

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON MY HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.

IV.

I insist upon the use of the article, on account of the abundant materials which this chapter supplies for information in syntax and style.

- 1. One of the chief faults of the Hebrew New Testament of the London Society is the frequency of הַבֶּבֶל (the terrestrial world) with the article. In biblical Hebrew this substantive never has the article. It is an ancient word, belonging to a stage of language in which the article, abbreviated from an ancient demonstrative pronoun, was not yet coined, and therefore beloved by the higher style, which delights in archaisms.¹ Salkinson has, Acts xvii. 13, correctly את־הַבֵּבל, where the London translation. I have avoided this fault at the very beginning of my work of translation.
- 2. A very bad fault of the London translation is מְאֶלְהִים and בְּאֶלְהִים, where the only true God is meant (e.g. Acts xx. 25 and John iv. 15, 16). The word, thus vocalized, signifies the gods of the heathen: Psalm lxxxvi. 8, "Among the gods (בְּאלְהִים) there is none like unto Thee"; and Exodus xxii. 19 (20), "He that sacrifices to the gods" (לְאלְהִים). On the contrary, the Hebrew equivalent of דָּשָּׁ Θׁבּשָּׁ is everywhere בּאלְהִים, and of ἐν τῷ Θεῷ בּאלְהִים. Fuerst's Concordance places Jonah iii. 5 and Psalm cviii. 14 (13) under בְּאלִהִים; but that is a pitiful, misleading error.
- 3. In both translations, Salkinson's as well as my own, τὸ συνέδριον of the New Testament has been rendered by the figure ; but the lawfulness of the determination by the article is questionable. The ancient Jewish idiom was wont

¹ Similar is Dinn, which in biblical Hebrew never has the ⊓ of article, but assumes it (prepared by Jes. lxiii. 13, Ps. cvi. 9) in the postbiblical Hebrew.

to say סנהדרין without article, just as the English sometimes say "Parliament," and not "the Parliament." There will scarcely be found any passage deviating from this usage of language. We meet often with the distinction of סנהדרין the great council) and סנהדרין קשנה (the little council), as for instance in the beginning of the treatise סנהדרין היתה כחצי גרן sentences as סנהדרין היתה כחצי גרן "the council was like the semicircle of a barnfloor" (Sanhedrin 36b) and סנהדרין באין בצד המזבח, "the members of the council entered on the side of the altar" (Mechilta, end of the section Jithro). Sometimes it is written סנהדרי, without Nun, either in consequence of nonchalant pronunciation or by abbreviation of writing (Sanhedrin 3b and elsewhere; Midrash Levit. c. 19 end). In the Palestinian Targumîm even a shorter form without interior aspiration occurs, which J. Levy erroneously punctuates סנדרי, instead of סנדרי (plur. סנדריתא). The word in all these forms is without article, like a proper name, as determinate in itself, and there is no reason for adding the article in the Hebrew New Testament, except, as it seems, in the translation of $\delta\lambda o\nu$ $(\pi \hat{a}\nu)$ $\tau \delta \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \delta \rho \iota \sigma \nu$, though even there כל סנהדרין (for כל הסנהדרין) would be inoffensive and more consequent. The plural tà συνέδρια is to be found in the New Testament only twice. The Hebrew plural is סנהדרייות (at the beginning of the Mishna Sanhedrin) or סנהדראות (Jalkut Levit. § 619, Midrash Cant. iii. 7); likewise as the singular without article, which also in those two passages (Matt. x. 17, Mark xiii. 9) is omitted, because councils in general are intended.

4. The Hebrew word for synagogue is בַּנֶּשֶׁתְּא (with the Zere of the first syllable (comp. the Aramaic אַנְשֶּׁתְּא with Chirek in the first); mostly where not the congregation per se, but with relation to the edifice, is aimed at, בּית כנכת (house) is put before. One says for a synagogue בית כנכת, and for the synagogue בית הכנכת But which is the correct expression in the plural? The plural συναγωγαί, mostly with the

article ai συναγωγαί, occurs twenty-four times in the New Testament. The first passage is Matthew iv. 23, "teaching in their synagogues," where Salkinson has וילמד שם בבתי הכנסת. He omits (likewise as ib. ix. 35, x. 17, Mark i. 39, Luke iv. 15) the genitive αὐτῶν (of the Jews or of his countrymen), and his בתי הכנסת is by no means idiomatically Jewish. A plurality of synagogues is, as far as I know, throughout in Talmud and Midrash expressed either by בָּנְסִיּוֹת (Aram. בָּנִישָׁתָא, e.g. jer Schekalim, c. 5, כנישתא דלור, the synagogues of Lydda) or (and that is the common use) by the double plural בתי כנסיות. Therefore I have in those five passages translated בבתי כנסיותיהם. More idiomatical would be בכנסיותיהם, without בבתי just as מֹפְעִנסטים, אשי כנסיות, or even more idiomatical בתי כנסיות של הם, as in Aboth iii. 14, בתי כנסיות שלהם, הארץ, that is, meeting houses of common people. Salkinson has throughout avoided the plural בנסיות as too rabbinical, as if the singular כנסת were not also post-biblical Hebrew; his בתי הכנסת is invented by himself and unknown in the Jewish literature. But also בתי הכנסיות (with article like בתי הבמות, 2 Kings xxiii. 19) is, according to my knowledge of the literature of Talmud and Midrash, without support and precedent. In the singular one says in case of exigency not less correctly בית כנסת as בית כנסת, while the plural refuses the article even where it is required logically; e.g. בתי כנסיות שבבל, the synagogues in Babylon (Megilla 28b); מכריזין בבתי כנסיות, proclaiming in the synagogues (Baba mezia 28b). Hence it is commendable to render ai συναγωγαί of the New Testament always by בתי מנסיות as determinate in itself. Usage is a tyrant and has its unalterable caprices.

5. In another case the article is not to be rejected. In three passages of the Revelation (i. 8, xxi. 6, xxii. 13) our Lord says, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end." The Received Version reads the names of the two

letters without article, whereas the Revised Version substitutes, "I am the Alpha and the Omega," according to the Greek original. Quite in the same manner differ the two Hebrew New Testaments: Salkinson has אנכי אלף ותו. and I myself with articles. אני האלף והתו. Without doubt Salkinson has designedly struck out the article, which he found in my version. And indeed the usage of grammar and grammatical exegesis deals with the names of letters as proper names, which do not require external determination. But the language of Talmud and Midrash supplies the names of letters with the article wherever the matter requires or recommends it. not only where the letters are personified in a Haggadic manner, e.g. האלף קורא תגר לפני הק"בה, "the Aleph raised guarrel before the Holy One" (because of the beginning of the Torah with a Beth and not with an Aleph): Gen. rabba, chap, i., fol. 4a, but also where personification does not take place; e.g. נחלק היוד לשנים ה' לאברהם ה' לשרה, "the Jod (sign for ten) was divided in halves, one He (sign for five) was given to Abraham, one to Sarah": Num. rabba chap. xviii. And even the grammarians do not hesitate to prefix the article, e.a. האלף שבא נח נעלם, the Aleph where it is quiescent (Abenezra, Zachoth 12a); and likewise the old commentators, as e.g. the author of the commentary Lekach tob to Genesis vi. 9. who remarks, that התהלך must be written with three points (Segol) under הלמד. Hence it follows that Salkinson's scruple about my translation אני האלף והתן falls to the ground. The names of the two letters are there emblems of definite ideas, and resist the omission of the article.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.