

NOTE ON ΠΡΗΝΗΣ ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ IN ACTS I 18.

PROFESSOR NESTLE contributes a note on *The Fate of the Traitor* to the April number of the *Expository Times* (p. 331). By a curious coincidence, as Dr Nestle tells us in a *postscript*, the note was written the night before he received a copy of the *J. T. S.* containing my note on Acts i 18. The Professor very courteously wrote to me privately on the subject.

In this note Dr Nestle adduces a passage which I had overlooked. It occurs in the *Acta Pilati* B (ed. Tischendorf, p. 268 n. in the first edition, p. 290 in the second). A MS which Tischendorf calls C ('i. e. Paris. Reg. nunc Nation. num. 770. exaratus anno 1315. manu Georgii sacerdotis', *Proleg.* p. lxxi) contains the story of Judas. I transcribe the pertinent words as given by Tischendorf 'εὐθὺς ἐποίησε τὴν ἀγχόνην διὰ σχοιρίου καὶ ἐκρεμάσθη, καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπήγγαστο (hucusque textum exscripsit Thilo) τῇ ψυχῇ. (Sequitur οἱ δὲ τῷ σώματι. ἄλλοτε ἐλάκισε [sic], ἐπίσθη καὶ ἐβρέμεσεν [?]: quae margini adscripta fuisse indeque in textum irrepsisse apparet.)'

As Dr Nestle points out, ἐπίσθη is obviously for ἐπρήσθη. But what can be said of ἐβρέμεσεν? The word is clearly very corrupt. I venture to suggest that -μεσ- represents μέσος. The ἐβρ- may have arisen from ἐρρ-. I conjecture therefore that the original words were ἐπρήσθη καὶ ἐρράγη μέσος. In any case this passage from the *Acta Pilati* should be added to the passages I brought together in my previous note.

F. H. ELY.

A NOTE ON PHIL. I 21, 22.

Philippians i 21, 22.

Revisers' Text : ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός, καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος. εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου, καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω.

A. V. : For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour : yet what I shall choose I wot not.

R. V. : For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if to live in the flesh—if this is the fruit of my work, then what I shall choose I wot not.

Everybody must have felt how hopelessly unsatisfactory these translations are ; the R. V. even more so than the A. V. Yet the

commentators—so far as I have studied them—give us very little help, and the text is undisputed. But does not the whole difficulty of the passage arise from a wrong method of punctuation? Take away the full stop from after κέρδος, and put it—or at least a colon—after Χριστός, and the verses become luminously clear. And there is good reason for this change. ‘To me to live is Christ and to die is gain’ inevitably suggests to our minds the familiar antithesis between life and death. But there can be no antithesis between the *life in Christ* of the first clause and the *death of the body* of the second clause, least of all to St Paul. He is quite incapable of suggesting an antithesis between the two. To him the death of the body is also life in Christ—he says so in the very next verse: ‘having the desire to depart and to be with Christ.’ And again in 1 Thes. v 10: ‘Jesus Christ who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep we should live together with Him.’ So also Romans xiv 8, 9. Moreover this translation, contrasting death with life, would seem to require τὸ δὲ ἀποθανεῖν rather than καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν. ‘Καί is never really adversative’, says Winer. What then we have to bring out by our punctuation is that while the τὸ ἀποθανεῖν of v. 21 is undoubtedly the death of the body, the τὸ ζῆν of this verse is not the life of the body only but that ζωὴ αἰώνιος which is continued beyond the grave, and there can be no sort of antithesis between the two. The true antithesis is between τὸ ἀποθανεῖν of v. 21 and τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί of v. 22, and here it is clearly marked by the appropriate δέ.

What then we must emphasize is that the first clause stands by itself and dominates the whole passage. We might do it by printing thus:—

ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός·
καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος, εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου,
καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω.

Καί will then in both cases have its familiar sense of ‘and so’ (*καὶ consecutivum*), as in 2 Cor. xi 9 (*καὶ ἐν παντί*) and many other places. And the difficulties simply melt away. ‘Christ is my whole life (whether on earth or in Paradise). And so to die is gain, but if the life (which I am to live) be in the flesh this will be to me fruit of work (i.e. the more work I can do in this life, the more fruit I shall have); and so which of the two I shall choose I do not know (or, do not tell).’

It may be thought to be an objection to this view that St Paul has just in verse 20 used ζωὴ as meaning earthly life. But in v. 21 he changes his expression from ζωὴ to τὸ ζῆν (*continual* life expressed by the present tense) as if to hint at the change of meaning. Of course both ζωὴ and ζῆν are constantly used in the two senses of life physical and life spiritual—like the English word ‘life’—but St Paul never finds any difficulty in passing directly from one sense of a word to another, and

it is quite a false canon of criticism to lay down that the same word must be used in the same sense throughout the whole of any passage. See for instance the uses of *καθεύδειν* in 1 Thes. v 6-10.

For the thought compare the words of St Teresa : 'This resignation to His will is so efficacious that I desire neither life nor death, except for some moments when I long to see God ; and then the presence of the Three Persons becomes so distinct as to relieve the pain of absence, and I wish to live—if such be His good pleasure—to serve Him still longer. And if I might help, by my prayers, to make but one soul love Him more and praise Him, and that only for a short time, I think that of more importance than to dwell in glory' (*Life of S. Teresa of Jesus*, translation by Lewis, p. 479).

E. F. BROWN.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

I. 'THE JEWS' LANGUAGE': 2 KINGS XVIII 26 = ISA. XXXVI II.

DR G. A. SMITH, in dealing with the Biblical narrative of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah (2 Kings xviii 13, 17-xix 37 = Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii), happens to refer to 'the possibly late features which the language of the two accounts exhibits' (*Jerusalem* ii p. 165), and adds the footnote 'For example, the name *Jewish* (instead of Hebrew) for the language of the people of Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii 26, 28), not elsewhere used in the O. T. except in the post-exilic Neh. xiii 24, and objected to on the ground that it could not have come into use so soon after the fall of Samaria and the sole survival of Judah at the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century'. As such an inference from the use of the term יהיודי in this narrative struck me as somewhat surprising, I have been at some pains to investigate the opinions of the more recent commentators on Kings and Isaiah upon this point, and I find that the view that the use of this expression is a mark of late date appears to be generally held.

Thus Dr Benzinger remarks, 'The fact that the narrator calls Hebrew "Jewish" proves that he is writing at any rate long after the fall of Israel'. Dr Kittel, after stating with good reason that the fact that a high Assyrian official knew Hebrew need cause us no surprise, goes on to say that 'it is more remarkable that, instead of "Hebrew", the term employed is "Jewish", an expression which naturally could first have arisen (only) some time after the fall of "Israel"; cf. Neh. xiii 24'. Dr Duhm, in his commentary on Isaiah, expresses himself still more