

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

ἐὰν ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου, καὶ
 ἐὰν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα καυθήσομαι,
 ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω
 οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι.

Cum his confero Epict. *Diss.* iv 8. 25 :

‘εἰ μέ τις’, φησὶν, ‘βλάψαι δύναται,
 ἐγὼ οὐδὲν ποιῶ’
 εἰ ἄλλον περιμένω, ἵνα με ὠφελήσῃ,
 ἐγὼ οὐδὲν εἶμι·

θέλω τι καὶ οὐ γίνεται
 ἐγὼ ἀτυχῆς εἶμι.’

Adicio locum ex Vetere Testamento adhibitum, Ps. cxxxviii (LXX)

vv. 8 s. :

ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,
 σὺ εἶ ἐκεῖ·

ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην,
 πάρει·

ἐὰν ἀναλάβω τὰς πτέρυγάς μου κατ’ ὀρθὸν
 καὶ κατασκηνώσω εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς θαλάσσης,
 καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἡ χεὶρ σου ὀδηγήσει με κτλ.

Haec eodem pertinent. In monendo Corinthios de excellentia amoris apostolus σχῆμα sequitur rhetoricum, non proprium sermonis genus et ex ipso natum affectu mystico incitatus procreat.

ANTON FRIDRICHSEN.

EN ΟΛΙΓΩ ΜΕ ΠΕΙΘΕΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΝ

ΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ—ACTS XXVI 28.

IN Acts xxvi 28 Westcott and Hort, faithful to the documentary evidence, print ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. Yet primitive error is suspected, and Hort proposes πέποιθας for με πείθεις ‘for the personal reference expressed by με loses no force by being left to implication’. A possible explanation of the text seems to have escaped notice, though the quotation may be found in Sophocles’ Lexicon. In 3 Regn. xx 7 Jezebel taunts Ahab: Σὺ νῦν οὕτως ποιεῖς βασιλεία ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ; Dost thou thus play the king over Israel? Hence we may translate in Acts, ‘Almost, or lightly, or closely thou art pressing me to play the Christian’; unless, taking the present tense more freely, we

prefer, 'The next thing will be that you would persuade me to play the Christian'.

It is true that in 3 Regn. the reading of A is *βασιλείαν*, which corresponds to the Hebrew. That correspondence is, however, an argument, so far as it goes, against originality. A somewhat curious parallel to phrase and variation is to be found in Tacitus. In *Ann.* xiii 14 we read that 'Nero infensus iis quibus superbia muliebris innitebatur demovet Pallantem cura rerum quis a Claudio impositus velut arbitrium regni agebat': and in *Hist.* iv 21 'Proinde perfuga Batavus arbitrium rerum Romanarum ne ageret'. So the Medicean MS in each place. But in each place *arbitrium* is an early correction, and in *Ann.* xiii the apologetic *velut* lends probability to the correction. Is *ποιεῖς βασιλέα* an early example of Latinism in the *κοινή*? Perhaps not. The other quotations in Sophocles seem to shew that the use is idiomatic in later Greek, and it might have sprung up naturally in the popular speech of any period.

A. NAIRNE.

PROVERBS xxv 22.

'THOU shalt heap coals of fire upon his head.' The sense of these words is clear; as Wildeboer says (*Marti Kurzer Handcommentar*), they are an image of penitence. No satisfactory explanation, however, has been offered of the figure. In 4 Ezra xvi 54 a similar phrase describes the punishment of hypocrisy: 'Non dicat peccator se non pecasse, quoniam carbones ignis comburet super caput eius qui dicit: Non peccavi coram deo et gloria ipsius.'

A striking parallel occurs in the Egyptian story published by F. L. Griffith in *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis* (Oxford 1900) and called by him 'the Tale of Khamuas and Neneferkaptah'. In this tale (p. 32), after Setne has stolen the book of Thoth, Neneferkaptah says to his wife: 'Be not grieved in heart, I will cause him to bring this book hither, a forked stick (?) in his hand and a censer (?) of fire upon his head.' G. Maspéro (*Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne* 2^me éd. 1889) translates 'une fourche et un bâton à la main', and in a note speaks of the magical properties of fire and iron.

Griffith remarks: 'This curious penance (?) may have been a recognized one, but no other instance of it is recorded.'

The papyrus containing the Egyptian tale is said to be not earlier

than the Ptolemaic period. The tale itself may be older or may contain old ideas. The likeness to the verse in Proverbs is remarkable, and as no explanation can be given from Hebrew sources the idea may have been borrowed from Egyptian ritual.

A. S. TRITTON.

'THE JOHANNINE ACCOUNT OF THE EARLY MINISTRY OF JESUS.'

A FEW arguments may be added in support of the contention in Dr Cadoux's article in the last number of the JOURNAL that the Johannine account of the cleansing of the Temple stands as against the Synoptic.

Dr Cadoux's first five 'considerations' do not need comment: they stand unchallengeable. On 6 (a) I may refer to my article in *The Interpreter* for July 1910 on the *Misinterpretations in the Fourth Gospel*. On 6 (b) nothing needs to be added.

Approaching the incident of the cleansing of the Temple court from this point of view, we see these notable features in the Johannine account.

On His *first* visit to Jerusalem, coming up to the centre of the nation's religious life, with heart enkindled with historic memories and present anticipation, Jesus is overwhelmed with horror at the actual facts: 'My Father's House—this!' The anger of that day is probably an epoch in religious history. Two points are clear and relevant here: first, the anger and amazement of Jesus are psychologically incredible in the year 29, though entirely natural in 27. Second, Dr Oesterley's view (which I accept) that Jesus is abrogating entirely the Jewish sacrificial system is supported by the Johannine narrative, wherein Jesus bids the Jews (the religious authorities) go on with their work of destroying their religion, and He will build a new one. This is here ignored by the Synoptic narrative, but confirmed by Matt. xii 6: 'one greater than the temple is here' (a cotemporary statement). If the Fourth Gospel is psychologically correct, is it not likely also that it may be historically correct? This is made the more likely when we note Dr Oesterley's contention that Jesus abrogated both the Jewish sacrificial system and the Jewish Sabbath. According to my system (*op. cit. infra*) He did these things at the same period. Dr Oesterley brackets them psychologically, and separates them by two years in time.

Against Dr Cadoux, I must point out that in placing this incident at