

But again (so I suppose) the fear of omitting something prevailed. Some early transcriber of the LXX text of Kings who was acquainted with the Hebrew text found there a combination of letters which he (disregarding the suspension of the last two) read as  $\beta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma$ . Such a form, if we may judge by analogy, would be represented in the LXX by  $\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\zeta$ <sup>1</sup> or  $\beta\alpha\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\zeta$  or by one of the many intermediate forms cited above. But if we accept either of the above forms as original, the remaining forms given in the cursives may easily be explained as corruptions which arose in the course of the transcription of the Greek. (The present Heb. reading BOAZ (= LXX A) may be described as one remove further in the direction of euphemism than the Lucianic BAAZ.)

I conclude that the evidence of the LXX points to the reading  $\beta\alpha$  (read *yāchūn* or *yāchōn*) for *Jachin*, and to  $\beta\epsilon\gamma$  (read, however, as *Baaz*<sup>2</sup> by way of euphemism to avoid the name *Baal*) for *Boaz*. The two words thus restored *may* be Hebrew (though not Massoretic Hebrew), but they are more probably Phoenician. If they be Hebrew, it is conceivable that  $\beta\alpha$  was understood by the writer of the account of the Temple-building in a sense kindred to the word  $\beta\epsilon\gamma$  (1 Kings viii 13, 'a settled place' A.V.; 'a place' R.V.;  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\eta$  LXX B;  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\eta$  cod. A). Then reading the two names in the order given in the text of ver. 21 the writer may have understood them to mean 'The Lord dwelleth' or 'The Lord hath a dwelling'. But the words *may* be Phoenician, they *may* have to be read in the order *Baal Jachun*, and they *may* both be names or epithets of a Deity. Until we know more of Phoenician religion and Phoenician worship, it seems to me unsafe to go further.

W. EMERY BARNES.

PS. In *Critica Biblica* (Part IV, *in loco*) Prof. Cheyne proposes to read *Jerahmeel* for *Jachin*, and '*Jezebel*, i. e. *Ishmael*' for *Boaz*.

## ON ROMANS IX 5 AND MARK XIV 61.

THE punctuation of Rom. ix 5 has probably been more discussed than that of any other sentence in literature, and I should not venture to reopen the subject were it not that the interpretation which I wish to bring forward is based on a somewhat different view of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  $\beta\omicron\omicron\mu\mu\epsilon\upsilon$  =  $\beta\omicron\gamma\gamma$  (Ruth, *passim*, cod. A);  $\beta\omicron\theta\omicron\mu\eta\lambda$  =  $\beta\omicron\theta\mu\eta\lambda$  (Jud. iii 9, 11, codd. A B);  $\beta\omicron\mu\omicron\rho$  =  $\beta\omicron\mu$  (Exod. xvi 36, codd. A B);  $\beta\omicron\beta\omicron\kappa$  =  $\beta\mu\beta\kappa$  (Gen. xxiii 2, cod. A; hiat B).

<sup>2</sup> I fancy that the Lucianic LXX here as in some other places has preserved an ancient Hebrew tradition.

whole passage from what is usually taken. As a rule the discussion is confined to the question whether the doxology ( $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \delta \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \varsigma \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \alpha \varsigma \acute{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ .) is to be referred to the preceding words  $\delta \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \tau \omicron \kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\alpha} \sigma \acute{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$ , or to God the Father. But the question still remains why any doxology at all occurs in this context. Why does St Paul suddenly pause in his argument to bless God?

For the passage is a formal Benediction, followed by the *Amen*, not a statement of the Glory of a divine Person. Dr Sanday and Dr Headlam (p. 232) speak of the words which we are considering as a 'description of the supreme dignity of Him who was on His human side of Jewish stock', but to say this is to ignore St Paul's *Amen*. Whatever else the words may be, they are not a description but an ascription.

The obvious difficulty in referring the words to our Lord is not that the Christology, which on this assumption would underlie the clause, is too 'high' for St Paul, but that the words are used in a parenthetical way. How different is Philippians ii 5-11, with its careful choice of theological terms! I can imagine that St Paul or his immediate hearers might have been willing to assert that Jesus Christ was  $\theta \epsilon \delta \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$ , but I cannot believe that He was commonly given that title. Be this as it may, it does not explain the *Amen*. We cannot properly understand the passage until we have found some reason why St Paul should break off his impassioned rhetoric to utter a benediction.

The word  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$  occurs eight times in the New Testament and is always used of God. In four places (Lk. i 68, 2 Cor. i 3, Eph. i 3, 1 Pet. i 3) it occurs in its natural place as an exordium, like the 'Praise be to God' at the beginning of the Qoran. The passage Mk. xiv 61 we shall discuss later. The remaining passages are Rom. i 25, ix 5, 2 Cor. xi 31. In all of these we find the phrase  $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \varsigma \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \alpha \varsigma$ . We are evidently in the presence of a standing formula, of fixed meaning. On what occasions does St Paul use it?

The question almost answers itself, if we compare the three passages. In all three St Paul breaks off what he is saying to utter an interjection of blessing to God, after having deliberately made what might seem to be a monstrous statement. In Rom. i 25 he has said that God Himself had given up the idolatrous heathen unto uncleanness, and as a pious Jew he cannot mention the blasphemous pagan worship without cleansing his lips by blessing the Creator. In 2 Cor. xi 31, in the midst of St Paul's  $\acute{\alpha} \phi \rho \omicron \sigma \acute{\upsilon} \nu \eta$  of 'boasting' he pauses to say 'These things are serious and true, wild as they sound, and in proof of my soberness and sincerity I do not shrink from taking God's Holy Name on my lips'. Here in Rom. ix we find the same state of things. The Apostle has shewn how the elect of God without distinction of Jew or

Greek are justified by faith. He might seem to have no care for the fate of his fellow countrymen, but he passionately affirms the contrary by every Christian vow. He does not underrate the privileges of the chosen people of whom came the Messiah (ix 4 f); he swears by Christ that he is truly grieved if they are to perish (ix 1 f), nay, he would pray to be banned from Christ for his fellow countrymen's sake (ix 3). And then he goes on to explain that nothing is further from his meaning than to imply that the Word of God can have failed of its purpose (ix 6 ff). St Paul's language is so well known to us that it makes little impression, but to his first hearers it might very well seem either insincere or blasphemous, like the excited statements which precede Rom. i 25 and 2 Cor. xi 31. He therefore adds here, at the end of his enumeration of Israel's privileges, at the first point where he can stop to take breath, his solemn invocation of the God of Israel.

On this view there is no pause at the end of Rom. ix 5, any more than there is a pause at the end of Rom. i 25 or 2 Cor. xi 31: whatever the grammatical structure of  $\delta \omega\nu$  . . .  $\alpha\mu\eta\nu$  may be, it is in the argument a parenthesis, and the essential meaning is 'I know well what I am saying, and I am not afraid to call God to witness my words'.

And by what name is St Paul thus calling upon God? Of course he is writing in Greek, but I venture to think that what he has in his mind is the sacred Hebrew Tetragrammaton. It has been objected by those who refer the doxology to 'Christ after the flesh' that no parallel to this use of  $\delta \omega\nu$  can be found. But apart from the remarkable use of  $\delta \omega\nu$  in the Apocalypse we have the parallel of Exod. iii 14, 15, which might very well have guided the phraseology of a Greek-speaking Jew. There we read  $\delta \omega\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\kappa}\epsilon$   $\mu\epsilon$  . . .  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$   $\mu\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$   $\delta\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$   $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$ . The mention of the Tetragrammaton calls forth the benediction expressed in  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\gamma\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\varsigma$ , for the Name of the Holy One, *Blessed be He!* should not be uttered without a benediction; and conversely, the occurrence of the word  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\gamma\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\varsigma$  is enough to shew that the Holy Name has been explicitly or implicitly *pronounced*.

This brings me to my second point, the meaning of Mk. xiv 61 ff. According to St Mark, our Lord after one indignant exclamation at the moment of His arrest (*vv.* 48, 49) kept a resolute silence. He answers nothing at all to the charges brought against Him. Why then does He at once reply when the High Priest asks Him whether He be the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One? I venture to suggest that the reason lay in the form of words which the High Priest was at last driven to use. It would be hazardous to attempt to reconstruct the probable Aramaic original of his question, but I feel pretty sure that the phrase  $\delta \nu\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\gamma\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\upsilon$  indicates either an actual use of the Tetragrammaton itself, or one of the recognized substitutes for it. In

other words, Caiaphas adjured his prisoner by the Holy Name. And this course did secure him a tactical victory. It compelled Jesus to speak, because not to speak after such an adjuration would mean to all those standing by that He was afraid to claim Messiahship in God's hearing. Matt. xxvi 63 ('I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us, whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God') is therefore a correct paraphrase of St Mark's more discreet and yet genuinely Jewish phraseology, but the language used in Matt. does not afford the parallel with St Paul's use of εὐλογητός.

To make my meaning clearer I give a paraphrase of what I have ventured to suggest as the meaning of the three passages in St Paul's Epistles.

Rom. i 25 τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

'God Almighty, whose Name all creatures are bound to bless, as I do now.'

(The last clause corresponds to 'Ἀμήν.')

Rom. ix 1, 5<sup>b</sup> οὐ ψεύδομαι . . . , ὁ ὢν, ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

'I lie not . . . , The Eternal (Blessed is His Name!), I call Him to witness.'

2 Cor. xi 31 ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ αἰδῶν, ὁ ὢν, εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι.

'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus knows, even the Eternal Himself (Blessed is His Name!), that I lie not.'

For a calling on the Divine Name, with the Divine Attributes, but without a verb, it is sufficient to mention Exod. xxxiv 6, 7. With regard to the use of the Name among the Jews to compel an unwilling witness, the decisive passage is Mishna Shebá'óth iv *ad fin.* '[If a man say] I put you on your oath, I adjure you, [it depends on the form of words used whether you are bound to comply. If he merely say] "By Heaven and Earth!" you are not bound. [But if he say] "By Yod-He!" "By Aleph-Daleth!" "By Shaddai!" "By Sabaoth!" "By Merciful and Compassionate!" "By Slow to anger and plentiful in mercy!" or by any of the recognized Attributes of [the true] God, you are bound.'

A still nearer parallel to the view here maintained is to be found in the Syriac *Acts of Philip* (Wright, p. 94; E. Tr., p. 87). This document is certainly Syriac in origin, so that it has some authority as a witness to Oriental customs. A Jew named Ananias had been converted by St Philip and then murdered by his countrymen. The Jews having denied the murder, St Philip says: 'Swear to me, for as the Paraclete

who is with me commands me will we do unto you.' Then the Jews cried out and said: 'No,—*the God of Abraham, He that spake with Moses from the midst of the Bush*,—that this Ananias has not been seen by us and we do not know what has befallen him.' I give the curious syntax of the sentence quite literally: there is no preposition before the Name of God, so that the form of oath exactly corresponds with that used by St Paul.

I take this opportunity of pointing out that there appears to be a reminiscence of Rom. ix 5 in the Epistle of Clement of Rome §§ 31, 32. The reference is given by Hilgenfeld, but it does not appear in Tischendorf's apparatus, and it is barely noticed by Light-foot. St Clement is speaking of the honours and blessings received by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not through their own merits but through the will of God. To Jacob, says Clement, were given the twelve Tribes of Israel. How great was the free gift given to him! 'For from him were Priests and Levites, all those who served at the altar of God, from him was the Lord Jesus according to the flesh (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*), from him were kings and rulers and governors through the tribe of Judah', the other tribes all receiving great honour, not for their merit but according to the will of God; and similarly we have been called in Christ Jesus and justified by faith, 'by which alone all the saints from of old were justified by Almighty God, to whom', adds Clement, 'be glory for ever and ever, Amen'.

Surely this is just such a sentence as might flow from the pen of one to whom Rom. ix 1-5 was verbally familiar. But if so, it is clear that St Clement did not take the doxology at the end of *v.* 5 to be addressed to 'Christ after the flesh'.

F. C. BURKITT.

## THE JUSTIFICATION OF WISDOM.

'And wisdom is justified by her works.'—Matt. xi 19 (R.V.).

'And wisdom is justified of all her children.'—Luke vii 35 (R.V.).

THE difficulties of text and of interpretation which are connected with these words are well known to all readers of the JOURNAL. None of the many attempts to account for the variations in the form of the saying seems to be satisfactory. So there is room for a fresh suggestion. By a combination of the two readings we can reach, I believe,