

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:



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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

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

Jeremias already reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and treats the subject from much the same point of view. Like myself, Professor Oettli is struck rather by the contrast between the codes of Babylonia and Israel than by their agreement. As he remarks, what parallels exist between them are to be found on the Israelitish side chiefly in the Book of the Covenant, to a less extent in Deuteronomy, and least of all in the Priestly Codex. For this, however, there is a good reason. The ritual Codex of Babylonia has not yet been dis-

covered, and it is with the ritual law that the Priestly Codex is pre-eminently concerned. The arrangement of Professor Oettli's book is clear and easy, to follow.

Queen Hatshepsu.

The burial-chamber of the tomb of queen Hatshepsu at Thebes has just been discovered, with the sarcophagi of the queen and of her father, Thothes I. The mummy of the queen, however, has not yet been found.

Contributions to the Greek Testament.

BY PROFESSOR EBERHARD NESTLE, D.D., MAULBRONN.

NOTE ON LUKE ix. 57-61.

AN important religious lesson is to be learned from a minute difference of spelling in these verses. One set of editions prints Κύριε (with a capital K), the other κύριε; among the latter are some in which the custom is followed to print the word where it refers to God and Christ with a capital K.

Compare on the one hand Mill, on the other Lloyd's reprint of Mill and the editions of the B.F.B.S. Scrivener is divided. In his reprint of Stephen's text of 1550 he gives κύριε; in his edition 'according to the text followed in the A.V. together with the variations adopted in the R.V.,' Κύριε. The latter is based on Beza's text of 1598. Scrivener, who noted in Ac 27¹⁷ the difference of spelling between σύρω and Σύρω, and Hoskier, who noted also that between κέδρων and Κέδρων (see *A full Account*, App. B. pp. 6, 14, App. C. p. 20), both fail to call attention to this variation. I have verified the passages in the original editions of 1550 (Stephanus), 1598 (Beza), 1707 (Mill). All have both times Κύριε with a capital. In Lk 23⁴² Scrivener's reprint of 1550 gives (with the original) Κύριε, but 19⁸ κύριε, where the original has Κύριε. Here the capital K seems even more justified than in 9⁵⁷⁻⁶¹.

A comparison of the Gospels gave the following results:—

Stephens (1550) printed Κύριος (capital): Mt 13⁵¹ 15²²⁻²⁷ 16²² 20^{30, 31} 22^{43, 44, 45} 24⁴² 26²², Mk 11⁸, Lk 5⁸ 6⁴⁶ 9⁵⁷⁻⁶¹ 10² 17^{37 (-38)} 19⁸ 20⁴⁴, Jn 8¹¹.

Beza (1598) put a small initial in two passages: Mt 24⁴² 26²².

Mill (1707) also in two: Mt 15²⁷, Lk 10².

Lloyd (1828) and Scrivener have a small initial in all these passages, except that in the latest reprint of Lloyd (1889) the capital K has been restored in Lk 19⁸, but not in 9⁵⁷⁻⁶¹, nor in any other of the passages above mentioned. Scrivener restored the capital K in the so-called *editio maior* of 1886 in Lk 5⁸ 6⁴⁶ 9⁵⁷ (not 61) Jn 8¹¹.

Most curious is the case in the parallel passages: Mt 21³ = Mk 11³ = Lk 19³¹⁻³⁴. Here Stephens, Beza, Mill have everywhere capitals; Lloyd and Bible Society only in Matthew, Scrivener in Matthew and Luke.

Similar is the case in Mt 22^{43, 44, 45} = Mk 12^{36, 37} = Lk 20⁴²⁻⁴⁴.

Here already Stephens had a small initial in Matthew twice, in Luke once (not 44); Beza and Mill in Matthew once (not 36); Lloyd and Scrivener have it everywhere. Small initials are found in Stephens, also in Mt 15²⁷, Mk 7²⁸.

If the principle be maintained to distinguish between κύριος and Κύριος, it is difficult to see the reason in most of the twenty-one passages why K was given up by Lloyd and Scrivener.

Very interesting, further, is the comparison between the Κύριε in the mouth of the apostles (Mt 26²²) and the *ῥαββί* of Judas Iscariot in v. 25.

The R.V. noted the difference of translation, *Sir* or *Lord*, in Jn 4^{11, 19, 49} 5⁷. An article on this

use of 'Sir' in the Bible would have been welcome in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

In the parable Lk 19, the R.V. prints v.¹⁸, 'Thy pound, Lord,' and both Palmer and Scrivener give in the corresponding Greek, 'Ἡ μὲν σου, Κύριε. I do not know whether these capitals L and K are intentional, or the consequence of the fact that in the earlier texts 'Lord' and Κύριε stood at the beginning of the sentence.

We must not be content to say to Christ κύριε, nor even Κύριε, in the sense of Mt 7^{21, 22}; He must become, in reality, our κύριος and Κύριος.

THE NEW GREEK TESTAMENT OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

There are two editions of the Greek Testament which have been published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in connexion with its Centenary—one which contains nothing but the text, the other which has marginal references and a critical apparatus. On the former nothing need be said. The text is that which was first published in 1898 by the Wurttembergian Bible Society at Stuttgart, based on a comparison of the recensions of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, and Weymouth, the latter being replaced afterwards by that of Bernhard Weiss. Only the square brackets [] of that edition have been removed, except in certain cases, as Lk 24^{12, 36}, etc.

The principal edition is the annotated, which gives in its apparatus a comparison of the new text—(1) with the Textus Receptus, and (2) with the Greek text that underlies the Revised Version. As the Revisers state in their preface: 'A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text.' In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. But for various readings, which might properly affect the translation, they had to decide between their rival claims, and these decisions have been published by the University Presses in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. Cambridge published, under the care of F. H. A. SCRIVENER, the text followed in the A.V., with the variations adopted in the R.V. in the margin; Oxford, *vice versa*, under the care of

Archdeacon PALMER, put the readings adopted by the Revisers in the text, referring the readings of the A.V. to the margin. Only SCRIVENER'S edition had to be consulted, the more so as he kept the record for the N.T. Revision Company of the readings which it adopted, and prepared the list of these readings, which was communicated to the University Presses. SCRIVENER'S edition (used in a copy of *The Parallel New Testament, Greek and English*, 1892) shows about 5600 marginal notes, Palmer's about 5250. These had to be compared with the new text. The figures below will show how closely both agree. Then the English text of the R.V. had to be compared with the new Greek text, to infer any Greek readings followed by the Revisers which might deviate from the new text. This comparison has been made twice, beside some assistance given by Mr. Sewell, to ensure greater accuracy, and these 'inferential readings' are marked with a different mark (clarendon **R**) to distinguish them from those which the Revisers expressly fixed as their Greek text. The inferential readings were found frequently to agree with the Received Text. No account is made of them in the following list. Finally, the marginal notes of the R.V. had to be attended to, where they presupposed a different reading and did not give only a different translation of an identical text. Frequently these marginal notes affected the punctuation or spelling (for instance, κύριος and Κύριος = *sir* and *Lord*, πνεῦμα and Πνεῦμα, the latter reserved for the Holy Spirit; compare Ph 1²⁷ 'stand fast in one spirit' = mind, with 2 Co 12¹⁸ 'we walked by the same Spirit' = Holy Ghost). One of the nicest examples of this kind is the inscription of the altar at Athens, Ac 17²³, 'to an unknown god' or 'to the unknown God,' though here the capital types used in the R.V. do not express this difference as in other places. Variations touching the punctuation and interpretation are put into brackets; they are most frequently in the Epistles of Paul, and had not found sufficient attention in previous editions. Compare, for instance, 1 Ti 2¹ A.V., 'I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications . . . be made'; R.V., 'I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications . . .'

A glance through the book will at once show that some parts are crowded with variations, while others have very few. No page is quite free from variation; but see in the Gospels, Mt 10^{34ff.} (ten verses without any variation); in the Epistles,

Ro 5¹⁵⁻⁶¹⁰ (one marginal reading of the Revisers, one variant of T.R.), or Gal 1²⁰⁻²¹⁰, Ph 4⁴⁻¹⁸. The greatest number of variations is found in the Second Gospel and in the last book of the N.T. This has a very simple explanation.

When ERASMUS printed his N.T. in 1516, he had for Revelation but one MS. at his disposal, which was partially defective and not always correctly read by him. His errors have been transmitted through the T.R. into our days. The Revisers could not allow them to pass without change, just as they had been corrected before in the recensions of Tischendorf and others. Hence the great number of variants.¹

¹ By way of comparison I can give the number of variants in SCRIVENER'S so-called *Editio Maior*. He compared BEZA, ELZEVIR, LACHMANN, TISCHENDORF, TREGELLES, WESTCOTT-HORT, and the REVISERS with STEPHEN'S text of 1550, and noted even orthographical variants, which are neglected in my comparison. I counted in his edition 12,125 notes. It is a very conscientious work; nevertheless, I found some omissions and misstatements when I used it to check my own collations; compare, for instance, He 10¹, where it is stated that W.H. have *als* instead of *ds*, or Ja 4⁸, where the reading *ἐγγλωσε* of W.H. is missing, etc.

In the case of the Second Gospel the reason is different. Here the variations arose in very early times, when the N.T. as a whole began to be transmitted by handwriting. Then copyists were tempted to assimilate the text of the Second Gospel to that of the First, which was better known. Already Jerome complains that this was one of the chief causes of textual corruption in his days. The critical editions restored the original text, and the Revisers, following them, were forced to deviate from the T.R. more frequently in this Gospel than in the First or the Fourth. But the table given below will speak for itself. Full exactness of figures is not aimed at, especially in columns 2 and 3, but the figures will be sufficiently accurate.

The first column gives the number of verses (counted on the English Bible). There are differences of numbering in different editions: Jn 1, for instance, has 51 or 52 verses, Ac 19 has 40 or 41, 24 has 28 or 27, 2 Co 13 has 14 or 13, Philem 23 or 25, 3 Jn 14 or 15, Rev 2 17 or 18 verses.

The second, the number of marginal notes in

	1. Verses.	2. Marginal Notes in SCRIVENER.	3. Marginal Notes in New Edition of B. & F. B. S.	4. 5. 6. Marginal Notes from--			7. Total of R.V. (4-6).
				R.V. Text.	R.V. Marg.	R.V. Greek.	
St. Matthew	1071	475	885	24	45	10	79
St. Mark	678	675	920	25	27	16	68
St. Luke	1151	864	1263	16	56	35	107
St. John	878	551	573	18	34	22	74
Acts	1007	804	1165	14	37	12	63
Romans	433	194	275	12	35	3	50
1 Corinthians	437	291	371	20	16	5	41
2 Corinthians	257	166	211	8	11	10	29
Galatians	149	65	96	4	3	1	8
Ephesians	155	94	117	5	7	2	14
Philippians	104	58	69	2	7	1	10
Colossians	95	73	94	7	15	2	24
1 Thessalonians	89	57	72	1	8	0	9
2 Thessalonians	47	30	36	2	3	0	5
1 Timothy	113	53	62	0	3	1	4
2 Timothy	83	40	52	4	3	1	8
Titus	46	24	34	1	3	0	4
Philemon	25	19	23	4	0	1	5
Hebrews	303	153	183	10	12	1	23
James	108	65	97	5	10	0	15
1 Peter	105	80	98	4	6	1	11
2 Peter	61	41	54	4	4	2	10
1 John	105	57	74	2	6	0	8
2 John	13	12	17	1	1	1	3
3 John	14	11	14	1	0	0	1
Jude	25	25	31	2	2	5	9
Revelation	404	641	699	15	36	24	75
Total	7956	5618	7585	211	390	156	757

Scrivener's comparison of the Greek text underlying the A.V. with that of the R.V. (*Parallel New Testament*, see above).

The third, the numbers of marginal notes on the new edition of the Bible Society.

Columns 4-7 give the notes from the R.V.—4 from its text, 5 from its margin, 6 the Greek readings fixed by the Revisers (see above), 7 the total of 4-6.

If the new edition will be found tolerably free from misprints, the merit is due, in the first instance, to the skill of the workmen and to the care of the readers of the Cambridge University Press, where the book has been printed.

It is not the intention of these lines to call attention to particular readings of the old or the new text. Only one example may be quoted to show how the position or omission of a comma

makes quite a different construction. Ac 27⁸⁹, the A.V. has, 'into which they were minded, if it were possible, to thrust in the ship'; the R.V. put 'they took counsel whether they could drive the ship upon it.' The A.V. construed *ἐβουλεύσαντο* with *infinitive* and took *εἰ δύναντο* as conditional clause; the R.V. made *εἰ* dependent on *ἐβουλεύσαντο* and the infinitive on *δύναντο*. No German commentary or translation known to me has ever thought of this possibility, which seems to me the better construction, and both SCRIVENER and PALMER failed to call attention to this difference between A.V. and R.V. In the text of Palmer the, after *δύναντο* must be deleted; in the edition of Scrivener a marginal note must be added. It surely pays itself to compare most carefully the R.V. with the Greek, and the new edition will prove a convenient help for this purpose.

At the Literary Table.

THE LIFE OF FARRAR.

THE LIFE OF FREDERIC WILLIAM FARRAR.
By his son, Reginald Farrar. (*Nisbet*.
6s. net.)

FARRAR was more to the world than to the Church. And that was because he was less of the world than most Churchmen are. His son admits that 'his work was often the subject of criticism.' There is apology in the admission where there should be pride. If he had been less a man and more a Churchman he would have been little criticised. It is the business of men who are men as well as Churchmen to lead the Church forward, not to smile and say all is well; and the leader is always criticised.

Mr. Farrar was alive to the criticism when he undertook to write his father's life. So he has made the life an apology. And the apology, wisely, is written by other men. It is contained in letters and the like. We are glad to see those letters. But they were not needed. No apology was needed. That many men and probably yet more women were saved from spiritual disaster by Farrar, by the very things for which he was so severely criticised, we had no doubt whatever. That the world was altogether a sweeter and more hopeful place to live in because he had lived in it, we had no doubt whatever.

It was not his opinions that saved or sweetened. It was the courage with which he uttered them. It was the man who held the opinions. It is probable that the causes for which he stood—they were chiefly temperance and eternal hope—gained considerably by his advocacy of them. But it was not through the arguments he used. It was by the way he told on the heart. He had a moral, more than an intellectual, hold of his contemporaries. He used words that burned like fire, not words that merely gave clear light.

He was criticised. His son feels it. He feels it too keenly to refer often to it. But once he is very bold and quotes a letter. This is the letter—

'SIR,—If your sermon has been correctly reported in the *John Bull*, which you preached last Sunday afternoon in Westminster Abbey, in which you boldly denied the doctrine of eternal punishment, which is distinctly taught in the Church of England, as well as in the Word of God, for the Church teaches nothing contrary to God's word: you will, of course, if you are an honest man, secede from that Church as I believe Sir Samuel Minton has done. You may be a theologian, but I fear that you have never been taught by God's Spirit, or you would not preach such a soul-destroying error as that which you preached last Sunday, if the report be a correct one. Look, for instance, at one passage, out of multitudes that can be adduced, Rev. xx, 10: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are;