Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

The Divine Names in the Book of Job.

BY PROF. H. M. HARMAN, D.D., LL.D.

IT is worthy of note that the name *Jehovah* is used (occurring *thirteen* times) in the prologue (chapters i., ii.), and also in chapters xxxviii.–xlii., wherever the remarks of the author of the book occur. In this last section, the name *Jehovah* is found *twelve* times ; but nowhere do the speakers, in their discussions, ever use this sacred name by which God revealed himself to Moses.

In the last part of the book, where God expostulates with Job and refers him to the wonders of the Creation, the Deity is called *El, Eloah, Elohim*, and *Shadday*. In the first part of the book God speaks of himself as *Elohim* in his remarks to Satan. This is also the term which Satan uses. Job uses the name *Elohim* once, and Elihu and Eliphaz do the same.

The divine names which Job and his friends use besides these few instances of *Elohim*, are *El*, which occurs fifty-four times ; *Eloah*, forty-one times ; *Shadday*, thirty-one times. The divines names seem to be varied to give a pleasing variety to the diction, and are expressed differently in parallel sentences.

We never find in the book of Job the names *El Shadday* combined, as in several places in the first part of the Pentateuch. It would have been incongruous for the author of the book to have represented the patriarch and his friends living outside of the pale of Israel, as using the name *Jehovah*, by which the Deity was known to Israel only. For a reason somewhat similar, the author of the book does not allow Satan to use the name *Jehovah*, for Satan has no part in Israel.

Memoranda.

BY PROF. ISAAC H. HALL, PH.D.

I.

WITH reference to my note in the last *Journal*, p. 101 ff., on "Variations in the Same Edition of Certain Greek New Testaments," the following may be of interest. Prof. Ed. Reuss, of Strassburg, writes me that he has carefully collated his copy of the Gr.-Lat. N.T. of R. Stephen, 1551, with the matter of my note, and finds the following result : —

Page 103.   Folios wrongly numbered.

Vol. I., foll. 70–448, all, as stated, wrongly numbered except 405, which is right.

Fol. 115 also right.

Vol. II., foll. 36, 38, 82, all wrongly numbered, as stated ; but fol. 40 has neither 40 nor 42, but 38.

Page 104.   Errata in headings, etc.   All as given in my note ; but Fol. 301, *verso*, has " Cap. V " instead of " Cap. VI."

Fol. 320, *verso*, is right.

Fol. 410, *verso*, verse 26, is right (not misnumbered).

Page 105.   Errata in text ; all, without exception, as in my note. Page 106, the same.   Page 107, Rev. iii. 20, no erratum.

II.

Respecting the change which sometimes occurs in old Syriac MS. of *dolath* to *rish*, or the reverse, besides certain changes actually made in the common Peshito MSS. and printed editions, noted by me in an article in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society* some years ago, a number of others occur in the Curetonian Fragments of the Gospels, in the genealogy in Matthew, and elsewhere. Also, in the genealogy in Luke, in the Beirût MS., a few more occur. The point appears to be omitted with the *dolath* in the chief MS. of the Jerusalem Syriac Dictionary, but to be present with the *rish ;* yet not with the latter in the St. Petersburg MSS.

A remark, which it is scarcely worth while to publish as a note, was made about the persistent praise commonly given to the Syriac-Latin N.T. of Leusden and Schaaf, in the face of the facts, and notwithstanding the truth is stated in many good places, including the fourth volume of Tregelles' Hornes' *Introduction.*   The fact is, that Leusden, more familiar with Hebrew and the Talmudical dialects, insisted on pointing the Syriac texts after the analogy of those languages or dialects rather than the Syriac, and thus made its texts as poor as any, at least two-thirds of the way through the Gospels.   Then he died, and Schaaf had the rest of the text pointed and vocalized in a better manner.   The edition is of value chiefly for its *convenient* Latin translation, its variant readings (which, however, have not always a MS. basis), and, above all, for the fact that its text has been taken as the standard Peshito text for the recording of variants by Tischendorf and Tregelles.   (But the Syriac citations of these two editors need overhauling generally, for they are full of mistakes.)   Apart from

the text, translation, and notes, the *Lexicon concordantiale* of Schaaf
is of the greatest value still ; but the *text* by no means compares for
excellence with that of several other editions.

III.

The Peshito Syriac in Ruth ii. 8, 9, reads : " My daughter, has it
not been heard by thee in the proverb, ' Do not glean in a field that
is not thine own '? Therefore remain, and abide here with my
maidens, and be looking after them and be going after them."

Whether this indicates an emendation of the Hebrew text or not, I
would not venture to say ; but it certainly throws light on it. It is
the polite Oriental way of saying, " My field is thy field," only in a
more refined phrase than the one now current. In the Syriac the
" saying " or " proverb " is introduced by a *dolath* prefix, to mark a
quotation.

The Septuagint likewise hints, though obscurely, at some such
thing. " Hast thou not heard, daughter? Go not in a field to glean
for another. Therefore ($\kappa a i$ — also) do thou go not hence ; here
cleave to ($\kappa o \lambda \lambda \eta \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \ \mu \epsilon \tau a$ — be joined fast with) my maidens."

It is evident that these old interpreters understood that a proverb
was quoted by Boaz ; and when we once get the idea, it is plain
enough in the Hebrew text as it stands ; giving only to אַחֵר the
meaning of *another's*, or *a stranger's*, or *strange* (as the word is trans-
lated frequently) ; that is, one strange to you, or not owned by you ;
and not, one not owned by me, Boaz. The omission of the word for
" proverb " in the Hebrew is natural enough.

IV.

Dr. E. Nestle, of Ulm, in a short communication to a German
periodical, entitled *Salomo's Alter bei seiner Thronbesteigung*, remarks
upon certain authorities for the tradition that Solomon was thirty
years old at the time he ascended the throne, as the Apostolical Con-
stitutions and Josephus ; also that mentioned in an article in *The
Hebrew Student*, by Dr. B. Felsenthal, viz., Seder Olam, r. c. 724.
But these two lines of tradition are apparently independent, and Dr.
Nestle has found the origin (apparently) of the former in the Sep-
tuagint in the various reading Βασ. γ. ii. 12 (1 Kings ii. 12), $\kappa a i$
Σολομὼν ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐτῶν δώδεκα
$\kappa a i$ ἡτοιμάσθη ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ σφόδρα. With this variant I was long
familiar, and had connected it years ago with the two sources first

mentioned ; but Dr. Nestle adds to the Cod. Alexandrinus, as author-
ity for the reading, about twenty other MSS. along with the Slavic,
Armenian, and Georgian versions.

Dr. Nestle also writes me that in the famous *edito Sixtina* of the
Septuagint of 1586–87, the Greek title reads HIIAΛAIA ΛIAOHKH ;
that is, with two II's for the Π, an inverted Λ for the Δ, and an O for
the Θ ; using Roman type, since it " seemed too much " to cut Greek
type.   The same is true for the rest of the title.   No biographer
seems to have noted these facts.

'Eὰν μή, *Gal.* ii. 16.

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.

In rendering these particles the English revisers have substituted
" save " for the " but " of the authorized version, and have relegated
" but only " to the margin ; and to this change they must have ad-
hered by a two-thirds vote against the protest of their American
coadjutors.

It is here proposed to examine the propriety of this change.

Both ἐὰν μή and εἰ μή primarily mean *if not, unless, except (nisi)* ;
but sometimes, when subjoined to a main proposition which has been
modified by an adjunct, they indicate an exception, not to the entire
proposition, but to the proposition considered aside from its adjunct,
thus : " No lepers in Israel were cleansed εἰ μή Naaman the Syrian,"
where we cannot reasonably mean, " No lepers in Israel were cleansed
save (or except) Naaman the Syrian " ; but the sense must be, " No
lepers in Israel were cleansed, — no lepers were cleansed except
Naaman the Syrian " ; or, briefly, in English, " No lepers in Israel
were cleansed but Naaman the Syrian."   So that, unless before these
particles the main proposition is supposed to be repeated *without the
adjunct*, the statement (with *save* or *except*) becomes illogical, and
often amounts to an absurdity.   With εἰ μή, it is true, these cases are
more frequent than with ἐὰν μή, but with the latter they are not want-
ing.   In most of these cases it is to be observed the English particle
" but " gives the exact sense of the original, *without requiring* any
ellipsis to be supplied ; and then to use *save* or *except* instead of *but*,
cannot fail to suggest to any English reader of a logical turn of mind
a painful contradiction.   The English " but," it is true, is mostly
adversative ; but it is remarkable that, by its etymology, it is properly
exceptive (beutan, be out, let be out, or except) ; and, indeed, the