

that they are the pangs which death itself suffers, not the pains it inflicts on someone else; and the participial clause *lusas tas ôdinas tou thanatou* can mean only 'bringing to an end the labor pains of death', that is, bringing the labor to an end in the birth of the child. That this would be the meaning is clearly proven from the LXX of Job 39:2: *ôdinas de autôn elusas* 'did you bring to an end their labor pains?'

It would seem, therefore, that the proper meaning of the Greek phrase *hai ôdines tou thanatou* in Acts 2:24 is *hëbhlēy-maweth* 'the cords of death', and that the participial clause *lusas tas ôdinas tou thanatou* means 'unfastening the bonds of death'. God raised Jesus from the dead by untying the cords with which death held him fast. This is a natural figure of speech, conforming with figures used in the Old Testament, and would certainly convey meaning to Peter's listeners (whatever Peter may have said in Aramaic) and to the readers of the Acts (cf. also *Epistle of Polycarp*, I.2).

It should be more generally recognized, therefore, that *hai ôdines tou thanatou* means 'the bonds of death'. Liddell-Scott-Jones have already done so (*s.v.* *ôdis* II.3), and one can only wish that Arndt and Gingrich had followed Liddell and Scott in the matter. Of the translations which have adopted this meaning, Berkeley has "unfastening the cords of death," and the new Brazilian revision *rompendo os grilhões da morte*.

Note on G'RH with Especial Reference to Proverbs 13:8

Francis M. Seely

Proverbs 13:8 in the ASV reads, "The ransom of a man's life is his riches: but the poor heareth no threatening (mg. Or rebuke)." AV reads "rebuke," and the ASV was right in seeking some more appropriate meaning for the word. The question is, is 'threatening' a legitimate translation of *G'RH*, and does it give a good sense to the verse? Apparently RSV did not think so, and so altered the Hebrew text.

Perhaps the trouble began with a statement by Toy,¹ "some take *rebuke* as = *threat* (a sense which the word nowhere else has)." This statement is echoed by Oesterley,² and again by Fritsch.³ An examination of the passages in which *G'RH* occurs shows the opposite to be true. The use of 'threat' is supported by both the Gesenius-Buhl and the Koehler lexicons. It quite definitely means 'threat' in Isa. 30:17 and is so translated by ASV, RSV, and Bewer.⁴ That a thousand should flee at a rebuke is hard to imagine, but to flee at a threat is

¹ *Proverbs*, International Critical Commentary, p. 265.

² *The Book of Proverbs*, Westminster Commentary, p. 100.

³ *Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 4, p. 856.

⁴ *The Book of Isaiah*, Harper's Annotated Bible Series, p. 80.

understandable. In 2 Sam. 22:16, Ps. 18:16(15), and Ps. 104:7, where the *G'RH* causes great changes in nature, 'threat' would be a more appropriate translation than 'rebuke'.⁵ Something much stronger than 'rebuke', stronger even than 'threat', is needed in Ps. 76:7(6) and 80:17(16) where the *G'RH* causes death and in Isa. 50:2 where it causes widespread destruction. Here something like 'destroying word' would seem more fitting. In Isa. 51:20 the *G'RH* is parallel to the wrath of God which causes the downfall of men, and in Isa. 66:15 it refers to the fearful judgment of God.

From these passages, which comprise nine out of the fourteen occurrences of the word, it is apparent that 'rebuke' is not always adequate, that 'threat' is at least once required and is appropriate, if not required, in three other passages, and that neither 'rebuke' nor 'threat' is a strong enough word to render the sense in some passages.

The verb *G'R* similarly sometimes has a meaning stronger than 'rebuke'. Apparently the word, which in cognate languages has to do with a loud cry,⁶ means a rebuke, a threat, and then comes to refer to the action which is threatened, and hence has the meaning in some places of 'render ineffective', 'destroy'. In Jer. 29:27, "Why hast thou not rebuked Jeremiah," both ASV and RSV translate "rebuke," though from the context 'threaten' or 'put a stop to by threatening' would be more appropriate. AT translates "put a check on." In Isa. 17:13 'threaten' again makes more sense than 'rebuke': "He shall rebuke them and they shall flee far off." Passages where a translation implying destruction or rendering ineffective through God's word would be appropriate are: Mal. 2:3, "I will *G'R* your seed, and will spread dung upon your faces"; Mal. 3:11, "I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground"; Ps. 9:6(5), "Thou hast rebuked the nations, thou hast destroyed the wicked."⁷

There are no obvious close parallels to this passage in Proverbs. There are, however, many passages which compare riches unfavorably with such things as wisdom, righteousness, freedom from a contentious woman, freedom from hatred. And 28:11 hints that a poor man may have clearer insight than a man whose riches blind his eyes to his own conceits. So the thought of 13:8 that a poor man has the advantage over a rich man, in that he is not so likely to be threatened, is not out of line with thought patterns in other parts of Proverbs.

In view of these facts, there is no need to alter the Hebrew text of Proverbs 13:8. The translation of the ASV is adequate and gives good meaning and good parallelism. Paraphrasing, "A man with riches is able to ransom his life (when threatened), but a poor man is not even threatened."

⁵ The interpretation of the English word *rebuke* as 'to check', 'to repress', 'to restrain', is not allowable for present-day translation purposes, as this usage is now rare. (*Webster's New International Dictionary*, 1949.)

⁶ Koehler, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*.

⁷ In the Thai translation, the problem is made easier by the fact that the Thai word *kanahp* means not only 'rebuke', but the sort of 'threatening' that would imply effective result.