

to commend it unless it be the discovery in 1912 of the inscription *DOMVS PETRI* (probably of the fifth century at earliest) in an apsidal chamber near the 'Platonía': but it has been pointed out that this may be paralleled by the expression *domus martyris Hippolyti* in a sixth-century inscription from the crypt of St Hippolytus.¹ Both Dr La Piana (*Harvard Theological Review*, 1921, p. 53) and Mgr Barnes (*The Platonía, a lost Apostolic Sanctuary*, 1924, p. 19) suggest that St Peter may have taken refuge in a private villa on the spot: but St Damasus's lines clearly indicate the presence of *both* Apostles, whether in life or death; and *prius* would (as Duchesne remarks) be very inappropriately used of so brief a residence in life as compared with their existing place of permanent burial.²

Mgr Barnes would explain the 'Platonía' as the *memoria beati Petri* set up by St Anacletus, according to the notice of the *Liber Pontificalis*, *ubi episcopi reconderentur, ubi tamen et ipse sepultus est*: the words which follow, *iuxta corpus beati Petri*, are, it is true, absent in the earlier recensions of the notice, but we can hardly believe that they do not represent the tradition. On Mgr Barnes's theory the beardless figure of the fresco in the lunette would of course be St Anacletus. There is, however, no trace of any tradition connecting St Anacletus with this site at the period to which the decoration of the 'Platonía' belongs; St Damasus would not, we may be sure, have failed to raise a suitable memorial to the Saint, of which we should certainly have heard.

H. STUART JONES.

BIBLE TRANSLATION—OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL.

A STUDY OF PSALM IV IN ENGLISH.

An official translation of the Bible suffers from the conditions of its making. It is the work of many minds; it is (and must be) the result of a compromise or rather of many separate compromises. It must show the scars of a struggle between a 'Liberal' and a 'Conservative' tendency in scholarship. It must sometimes evade points of difficulty which an unofficial translator would grasp; sometimes again, it must be colourless, though the original appears singularly vivid to the solitary scholar.

¹ *Ihm Damasi Epigrammata* no. 82.

² No connexion can be proved between the 'Platonía' and the second-century villa mentioned above (p. 35), though there is little difference of level, and the structures there found *might* have been raised on the court-yard of such a house.

This fate which befell King James's version of 1611 also overtook the Revision of 1885. In some ways the so-called Revised Version suffered worse than its predecessor. The 'Authorized' Version had a prescriptive right of 270 years on its side, and those who undertook to revise it worked in handcuffs. Familiar turns of the English might be misleading, but because they were familiar the revisers felt an unseen pressure which forbade them to do their duty in full.

If such was the case with the Old Testament as a whole, it was particularly so with the Psalter. Ps. iv affords several examples of the faults of an official translation. On the one hand the rendering is cold, colourless, and indefinite; on the other it has taken over some of the familiar mistakes of the Authorized Version (following the earlier Versions) and has given them a new lease of life. So it reads

PSALM iv (Revised Version).

For the Chief Musician; on stringed instruments.

A Psalm of David.

1. Answer me when I call, O God of my righteousness;
Thou hast set me at large *when I was* in distress:
Have mercy upon me, and hear my prayer.
2. O ye sons of men, how long shall my glory be turned into dishonour?
How long will ye love vanity, and seek after falsehood? [Selah.]
3. But know that the LORD hath set apart him that is godly for himself:
The LORD will hear when I call unto him.
4. Stand in awe, and sin not:
Commune with your own heart upon your bed, and be still. [Selah.]
5. Offer the sacrifices of righteousness,
And put your trust in the LORD.
6. Many there be that say, Who will shew us *any* good?
LORD, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.
7. Thou hast put gladness in my heart,
More than *they have* when their corn and their wine are increased.
8. In peace will I both lay me down and sleep:
For thou, LORD, alone makest me dwell in safety.

The meaning of the Psalm in this official version is none too clear. The Psalmist says (ver. 1), 'hear my prayer', but what his prayer is and what it is about does not appear except in the generalized petition of ver. 6, 'LORD, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us'.

Yet it is natural to suppose from the urgent tone of the Psalmist that some special calamity has befallen or is threatening to befall his country. It can hardly be foreign invasion or oppression, for there is no mention of an enemy. There remain the two calamities of dearth and pestilence, and of these two the reference to 'corn and wine' in ver. 7 makes the former the more probable. Ver. 7 means that the Psalmist's sense of JEHOVAH'S favour gives him more gladness than any abundant harvest ever gave him. Further it is possible that in ver. 5 also there is an allusion to scarcity. 'Offer the sacrifices that are due', the Psalmist says, possibly because he saw that his fellow-countrymen fearing heavy losses among their flocks and herds were beginning to grudge the offerings that were due to JEHOVAH'S service. 'Put your trust in JEHOVAH', he adds, as if he meant to assure them that their God would not allow them to lose in His service in the long run. If in addition to their losses by the drought they were making offerings to 'new gods', to the Baals of the soil of Canaan, the Psalmist's warning in ver. 6 is seen to be still more appropriate.

It is true that the Psalmist does not expressly mention drought in his prayer, but it should be noted that his prayer is interrupted. In fact something besides a prayer was required of him. In ver. 2 he turns to vehement expostulation. Why? Because in times of calamity, and perhaps specially in days of dearth, Israel was wont to turn to other gods than JEHOVAH to supply the special help that was needed. 'Were not the Baalim', so Israel would ask, 'the true gods and lords of the soil of Canaan? Were not the Baalim the givers of water?' If in Jer. xiv 22 the prophet asks, 'Are there any among the vanities (false gods) of the Gentiles than can cause rain', no doubt many of his hearers would have asserted that which Jeremiah wished to deny. In time of dearth many would shout, like the prophets on Mount Carmel, 'O Baal, answer us'.

So in Ps. iv the Psalmist, feeling himself, like Elijah, to be JEHOVAH'S only prophet and champion, remonstrates with the leaders of his people for dishonouring JEHOVAH by turning aside after other gods when faced by calamity. In ver. 3 he testifies to his hearers his own experience of the willingness of JEHOVAH to hear prayer: there is no reason (he would teach them) for turning to other gods, idols of the heathen, 'vanity' and 'falsehood', as he calls them. So in ver. 4 he bids his countrymen ponder his words in the quiet hours of rest. From pondering go on (he says in ver. 5) to confession of JEHOVAH as your God: pay the sacrifices ye owe to Him and put your trust in these sad days in no other deity. In ver. 6 the Psalmist turns again to the communion with his God, which was interrupted at ver. 2. 'Many are saying' (so he tells his Lord), 'Who (among the gods) will shew us

good? but he himself turns at once in hope to prayer: 'JEHOVAH, lift thou up an ensign over us, even the light of thy countenance'.

The Psalmist's prayer is finished, and peace descends into his soul. JEHOVAH has granted him a gladness which is independent of the harvest of corn or wine (ver. 7). And so he falls asleep, calm in the conviction that JEHOVAH who is the Only God will keep him in the days of dearth.

B. Duhm (*Psalmen*, 2^{te} Aufl., 1922) has seen that a time of scarcity forms the background to this Psalm, but in other respects his view seems to be faulty. He supposes that the persons addressed in ver. 2 are malcontents, who charge the Psalmist who is head of the nation (High Priest?) with responsibility for the dearth. It has come upon them (they believe) because of some sin which he has committed. So Duhm takes the Psalmist's answer in ver. 4 *a* to mean, 'Be angry, if you must be, but do not utter your complaints aloud, for that would be to sin against JEHOVAH whose favourite I am'. This is a possible interpretation, but Duhm is not happy with the second half of the verse, *Commune with your heart upon your bed and be still*. Surely the words mean 'Meditate in the time of stillness, when ye rest upon your beds: consider JEHOVAH's dealings with you in the past, and when ye have acknowledged His goodness in the past, then trust Him for the future'. The *bed* and the thoughts of the *heart* must surely be original touches in the text, but in an unhappy hour Duhm thinks of metre and makes jettison of them. The stichos, he says, is overburdened, so he rewrites it:

Be angry, but do not do amiss:
Be bitter (רָחַם), but keep silence.

This emendation preserves what Dr Duhm believes to be the metre, but it impoverishes the sense.

Looking back over the Psalm I should describe the contents in general as three pictures of Contrast: (1) Scarcity *versus* Corn and Wine; (2) the Psalmist's Trust in JEHOVAH, his glorious God *versus* the Quest of others after Lies, i.e. false gods: (3) the 'Good' of corn and wine *versus* the 'Good' of JEHOVAH's gift of inward peace.

If this be truly the sense of the Psalm the official version has done very little towards making it plain. Familiar phrases, though they have little meaning, have been left standing through nearly four centuries through five successive English versions, namely, the Great Bible (1539), Genevan (1560), Bishops' (1568), A. V. (1611), and R. V. (1885).

1. *when I call*, a colourless rendering. It might be left out without affecting the sense. To the English reader it means no more than *when I cry*. The Hebrew word, however, suggests a direct appeal to JEHOVAH by name: the sense is, *when I invoke Thee*. The Psalmist is a second Elijah who calls on JEHOVAH, while others in their distress are invoking Baal or looking round to find new gods. Indeed the colour of the Psalm comes from its defiant iteration of the name JEHOVAH. If in ver. 1 the Psalmist withholds for a moment the Name of his God, it is only that he may dwell on it the more in ver. 3: 'JEHOVAH hath set apart . . . JEHOVAH will hear'—in ver. 5, 'put your trust in JEHOVAH—in ver. 6, 'JEHOVAH, lift thou up'—and finally in ver. 8, 'Thou, JEHOVAH, alone'. This short Psalm is in fact from one point of view just 'an exaltation of the Name'. The Psalmist testifies to his people, lest they forsake their God and turn aside after 'Falsehood', i. e. false gods.

The various forms of the official translation fail here. The Prayer Book version gives 'the Lord' with only a capital 'L' to emphasize it. The Bishops' Bible of 1568 prints 'God' simply in this Psalm and generally throughout the Psalter, as though there had never been a thought of other gods in Israel. King James's version of 1611, ashamed yet unable to free itself from the *κύριος* of LXX and the *Dominus* of the Vulgate, returns to 'the Lord' of the Prayer Book Version (1539), but endeavours to make it impressive by printing it in capitals. The Revised Version of 1885 leaves the matter where it was left in 1611. It held its hand even in Ps. xxxiii 12, where its rendering 'Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD' comes perilously near to nonsense for the English reader; and this though the Prayer Book version had given 'Blessed are the people, whose God is the Lord JEHOVAH'.

1. *Thou hast set me at large*, wrong tense (the present perfect). The Psalmist is thinking not of a present deliverance, but of one belonging definitely to the past. On the remembrance of a great past experience he appeals for present help.

2. *O ye sons of men*, a quite unsuitable rendering of the (comparatively) rare Hebrew phrase. On the analogy of Ps. lxii 9 it might be rendered, 'O ye men of high degree'. Cf. note on בני אִישׁ *infra*.

4. *be still*, an insufficient rendering. The meaning is, 'Wait in silent patience for JEHOVAH your God to act'.

6. *Who will shew us any good?* The indefinite rendering 'any' is misleading. The questioners are seeking not 'any good you please', but a particular good, namely, a harvest which will save them from the fear of famine. The Psalmist proceeds in the next verse to say that

Jehovah has given him a greater 'good' even than this, namely, a gift of inward peace.

LORD, *lift Thou up* &c. Rather, *Lift Thou up Thy ensign over us, even the light of Thy countenance, O JEHOVAH.* The suitability of the metaphor is manifest. To the Israelite it would recall the Exodus when the LORD went before the people in the pillar of the cloud and in particular guided them by its light to the further shore of the Red Sea. The ensign was no doubt a pole of shining metal and not a broad piece of coloured stuff. The Roman *signum*, writes E. H. Alton in the *Companion to Latin Studies* (§ 750) 'was a silver-plated pole adorned chiefly with metal discs, sometimes also with crowns'. The ancient Assyrian armies (as the bas-reliefs suggest) carried similar *signa*. Such ensigns flashing in the sun might seem to the Psalmist emblems of the burning glory of JEHOVAH'S countenance.

8. *in safety*, an erroneous rendering. The meaning of the Hebrew is 'in security', i. e. in freedom from anxiety. The rendering 'in safety' has come down through five English revisions.

SOME NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT.

1 (Heb. 2). בְּקִרְאִי 'when I call'; rather, 'when I invoke thy name'; Jerome, *invocante me*. Cf. Gen. iv 26; xii 8; xiii 4 (קָרָא in each passage). עֲנֵנִי is pointed as imperative: so E. V. ('Answer me'), but LXX (ἐπισηκουσέν μου), Vg. (*exaudivit me*) read the perfect.

אלהי צדקי; cf. אלהי ישעי, Ps. xviii 47; xxv 5; xxvii 9. The two titles approach one another in meaning from different directions. The God of 'my righteousness' is the God who (on appeal) does me 'right'; the God of 'my salvation' is he who saves me because salvation is my right. Of course this is a conception which belongs to O. T., not to N. T.

2 (Heb. 3). בְּנֵי אִישׁ is not 'sons of men'; cf. xlix 3; lxii 10, where בְּנֵי אִישׁ 'men of high degree' are contrasted with בְּנֵי אָדָם 'men of low degree'. 'Sons of men' (בְּנֵי אָדָם) is a title of men which suggests weakness or inferiority, whereas בְּנֵי אִישׁ 'Sirs' is a mode of honourable address used by one who desires to be courteous in his remonstrance; it corresponds closely in fact with the ἄνδρες which St Paul used on two occasions (Acts xiv 15; xxvii 21) in addressing unbelievers whom he sought to turn to the living God.

עַד מָה כְּבוֹדִי לְבַלְמָה תֵּאָהֱבֹן רִיק 'How long shall my glory be turned to shame (how long) will ye love vanity?' The construction is harsh, but it would be easier if we might assume that the particle לְמָה 'wherefore' has fallen out of the text just after לְבַלְמָה. The Septuagint

apparently read : עַד מָה כְּבוֹדִי לֵב לָמָּה 'How long, O ye heavy of heart (slow of understanding) . . . wherefore . . .', *ἕως πότε βαρυκάρδιοι, ἰνατί*. . . . But again the construction is harsh.

כּוֹב 'will ye seek after falsehood?' means 'will ye seek after false gods'. בַּקֵּשׁ is used of seeking God in Ps. xxiv 6; xxvii 8; xl 17; and כּוֹב of idols (false gods) in Ps. xl 5; Amos ii 4.

4. הִפְלֵה is not 'hath set apart'; cf. Ps. xvii 7, הִפְלֵה חֲסִדֶיךָ 'Shew thy marvellous loving kindness' (imperative), also the cognate root in xxxi 22, הִפְלִיא חֲסִדוֹ לִי 'he hath shewed me his marvellous loving kindness'. So here הִפְלֵה לִּי חֲסִדוֹ . . . הִפְלֵה 'he hath dealt wondrously with his favoured one': LXX *ἐθαυμάστωσεν . . . τὸν ὄσιον αὐτοῦ*. רָגַז is not 'be angry', LXX *ὀργίξασθε* (cf. Ephes. iv 26), but 'stand in awe', i. e. of JEHOVAH of whose work the Psalmist has just spoken. The verb is used in Ps. xcix 1, 'let the peoples tremble'; also Isa. lxiv 1 [2], 'that the nations may tremble at thy presence'.

דָּמוּ 'be still', i. e. wait without complaining for God to act; cf. Ps. xxxvii 7, דָּמוּ לַיהוָה 'rest in JEHOVAH'; lxii 6, 'wait thou upon JEHOVAH'.

6 (Heb. 7). נִסָּה is clearly connected with נִסַּח 'banner, ensign'; Num. xxi 8; Isa. xi 10. The נִסַּח is an ensign ('sign') of a general or king round which troops rally. The punctators probably intended נִסַּח for 2 s. m. imper. with הָאֵל added, so Rashi explains the word and translates 'Lift up over us for an ensign the light of thy countenance'.

The alternative view that נִסַּח is a mis-spelling of נִשָּׂא, itself a mis-spelling of נִשָּׂא imperative of נִשָּׂא, though apparently accepted in R. V. is improbable. As, however, the root is נִסַּח we should expect נִסָּה or נִסָּק rather than the נִסָּה of M. T. Finally, it should be noted that the reading with ס is confirmed by LXX *ἐσημεώθη*.

8 (Heb. 9). לְבַדֵּךְ is inadequately rendered by 'only' (P.-B.V.). Following as it does the Name JEHOVAH it serves as an epithet to it, 'Thou O JEHOVAH, the Sole God (among many false gods), makest me dwell free from care': cf. Deut. xxxii 12, 'JEHOVAH the Sole God, did lead him'. So also in Ps. li 4 (Heb. 6) לִךְ לְבַדֵּךְ חַטָּאתִי 'Against thee, Who art Sole God, have I sinned'. The Psalmist here is conscious of having sinned against One who is no mere tribal god, but the Only One, the Supreme God of the Universe. So again when בָּרַךְ is used in reference to Israel, it is to be taken as an epithet: Num. xxiii 9, 'Behold a people which dwelleth as the Unique people, and is not reckoned among the nations'; Deut. xxxiii 28, בָּרַךְ עַיִן יַעֲקֹב 'the fountain of Jacob is Unique'; cf. Mic. vii 14. The word בָּרַךְ is used to designate JEHOVAH as Sole God, and Israel His people as a Unique people.

A non-official translation of Psalm iv.

DROUGHT: THREATENED APOSTASY: A NEW ELIJAH.

1. *The Psalmist Prophet intercedes.*

1. When I invoke Thy name, answer me, O God who upholdest my right ;
Thou didst enlarge me once, when I was in distress ;
Be gracious unto me now and hear my prayer.

2-5. *He remonstrates with the Waverers.*

2. Ye leaders of the people, how long shall my Glory be dishonoured,
While ye love that which is vain, and seek after false gods ?
3. But know that JEHOVAH dealeth wondrously with His holy one ;
JEHOVAH heareth when I invoke His name.
4. Tremble at His presence, and go not after false gods :
Commune with your heart upon your bed, and wait for Him.
5. Offer the sacrifices that are His by right,
And put your trust in JEHOVAH.

6. *He prays again.*

6. Many are saying, Who (of the gods) will shew us good ?
Lift Thou up Thy ensign over us, even the light of Thy countenance,
O JEHOVAH.

7, 8. *Peace after Prayer.*

7. Thou hast given me gladness within
Greater than they had when their corn and wine increased.
8. Utterly at peace I lay me down to sleep,
For Thou, O JEHOVAH, Thou Only One,
Dost set me free from care.

A word must be added on the vigorous rendering of this Psalm which Dr James Moffatt gives in his *Old Testament, A New Translation* (1924). His version, however, misses the key which ver. 7 offers. Ver. 7 tells us that there was a time when their corn (the corn of the men addressed in ver. 2) was plentiful. But the Psalmist looks back to that time as past. It follows that the present day is a day of dearth, present or threatened. The prayer of the Psalmist in ver. 1 is surely for rain, and for the harvest that will follow rain.

But while the Psalmist is addressing his prayer for rain to JEHOVAH he perceives that some of the leaders of his people are addressing their petitions elsewhere. The approach of disaster has shaken their faith in JEHOVAH, at least as the giver of harvests. So the Psalmist breaks off

to remonstrate with them, like Elijah on Mount Carmel. But he does not denounce them as enemies, but appeals to them as friends, 'Sirs' or 'Ye Leaders of the people'. I cannot think that Dr Moffatt is right in his translation of ver. 2, 'Proud men, how long will ye be so misguided, loving to deal in libels, eager on vain intrigues?'

This rendering means, I suppose, that the Psalmist has private enemies who bring false charges against him and hope to get him tried and condemned. But I do not find anything elsewhere in the Psalm to carry on this thought. If Dr Moffatt were right, should we not find later in the Psalm some such an appeal as that in Ps. xxvi 1, 'Be thou my judge, O JEHOVAH, for I have walked innocently'? And 'Proud men' can hardly be a correct translation of בְּנֵי אִישׁ, for there is no parallel phrase to suggest pride. In itself the expression is morally colourless.

A third interpretation of the meaning of the Psalm has been offered with some confidence by a Norwegian scholar (who writes in German), Sigmund Mowinckel, in his *Psalmenstudien* (Kristiania, 1921), i 45, 48, 156 *al.* He holds that 'vanity' (רִיק) and 'falsehood' (כֹּזֵב) in ver. 2 (also in many other passages of the Psalter) denote the work of the wizard. The Psalmist has enemies who are wizards. But when a spell is cast upon a man he becomes sick. Suspecting that his sickness is due to the black art the sick man desires to be taken to a temple (e. g. to one of the shrines of Asclepius) and to sleep there, that he may have a vision of his god and receive a reassuring oracle promising recovery. This Mowinckel believes is the situation represented in this Psalm. The meaning of ver. 8 is (so Mowinckel suggests):

In Frieden werde ich mich jetzt zur Inkubation niederlegen—Ich bin eines 'guten Zeichens' gewiss.

Of Mowinckel's interpretation it is perhaps enough to say that it is not sufficiently supported by the language of the Psalm as a whole. In the first place there is nothing to suggest that the Psalmist is (or has been) sick. Nor again does ver. 5 look as though it belonged to an answer to wizard-enemies. Finally be it said that ver. 2 *b* and ver. 8 even when read together are expressed in terms too general to make it even probable that the Psalmist is replying to the special menace of the Black Art.

The language of Ps. iv is, as we have seen, for the most part general¹ in character. But the urgent tone of it suggests the possibility that it once contained some more definite indication of the nature of the distress to which the Psalmist alludes. A clause containing such an

¹ Less so in the Hebrew than in the official English, however.

indication may have been removed as of too special a character, when the Psalm was taken into the public collection of the Praises of Israel (עֲלֵנוּ, *ψαλμοί*). But however this may be, I submit that the clearest suggestion that the present text makes as to the occasion of the composition of Ps. iv is that it was written in view of a drought which had succeeded in shaking the friends and acquaintances of the Psalmist in their faith in JEHOVAH.

W. EMERY BARNES.

ST LUKE IX 54-56 AND THE WESTERN 'DIATESSARON'.

THE story of James and John wishing fire from heaven to come down and consume the Samaritan village that would not receive our Lord is found in a longer and a shorter form. The text has been often discussed in works on textual criticism; my object in once more examining some details of the evidence is connected with the text of the 'Diatessaron' as preserved in Codex Fuldensis and the Dutch Harmonies. For this purpose it is needful to get as clear an idea as possible of the true text of the Latin Vulgate, quite apart from the question of the original text of St Luke's Gospel. The plan of this Note is (i) to give reasons why I think the Vulgate as issued by St Jerome had the shortest text, and (ii) to discuss in the light of this conclusion the affiliation of our authorities for the Western text of the 'Diatessaron'. First, then, as to the text of the Vulgate.

I. The Vulgate Text.

The longest text, Greek and Latin, runs thus:

- 54 . . . James and John said: Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come
down from heaven and consume them,
even as Elias did. (a)
- 55 And he turned and rebuked them
and said: Ye know not what spirit ye are of; (b)
- 56 *the Son of Man came not to destroy souls but to save.* (c)
- And they went away to another village.

A glance at Tischendorf or von Soden tells us that **b** and **c** go together: all texts that attest **b** also attest **c**, except Codex Bezae which alone omits **c**. As it is not in any way supported in this, it seems best to treat the Bezan reading as the result of some accident of transcription and to regard **b** + **c** as a single variant, to be inserted or omitted. Several authorities, on the other hand, omit **a** while retaining **b** + **c**, or