

# 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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

the tenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. At all events, it is not to be presumed, of course, that a Roman centurion, stationed in Judea, was in pagan darkness.

But, finally, even if this centurion must be presumed to have uttered his words from the polytheistic point of view, the proper English of those words would no more be "a son of God" than "the Son of God"; but, "the son of a god." The point of distinction lies in the Θεός, not in the υἱός, nor in the article with either. The heathen demigods were not supposed to be "sons of God," but "*the* sons of some god." Hercules, for example, was not "*a* son of God," but "*the* son of a god"; and Aeneas was "*the* son of a goddess." Is it not high time that we should hear no more of this blundering marginal reading, "a son of God"? Shall its advocacy still be considered a mark of the highest and broadest scholarship?

---

Τὸ λοιπόν, *Matt.* xxvi. 45.

BY PRES. THOMAS CHASE, LL.D.

THE following letter from the distinguished Greek scholar, Dr. August Böckh, received nearly thirty years ago, seems to me to deserve a wider reading than it has as yet had, and I have accordingly translated it for the JOURNAL.

"I take the liberty of answering your acceptable letter in German, in order to lay before you my view of the passage, *Matt.* xxvi. 45. You ask whether τὸ λοιπόν can here mean *hereafter, in future*, so that the passage should have the sense: 'Dormite et requiescite *alio, posteriori* tempore; *nunc* vero, surgite, eamus.' It is not to be denied that τὸ λοιπόν denotes a future time; notwithstanding, I must oppose the interpretation you mention. Τὸ λοιπόν is *the remaining* (das übrige); there is always presupposed by it a greater whole, of which a part is taken away; the remainder which is left after this subtraction is τὸ λοιπόν. Applied to time, τὸ λοιπόν is the remaining time which is left when one has taken off a definite preceding time; e.g., Plato, *Alk.* I. p. 103, B.: ἴνδ δ' ἐπειδὴ οὐκέτι ἐναντιοῦται, οὕτω προσελήλυθα· εἴελπις δέ εἰμι καὶ τολοιπόν μὴ ἐναντιώσσεσθαι αὐτό. The whole from which a part is taken is here the time present, and running on till the time when Socrates says these words, together with the time following from that point; from this whole the time is taken

which had elapsed up to that period ; the remainder is τὸ λοιπόν, the future time running on from that moment. There is, accordingly, here presupposed a continuing period of time ; from this continuous quantity a part is taken off ; the remainder of the continuous quantity is τὸ λοιπόν. The boundary of the two is the present moment. So far, then, τὸ λοιπόν, when it denotes time, is always future time, always *posteriori tempore* or *posthac* ; but it does not represent future time simply, or a part of it, but always with the presupposition of continuity, so that τὸ λοιπόν is the time reckoned from the present moment, or from the boundary line. This is very different from taking τὸ λοιπόν in the general sense of *hereafter*, which would simply give it the meaning of *in future*, *alio tempore posteriori*, without the reference to a *continuity* of time. This meaning would, in my judgment, have been given by ἐς ὕστερον ἢ ἐν τῷ ὕστερον χρόνῳ ; ἢ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

“The passage has been very variously explained by the commentators. Some have taken καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπόν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε as a question, which is absolutely impossible. I have compared many commentators, but without criticising them will give briefly my own view. Christ has twice found the disciples sleeping ; he warned them the first time to watch, as is expressly stated ; he must also have warned them the second time, as Mark xiv. 40 plainly implies in saying, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ. Now he finds them the third time sleeping ; at this, he is indignant, and his displeasure breaks out in the irony lying very near to grief : ‘Well, then, sleep on and take your rest.’ A German would say : ‘Well, then, in God’s name, sleep on farther forever, if still again ye are not to be awakened’ (‘*Nun so schlaft in Gottes Namen immer weiter fort, wenn ihr noch einmal nicht zu erwecken seid*’). When he says afterwards, ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν, this is no contradiction. After he has, in his first indignation at their indolence, spoken those words to show his displeasure, he returns to his purpose of awakening them. The Vulgate has given this excellently : ‘Dormite iam et requiescite.’ This translation gives exactly the right thought : ‘Nun so schlaft jetzt weiter fort,’ — ‘well, then, sleep on now farther.’

“I have compared a great number of places from classical authors, and find nothing which justifies the interpretation you speak of, but all the passages lead to this conclusion, that τὸ λοιπόν represents the future always, with the understanding that it is the future in immediate continuity with the present, or, what is all the same, with the shortly bygone ; accordingly, it passes into the meaning of *henceforth*, *farther*

on, *in posterum* (considered as *from now on*, or *from then on*), which is very well represented by the Latin *iam*.

"I have noticed in many passages that τὸ λοιπὸν in this meaning of *henceforth* (from now on) is used especially with excited feeling, giving an ironical or even sarcastic turn to the expression; and such an irony, yes, something of sarcasm, is found in my interpretation, also in the passage of Matthew. Should any one believe that this befits not the God-Man, it is to be remarked that Christ appears here entirely as man, and speaks in human fashion. In the following passages in Sophokles τὸ λοιπὸν occurs as ironical or sarcastic. *Antig.* 307: ἴν' εἰδότες τὸ κέρδος εἶθ' ἐν οἰστέον, τολοπὸν ἀρπάξῃτε. The watchmen shall be hung; there may they then *henceforth* (from now on) seek to clutch gain! When they are hung, they can get no more gain at all. The expression is, therefore, ironico-sarcastic. So in *Antig.* 693: ἑπ' οἷς κάτω στρέψας τολοπὸν σέλμασιν ναυτίλλεται. When the ship is overturned, the mariner can sail no longer; but it is said sarcastically, he sails *henceforth* below (in Hades). I have cited both passages in accordance with my edition. I would say, by the way, that I have placed τολοπὸν in these passages, and not τὸ λοιπὸν purposely, as I consider it the right form for the word in its adverbial use. A third passage is *Ced. T.* 1273: ἀλλ' ἐν σκότῳ τολοπὸν οὐς μὲν οὐκ ἔδει ὀψοίαθ', etc. The torn-out eyes can see no more; and yet, with ironical sarcasm, a seeing is still attributed to them. In the passage in Matthew, the irony or sarcasm is, to be sure, of a *different kind* from that in Sophokles, but to all these passages, irony, sarcasm, indignant feeling, belong in common.

"I will add still a fourth passage from Sophokles, *Aias*, 666: τοιγὰρ τολοπὸν εἰσόμεσθα μὲν θεοῖς εἰκείν, μυθησόμεσθα δ' Ἀτρείδης σίβειν. This is not irony proper, but Aias speaks these words evidently in a sorrowful feeling, and, in fact, in mockery and simulation. It appears to me from these passages that τολοπὸν was readily used in derisive speeches, and they can indicate the tone and coloring with which καθ' εὐδότε τολοπὸν was spoken.

"Finally, I remark that in Mark xiv. 40 the right reading seems to be λοιπὸν without an article. Granting that τὸ λοιπὸν could mean ἐς ἴσπερον (for which the Greeks say also ἐσαῖθις or εἰσαιῖθις), which, however, I deny, it would be still more difficult so to understand λοιπὸν. It must be understood, as in *Act. Apost.* xxvii. 20. We might also consider 1 Cor. vii. 29, but I must explain myself briefly on this passage. In Heb. x. 13 τὸ λοιπὸν is, as ordinarily, *from there on, thenceforth*.

· "BERLIN, 12th July, 1857."

An anonymous translation of the N. T., published in London in 1836, gives in this passage *sleep afterward*; and Greenfield, in his *Polymicrian Greek Lexicon to the N. T.* (Bagster & Sons), translates τὸ λοιπὸν *veî λοιπὸν, hereafter, afterwards*, with references both to Matt. xxvi. 45 and to 2 Tim. iv. 8, — sad proofs of the dangerousness of a little learning. Some years ago a correspondent of *The Reader*, a literary weekly paper then published in London, advocated the same translation in Matthew. My attention was first called to the matter by a gentleman of great intelligence, though not a profound Grecian, who was very anxious to vindicate the version *by and by, at some future time*, as removing the apparent contradiction which appears at first sight in the subsequent command, “Rise, let us be going.” I examined a large portion of the Greek authors with reference to their use of τὸ λοιπὸν, including the whole of Thucydides, Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus, and Polybius, of Pindar and the tragedians, and of the N. T., and large portions of Aristophanes, Plato, Demosthenes, Plutarch, and other writers, and did not find a single instance in which the meaning of *by and by*, or simply *hereafter*, could be given it without violence to the sense required by the context. Not succeeding in convincing my friend, I wrote to Dr. Böckh, and received the answer above given, which accorded precisely with my own opinion on this point.

Subsequently, after conversation with my friend, Professor Sophocles, of Harvard University, I became inclined, as I am still, to consider τὸ λοιπὸν here, as well as λοιπὸν in the parallel passage in Mark, as an adverb, in the sense of *well then*. I need only to call attention here to λοιπὸν (and τὸ λοιπὸν under the same head), with the significant citations in Sophokles' admirable *Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek*, a work which had not then been published, and which has thrown new light upon many points of N. T. and patristic interpretation.<sup>1</sup> But whether we consider τὸ λοιπὸν as accusative of the inner content with καθύστετε, *sleep the rest of your sleep*, or as an adverb, *well then, so then, now*, — and I believe we must take one of these two interpretations, — we could hardly improve upon the words of the Cranmer and King James versions, *sleep on now and take your rest*.

As for the apparent contradiction in the words, “Rise, let us be going,” Augustine suggests that they were preceded by a pause;

<sup>1</sup> Some false translations of passages in the *Διδαχὴ*, which have been published, might have been avoided by consulting this Glossary.

others, that it was not until our Saviour had begun to say καθέδρα κ. τ. λ. that he saw his betrayer and the armed multitude approaching; others, that the first feeling (was it of sorrowful rebuke or of resigned permission?) and its expression are not inconsistent with the earnest command which the new exigency called forth.

To take the sentence interrogatively, as some respectable scholars have done, — to whom I may add the great name of our late associate, Dr. Ezra Abbot, — is easier with Professor Sophocles's interpretation of τὸ λοιπὸν than with the other. It seems to me, however, that there are valid objections to this construction which I hope I may sometime have the honor of presenting to the Society.

---

### *The Masoretic Piska in the Hebrew Bible.*

BY REV. B. PICK, PH.D.

THE student who opens his Hebrew Bible will find under the text of Gen. iv. a note פִּיסקָא באמצע פסוק, *i.e.*, there is a space in the midst of the verse which must be distinguished from the Pasek, or a | between the proper names.

In the Talmud, nothing is said of these piskas,<sup>1</sup> and yet they are very important for the criticism of the Old Testament text. Concerning this piska, which the Masorites also call Perigma, Elias Leista writes in his treatise, the "Broken Tables," s.v. Perigma פְּרִיגְמָה, that they (*i.e.*, the Masorites) have thus called the pause or division in the middle of the verse, as, "And Cain said to Abel his brother and when they were in the field," with the remark that there are 25 such perigmoth, four of which occur in the Pentateuch. I know not from what language this word is taken, but the people call every section, be it an open or a closed one, perēgma.<sup>2</sup> I asked their sages concerningly, but none could answer my question.

There is, however, a difference of opinion as to the number of these piskas. Graetz thinks that there are 34. Jacob ben Chajim, in his *Rabbini-Bōle*, remarks on Gen. iv. 8 that there are 28, but on Gen. xxxv. 22, only 25. Of the latter number, Buetorf, in his *Tiberias* (Basel, 1665, p. 266), remarks, "quae nota verior videtur."

---

<sup>1</sup> Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, 1878, p. 482, reads 28, whereas Levita (Semler's and Ginsburg's ed.) reads 25.

<sup>2</sup> The word is evidently Greek, corresponding to φράγμα.