiom, with suppressed apodosis after the first of two 'if'-clauses, is thoroughly at home in Syriac.

'And if thou hast (shalt have) yielded: and if not, I know what I will do' (*Acts of Judas Thomas*, Wright p. 300 l. 18, trans. p. 266). Here the Gk. version (Bonnet c. 130) omits 'and if not'.

'And if deliverance has (shall have) dawned for us from any quarter:

¹ Ed. Wright, text p. 317, trans. p. 284 (but Wright does not translate the second 'lo'). The Gk. version (ed. Bonnet c. 150) represents the first 'lo' by *ἦδη* and avoids the second. In these *Acts* I have found five other cases of 'lo' before time in direct speech, and no example of its omission in such contexts; but in none of these places does ἰδοὺ appear in the Gk.

and if not, we will certainly surrender (perf.) the town' (*Julian* p. 169 l. 25).

This usage is found in classical Greek, but the context in St Luke makes the Semitic parallels especially interesting. The very next verse (xiii 10) will come under consideration in the following section.

IV

(a) Lk. v 12 (|| to Mt. viii 2, Mk. i 40): καὶ ἐγένετο . . . ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων.

(b) Lk. v 17 (|| to Mt. ix 1, Mk. ii 1): καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν.

(c) Lk. viii 22 (|| to Mt. viii 18, 23, Mk. iv 35): ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν.

(d) Lk. xiii 10: ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν.¹

(e) Lk. xx 1 (|| to Mt. xxi 23, Mk. xi 27): καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν.

We are not here concerned with the Hebraism involved in the use of ἐγένετο to introduce a narrative, but with the use of ἐν μιᾷ τῶν to indicate an entirely indefinite city, day, synagogue. Commenting on Lk. v 17-26 Plummer says: 'The cast of the opening verse [(b) above] is very Hebraistic, as is shewn by ἐγένετο, by ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, by καὶ αὐτός, and by δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς.' But where in the Hebrew or LXX is there any parallel to ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν? I have not succeeded in finding one. Where we should say 'It happened one day that', Heb. says 'And the day came (*lit.* was), and'. So at 1 Sam. i 4, 2 K. iv 8, 11, 18; and in these passages (except the last, where there is no equivalent) the LXX renders καὶ ἐγένετο (or ἐγενήθη) ἡμέρα καί.² The Syriac also adapts itself to the Hebrew in these places, just as it frequently does to St Luke's Greek where this is modelled on the LXX.

Let us now take the Syriac renderings of these passages from St Luke. *S* is available in all five places, and so of course is *syr. vg.*; *C* is wanting for (a) and (b), and in (c) it has 'on one of those days'. With these exceptions all three authorities render ἐν μιᾷ τῶν literally.³ In doing so are they merely sticking close to the Greek, or do they reproduce a normal Syriac usage? The idiom seemed to me quite familiar, but needed illustration by apposite examples. Failing help from dictionaries and grammars, I have turned to a couple of early Syriac writings which seemed likely to supply equivalents of our phrase 'It happened one day', namely the *Acts of Judas Thomas* and the stories in Burkitt's *Euphemia and the Goth*, and these have yielded the following:

1. 'And I tell thee, that I am not slightly tormented by the enemy,

¹ Introducing the story of the Crooked Woman, which is peculiar to Lk.

² See also Job i 6, 13, ii 1.

³ So, too, the Palestinian Syriac at (b) and (e): *op. cit.* pp. 100, 269.

lo, for the space of five years. For I was sitting in ease, and peace was around me on all sides. . . . And it happened *one day*, as I was coming out of the bath, a [*lit.* one] man met me. . . . And lo, up to the present, as thou seest me, lo, for five years he has not left me alone' (*Thomas* pp. 211-12, trans. pp. 183-4; I have given Wright's translation).

The context has here been quoted because it contains excellent further examples of the use of 'lo', discussed under III above. The words translated by Wright 'And it happened one day' are literally 'But it happened *on one of the days*'. The Greek version (Bonnet c. 43) has quite literally *ἔτυχεν δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν*.

2. 'And on one of the days' (*Euphemia* § 21).

3. 'And on one of the days' (*ib.* § 36).

4. 'On one of the days' (*ib.* p. 87 l. 18, in the story of the Merchant of Harran).

In the last three passages 'days' has the 'absolute' form, *yauṃīn*, while in the first, as in the Gospel, it has the 'emphatic' form *yau-māthā*; but there is no difference in the sense or the idiom, though the absolute form may tend, if anything, to emphasize the entire vagueness of the expression.

In the *Romance of Julian* p. 54 l. 5 we read that the emperor gave orders that if Christians were found holding an assembly 'in one of the forms or on one of the pretexts' (i.e. in any form or on any pretext), they were to be put to the sword; and the phrase 'on one of the pretexts' comes again on p. 70 l. 17. This is precisely the same idiom with a different application.

To produce exact parallels to (a) and (d), 'in one of the cities' and 'in one of the synagogues', is obviously not so easy. But if we turn from earlier writers to Bar-Hebraeus in the thirteenth century, abundant examples of all kinds are to be found. Though comparatively late, Bar-Hebraeus was a very great scholar, and in addition an authority on Syriac grammar, so that we need not hesitate to quote him. The obvious place to look for phrases like 'once upon a time', 'one day', 'a certain king', and the like, is his collection of *Laughable Stories* edited by Dr Budge. I select only a few specimens. The references given are to the numbers of the stories.

'In one of the times', i.e. 'once upon a time' (78, 674); 'on one of the days' (107, 528); 'one of the teachers used to say' (252); 'he went out to one of the villages' (444); 'when he went (about) in (or perhaps 'went into') *one of the cities*' (445); 'one of the demoniacs', i.e. a certain demoniac (621).

Before leaving this point we must take note, by way of distinction, of another, less indefinite, form of expression. To denote 'a certain' (ṛis) man, lion, &c., Syriac frequently says 'one man', 'one lion'. In

these cases 'one' is often equivalent to the indefinite article. This use is extremely common, and is found in Hebrew (cf. 1 Sam. i 1, vi 7), in Jewish Aramaic (as Dan. ii 31), and also in the LXX (1 Reg. i 1, vi 7: cod. A). It occurs even in the N.T.: Apoc. viii 13 'one eagle', ix 13 'one voice', xviii 21 and xix 17 'one angel'; and in Mt. xix 16 we have *καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν*. But in these cases the person, creature, or thing, though left indefinite, has some sort of identity and plays some part in the story. In the idiom discussed above 'one of the' is used with times, places, or persons that are meant to be left entirely vague and general, their identity being of no account: commonly they are mentioned merely to give the setting of a story or incident and enter no further into it. And such is St Luke's use of *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν*: it serves in every case to introduce some new incident.

A particular interest attaches to St Luke's employment of this Syriac idiom, since in four out of the five places in which it occurs the phrase comes, not in passages entirely peculiar to Lk., but in the Lucan introductions to incidents which are recorded also in Mt. and Mk. It is therefore due to *St Luke himself* in these four places, not to any written Aramaic source. And the same is probably true of its use in xiii 10, though there it introduces the incident of the Crooked Woman, related only by St Luke.

V

Acts xxii 25: *ὡς δὲ προέτειναν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἰμάσι, εἶπεν . . . ὁ Παῦλος· εἰ ἄνθρωπον Ῥωμαῖον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον ἕξεστιν ὑμῶν μαστιγῆσαι;*

The verb *προτείνω* occurs only here in the N.T., and in Thayer-Grimm's *Lexicon* no other example is cited of its use in connexion with scourging, nor have I succeeded in finding another. But in Syriac the verb *mēthah*, 'to stretch', is used quite technically of tying a person up for whipping; and so syr. vg. renders here (we have no 'Old Syriac' for the Acts): 'And when they had stretched him with¹ thongs, Paul said . . . Is it permitted to you to scourge a man (who is) a Roman, and one that is not condemned?' A few examples will illustrate this use of *mēthah*.

Some of the earliest allusions to the Pillar of Scourging are found in Syriac writers, and here the verb 'to stretch (up)' inevitably occurs. Thus St Ephraim writes: 'On the pillar, again, *they stretched* Him for scourging: Him whose pillar went before their tribes' (*Carm. Nisib.*, ed. Bickell, lviii 14).

In another poem attributed to St Ephraim, but probably of somewhat

¹ 'with' and not 'for': the Syriac (no doubt rightly) takes the thongs to be bands, not whips.

later date, we read: 'When Jesus was scourged by impious men at the festival, the column on which they scourged Him feared and was terrified. The rocks perceived that He who *was stretched* (sc. upon them) was He who established the rocks. The column shook because it knew that the Lord of creation was being scourged' (*S. Ephr. Hymni et Sermones*, ed. Lamy i p. 480).

Jacob of Serug (saec. v-vi) writes: 'The Judge of all they have bound to the column of judgement: the Fire *is stretched* (up), and they scourge Him with whips' (ed. Bedjan ii p. 563). In another place the same writer addresses our Lord as 'Thou (that wast) bound . . . *stretched* (i.e. scourged?) . . . killed' (ii p. 428): three passive participles (emphatic state) as substantives. But here 'stretched' *may* refer to the cross.

Isaac of Antioch (saec. v), in a long poem about a bird which learned with ease to repeat *Ḳaddish*, *ḳaddish*, 'Allāhā (ἄγιος, ἄγιος, ὁ θεός), contrasts the difficulty of teaching a boy his letters: the master brandishes the rod, boxes his ears, pulls his hair,—'he *stretches* his back to the column, and his sides to the whip' (ed. Bedjan i p. 756).

In the Acts of Ḥabib, one of the early martyrs of Edessa, we read: 'The governor said: Let him *be stretched* (up) and scourged with whips' (Cureton, *A.S.D.* p. 79, trans. p. 78). Probably other instances could easily be found: any original Syriac account of a scourging would be likely to employ this verb.

While we cannot say here, as we can of the expressions discussed under I-IV, that there is anything in the Greek itself to suggest Semitic influence, yet it is curious to find St Luke employing a verb, not found elsewhere in the N.T., which the Syriac translator can render exactly by a technical term. I cannot say whether or no *mēthah* had a similar technical use in Jewish Aramaic; but, unless St Luke was a Jew, is there any reason to suppose that he would borrow expressions from that dialect?

In these pages I have brought forward only a few outstanding examples of 'Syriacisms' in St Luke; but if the suggestion offered should be taken up it would easily be seen to be capable of wider application, at least in the case of his Gospel. R. H. CONNOLLY.

Addenda

In view of the special interest of No. IV for the question of Aramaism in St Luke, I add another early Syriac example of the idiom represented by *ἐν μῶ τῶν* which I have since noticed. In Lk. xx 10 C and S render *καὶ καιρῶ ἀπέστειλεν* by 'and *in one of the times* he sent', understanding the simple *καιρῶ* in the sense of 'upon a time'. But in the parallel passage Mk. xii 2, where the article is used, *τῷ καιρῶ* is paraphrased in

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 ἐπαρχί-
 ας πολιτῆαι τετείμηνται, τούτους λειτουργεῖν οὐδὲν ἔλασον ἐμ μέρει τῷ τῶν
 Ἑλλήνων σώματι κελεύω ἐκτὸς 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 πολιτείᾳ
 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 כָּרַח makes no sense. But there is no unanimity in the meaning the translators assign to this verb: ᾤρουξαν LXX: *foderunt* Vulg.: אָכַח