Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

Buy me a coffee   https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON   https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

words : " *An arrow of victory from Jahveh : an arrow of victory over Syria* " (2 Kings xiii. 17).   Then the king is told to strike the ground with the arrows, and as often as he strikes the ground, so many victories he will gain (v. 19). And even Jeremiah makes one of his disciples read aloud a curse upon Babylon and then throw the roll into the Euphrates (Jer. li. 59) ; Ezekiel tells us that there were, in the lower grades of prophecy, prophetesses able by their magic to " catch souls," i.e., to bring back into the body the departing souls of the sick, and it is significant that Ezekiel himself, while he condemns these sorceresses, has no doubt as to their magical powers (xiii. 17).

HERMANN GUNKEL.

(*To be continued.*)

WRONG CHAPTER AND VERSE DIVISIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IT is curious what slaves most of us are to custom.   We quickly enslave ourselves to our accustomed routine.   The Revised Version of the New Testament stirred one pious brother to remark that the King James Version was good enough for the Apostle Paul and it was good enough for him.   And yet for nearly fifty years it was not certain whether the King James Version or the Geneva would win the day.   When Erasmus published in 1516 his first Greek New Testament, he printed side by side with the Greek text a Latin translation and some notes.   In his edition of 1527 he put in also the Latin Vulgate which had for centuries held the field in the West.   But this Latin Vulgate of Jerome for many years met a storm of abuse from those who preferred the Old Latin versions.   The King James Version which the Revised Version challenged in 1881 had the verses printed separately as if each verse was a separate

paragraph. The effect of this way of printing the text was to destroy all sense of connexion between the verses. Each verse stood out as a thing to itself. Many people have expressed great surprise when it first dawned upon them that there was any grammatical or logical connexion between the verses. Paragraph marks were indeed printed here and there, but these marks made little impression upon the average reader.

The Revised Version put both chapter and verse divisions on the margin and printed the text in paragraphs according to the sense. This courageous act of itself was enough to justify the work of the Revisers if they had done nothing else. But, when the American Standard Version appeared in 1901, the chapter and verse divisions crept back into the text, only the paragraphs were retained and the verses were printed in the body of the text. This plan made the beginning and end of each verse easier to detect, but made some interruption in the easy reading of the text. Moffatt places the verses on the margin while Goodspeed drops both chapters and verses to the bottom of the page with no interruption at all to the flow of the narrative. But many good people are already troubled over this liberty with the verse divisions in the Bible. It may be worth while to recount the history of this matter.

It seems hardly necessary to state that our verse divisions come after the age of printing. They appear in no Greek manuscript. The Masoretic verses of the Old Testament were first numbered by Rabbi Isaac Nathan for use in his Hebrew Concordance, finished in 1448 and printed in 1524 at Venice. These Masoretic verses were first numbered by Arabic figures in 1509 in the *Quincuplex Psalterium*. In 1528 Sanctes Pagninus printed at Lyons a Latin translation of the whole Bible with verse divisions. " But in the Apocrypha and the New Testament his divi-

sion was very different from ours, the verses being twice
or three times as long ; and it seems to have been followed
in no other edition." (Ezra Abbot, *On the Division of the
Greek New Testament into Verses, Critical Essays*, 1888,
p. 465).

Our New Testament verse divisions were made by
Robert Stephens as he made a horse-back journey, *inter
equitandum*, "while riding," from Paris to Lyons. One
old commentator, after labouring with the verse divisions
of Stephens, said : " I think it had been better done on
his knees in the closet." It is generally supposed that
Stephens did the work while riding to relieve the tedium
of the long trip. If he actually did it while jogging along,
it is certain that the horse gave some bumps in the wrong
place. But Gregory (*Canon and Text of the New Testament*,
p. 474) challenges this interpretation and thinks that all
that is meant is that he made the verse divisions during
the stops for rest while on the journey : " During the
morning he may have rested a while at a wayside inn,
and certainly at noon he will have done so. And again
at night he doubtless drew out his little pocket edition
and ' divided ' away until it was time to sleep." Be that
as it may, we know that Erasmus had no verse divisions
in his Greek New Testament. Why did Stephens make
his verse divisions for the edition of 1551 ? He had none
in his previous editions of 1546, 1549, 1550 (his "royal
edition "). He was at work on a Concordance of the New
Testament, published by his son Henri in 1594. It was
absolutely necessary to have verse divisions in order to
give proper references in his concordance. So he proceeded
to make verse divisions for his own convenience and for
the confusion of readers of the New Testament ever since.
They do help preachers find their texts, but they hinder both
preachers and people from grasping the sense of a passage.

The first use of Stephens's verses was made by him in the fourth edition of his Greek New Testament in 1551. The Greek text was a reprint of the 1550 edition Greek text with the Greek in the middle column, the Latin translation of Erasmus on the outer side, and the Latin Vulgate on the inner side of the page. The Arabic verse numbers come between the Greek and the Latin translation of Erasmus. J. Rendel Harris (*Some Notes on the Verse-Divisions of the New Testament*, Journal of Biblical Literature, 1900, Part II., p. 117 f.) shows that Stephens made the verse divisions on the Latin Vulgate New Testament which was used as a printers' copy for his Greek New Testament of 1551. In the Stephens Vulgate of 1545 there is a verse in Acts ii. 19 and 20 not in the Greek or Latin of Stephens's 1551 New Testament. Hence the printer prints 19 and 20 together for the verse on which Stephens marked it is absent. That missing verse is in the Sixtine Vulgate of 1590 : *et apprehenderunt me clamantes et dicentes, Tolle inimicum nostrum.* There is another case just like it with double numeration in the Stephens New Testament of 1551. It is Acts xxiii. 25 and 26. It is extant as the missing verse 25 in the Clementine Vulgate of 1592 : *Timuit enim ne forte raperent eum Judœi, et occiderent, et ipse postea calumniam sustineret, tanquam accepturus pecuniam.* Nestle made this discovery. " Moreover, the Antwerp Polyglot of 1571 expressly says, in printing this verse from the Latin with no counterpart in Greek or Syriac ; ' *deest* 25 *versus* ' " (Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 117). The proof is thus plain that Stephens made his verse divisions on a Latin Vulgate New Testament and gave this to the printer to use in making the verse divisions for the Greek New Testament of 1551. No printed New Testament in Greek or Latin had these divisions before 1551, so far as any record exists.

Once started, however, it was hard to stop the innovation. In 1552 Stephens printed a French New Testament with the verse divisions, the French version of Olivetan revised by Calvin. Abbot (*op. cit.*, p. 466) gives the dates for these early editions with verse divisions. The Italian followed in 1555, Paschale's version. The first Dutch version with the verses was that by Ctematius in 1556. The first English New Testament with verse divisions was that by William Whittingham, printed at Geneva in 1557. The first whole English Bible with the verses was the Geneva Bible of 1560. The first whole Bible to have the verse divisions of Stephens was his edition of the Latin Vulgate of 1555 at Geneva (made for his Latin Concordance of the same date, 1555).

Other Greek New Testaments followed suit with the verse divisions. The Elzevir Greek New Testament of 1633, the Textus Receptus edition, was the first one that had the verses divided up, a lamentable innovation. It was bad enough to have the verse divisions at all, but this was the acme of perversity in destroying the sense. And it has kept up till 1881. "Beza deviated much more frequently from the verse divisions of Robert Stephens; and his editions had great influence in giving currency to the use of the divisions into verses, which soon became general. His variations from the divisions of Stephens were largely followed by later editors, especially by the Elzevirs, who also introduced others of their own. Others still will be found in the early modern translations" (Abbot, *Critical Essays*, p. 466). Gregory greatly deplores (*Canon and Text of the New Testament*, p. 475) the variations in different Greek New Testaments and versions. Abbot thinks that the absence of any critical examination of these variations in verse enumeration is largely due to the extreme rarity of Stephens's edition of 1551, "which has the best right

to be regarded as the standard, from which an editor should not deviate in marking the beginning of a verse without noting the change, and then only for very strong reasons " (*op. cit.*, p. 467). My own experience in making references over and over again to the verses in the Greek New Testament (see my *Grammar of the Greek N. T. in the Light of Historical Research*) bears out the charge that Abbot makes. I found it exceedingly difficult to feel sure that the verse given in any text was the one accepted generally. " The want of agreement in different editions, leading of course to discrepancies in concordances, dictionaries, and other books of references, often occasions doubt and perplexity." Abbot took about fifty of the chief editions and translations of the New Testament and noted variations in the different editions. It is an astonishing list on eight large, closely-printed pages. But Abbot adds : " This list is incomplete." Gregory (*op. cit.*, p. 475) wishes that some theologian would carry on what Abbot began so well and get all the data " showing where false divisions have crept in," and then that " all theologians would correct their New Testaments in whatever language according to the one standard of Estienne's (Stephens's) edition of 1551." That is a greatly desirable goal, but one hardly likely of realisation.

But enough has been said to make it plain how comparatively recent the whole matter of verse divisions in the New Testament really is. My sympathies are wholly with those editors who place the numbers in the margin instead of in the text and who use paragraphs and print both the Greek and the English text in a way to help one understand the sense of the passage. The custom of verse divisions arose as a convenience for reference in the use of a concordance. It has to be kept up because of convenience to-day. It is a necessary evil, to be sure, but it

is an evil that one has to endure, but with as many limitations as possible. One cannot resist the feeling that, if we had to have verse divisions, the thing ought to have been done by one thoroughly competent, in the first place, and by one who would take the time to do it carefully and with as much regard as possible to the sentence and the sense. It is a work of supererogation now to point out the hundreds and hundreds of verse divisions in the New Testament that try the soul of any man who loves a sentence with all its balanced and proportioned members. The work was poorly done by Robert Stephens who was a printer and not a real scholar. He did it in a hurry and in a more or less mechanical manner. It was done on the Latin Vulgate first as a printer's copy and then transferred to the Greek text. It was a late Latin Vulgate text and a late Greek text. The critical Greek text of modern scholars has had to drop out a number of verses like Acts viii. 37. But what has been done has been done and cannot now be undone. The only thing open to us now is to manage the verse divisions with as little damage to the understanding of the New Testament as possible. There is absolutely nothing sacrosanct about it. It has been of some service, but at a fearful cost to the right apprehension of the New Testament.

A few examples of poor verse divisions may suffice to make the point plain : Take 2 Timothy, for instance. A needless verse is i. 4, which breaks right into the middle of the closely-knit sentence. The same thing is true of i. 11. But a worse example is seen in i. 17 and 18 where the sense is interrupted by a full stop in the King James Version. The Revised Version has it right with a parenthesis, but no verse division is permissible here. In ii. 25 the verse breaks up a clause, one half of it in verse 24 and the other half in verse 25. Verse 24 surely should end with " oppose

themselves," not with " patient," with the semi-colon, not with the comma. In the same way iii. 3 is a needless verse division and interrupts seriously the group of adjectives. So also iii. 7 should go with iii. 6. These are the flagrant instances in a short epistle where the sense is seriously interrupted by the verse paragraphs in the King James Version. Schaff (op. cit., p. 237) has not put the case too strongly when he says : " The versicular division is injudicious, and breaks up the text, sometimes in the middle of a sentence, into fragments, instead of presenting it in natural sections ; but it is convenient for reference, and has become indispensable by long use. The English Revision judiciously combines both methods." The English Revision uses sense paragraphs with verse divisions in the margin, a much better plan than that of the American Standard Version with the Arabic numbers in the body of the paragraph.

The chapter divisions are older and do not disturb the sense so seriously and so frequently, though there are flagrant blunders here also. Our modern chapters were divided by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1228. He seems to have made the chapter divisions about 1204 or 1205. Gregory (Canon and Text of the New Testament, p. 473) says that this division in chapters by Langton got into no Greek manuscripts of the New Testament save a few late minuscules in the West. Langton, before he became Archbishop of Canterbury, was one of the doctors of the new University of Paris who were at work on purifying the text of the Vulgate. He afterwards became the leader of the barons in their contest with King John. His chapters were put into the Latin Vulgate. The Greek manuscripts (cursives) regularly had the Greek chapters while a very few of them, as already stated, had these Latin chapters of Langton, and a few

(cursives) had both the Greek and the Latin chapters. About 1243 Hugo of St. Caro with a number of other learned men produced a concordance to the Latin Vulgate which used the chapters of Langton with seven other divisions in each chapter except the short chapter indicated by the letters A B C D E F G. These letters appear on the margin of the Stephens-Erasmus Vulgate New Testament of 1545, next to the Vulgate. The Langton chapters are indicated by Roman letters. In the Stephens-Langton Vulgate New Testament of 1555 both the A B C D E F G divisions and the Stephens Arabic verse enumeration occur, but the Arabic numbers occur in the text. In the Stephens Greek New Testament of 1551 only the Arabic verse divisions occur, but each verse, alas, is a paragraph. The Langton chapter divisions are undoubtedly useful, though some are too long and some are too short and others break into the middle of a sense paragraph. It is easy for the average reader to run through the Revised New Testament and note some of these interruptions of the paragraph. A case in point is Matthew x. 1, which belongs in sense with ix. 38. Another is Matthew xx. 1 which cuts right into the speech of Jesus in reply to Peter. Matthew xxvi. is a very long chapter (75 verses) like Luke i. (80 verses). Mark ix. 1 clearly belongs to the preceding paragraph. In Acts vii. 1 the chapter division breaks right into the trial of Stephen. Acts viii. 1a belongs to the preceding paragraph (bad version division also). Acts xxii. 30 surely should be xxiii. 1. 2 Corinthians ii. 1 breaks into the paragraph, as is true of 2 Corinthians vi 1 and vii. 1. The same thing is true of Colossians iv. 1. One of the very worst chapter divisions is Hebrews xii. 1, which separates Jesus from the list of heroes of faith in chapter ii. Surely the new chapter had better begin at xii. 4. And Revelation xxii. 1 ought to start at xxii. 6 and not cut into the wonderful

pictures of heaven. These examples are enough to show the immense advantage of the paragraph divisions according to sense over the fixed chapter divisions of Langton. And yet we are shut up now to the actual use of these mechanical chapters.

But there were chapter divisions long before Langton. The Greek chapters (*κεφάλαια*) are very old, how old we do not know, but they do not correspond at all with those made by Langton for the Latin Vulgate. It is not known who made the large Greek chapters. Our oldest Greek documents have these chapter divisions on the margin. In fact, Codex Vaticanus (B) gives two separate systems of chapters for Acts, Paul's Epistles, and the Catholic Epistles. Euthalius is not the author of these sections. He merely applied a system already old for the church lessons. The Apocalypse received no chapter division, so far as known, apart from that in the commentary of Andrew of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a very artificial arrangement. For the Gospels Clement of Alexandria spoke of pericopes (*περικοπαί*), Tertullian of *capitula*, Dionysius of Alexandria of *κεφάλαια*. Origen used *περί* for sections. The *τίτλοι* found in A C N R Z are interesting because the titles of the chapters appear in tables at the beginning of each Gospel or at the top of the page. These Greek chapters number 68 for Matthew, 48 for Mark, 83 for Luke, and 18 for John. They vary greatly in length. In Matthew 55 there are only a dozen lines, while 56 has over ninety.

There was a still further effort made to enable the reader to refer from one Gospel to another. This arrangement is called the Eusebian (Ammonian) sections and canons. The plan of Ammonius was to write the parallel sections beside each other. But Eusebius made sections or little chapters in each Gospel (355 for Matthew, 233 for Mark, 342 for Luke, 232 for John). Then he had ten canons.

The first contains a list where all four Gospels agree. The second has the passages where Matthew, Mark and Luke agree, the third where Matthew, Luke, and John agree, the fourth where Matthew, Mark, and John agree. Then come sections where two Gospels agree and finally the tenth canon has passages where each Gospel stands alone. It was an ingenious scheme and was found very useful. Eusebius put on the margin in red ink the number of the canon in which the passage is found. The reader could turn to the number of the canon and then to the Gospel or Gospels referred to by the numbers. It was a harmony of the Gospels in skeleton form and served a useful purpose.

But we are now under the regime of Langton's chapters and of Stephens's verses and can only make the best of it. We owe it to all students and readers of the New Testament to throw as few difficulties in their way as possible when they turn to the New Testament for light and leading. One can find a full presentation of the facts about the chapters in Gregory's *Prolegomena* (pp. 140–166) to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Græce* (editio octava) and of the verses also (pp. 166–182) where he gives chapter xx. of Ezra Abbot's *Critical Essays* with his invaluable data. Each reader to-day is supposed to be on his guard against the mechanical chapters and verses which, like barnacles, have fastened upon the New Testament.

The division into chapters and verses was objected to as long ago as John Locke (died 1704), who said in his *Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by Consulting St. Paul Himself*: "The dividing of them into Chapters and Verses, as we have done, whereby they are so chop'd and minc'd, and as they are now Printed, stand so broken and divided, that not only the Common People take the Verses usually for distinct Aphorisms, but even Men of more advanc'd Knowledge in reading them, lose

very much of the strength and force of·the Coherence, and the Light that depends on it." But a habit is a habit. If we can get people to read the New Testament, we can ignore the chapters and the verses if they occur only in the margin.

<div align="right">A. T. ROBERTSON.</div>

PAULINE RE-ADJUSTMENTS.

I.

THIS paper is an attempt to discover the historical setting of 2 Timothy iv. 9 ff.

The difficulty of accounting for the details recorded in this section has led to two outstanding explanations of the movements of Paul.

On the one hand it is claimed that the Apostle visited Asia and Macedonia when released from imprisonment at Rome, and that Luke closed the Book of the Acts without recording the visit.

On the other hand this eastward journey with its implied second imprisonment is discountenanced on the ground of no reliable evidence. It is further maintained that the details given in the above section cannot in any possible way be accounted for during one single period of Paul's life as known to us from the Acts and the Epistles.

What is of special interest at present is that in developing this second point of view Dr. Harrison in his recent book [1] reconstructs the story of Paul's life at this time.

He pays particular attention to the material in this section of 2 Timothy, and advocates the view that while the details given are unquestionably Pauline they were originally personal Notes sent by Paul to Timothy, and that they were utilised later on by the *auctor ad Timotheum* who was responsible for the epistle in its present form.

New and interesting though Dr. Harrison's reconstruction is, it does not escape the objection that what is apparently a continued passage is broken up for reconstruction purposes. The

---

[1] *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 115-35.