

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]

belongs to the same period, viz. the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century B. C. It will be noted that the possibility of a Yod having been thus mistaken for a Samekh in Dan. v 31 presupposes that this Book must have been written not later than the first quarter of the fifth century B. C.

NOTE 3. Since writing this article my attention has been drawn to a most important paper by Dr Pinches in the *Expository Times* for April 1915, entitled 'Fresh Light on the Book of Daniel'.

Among a collection of contract-tablets from Erech Dr Pinches has deciphered one, dated the 22nd day of the additional month of Adar, the 12th year of Nabonidus, which commences thus: 'Ishi-Amurrū, son of Nurānu, has sworn by Bēl, Nebo, the Lady of Erech, and Nanā, the oath of Nabonidus king of Babylon, and Belshazzar, the king's son, that "on the 7th day of the month Adar of the 12th year of Nabonidus, king of Babylon, I will go to Erech"', &c., &c. On this tablet Dr Pinches makes the following observation: 'The importance of this inscription is that it places Belshazzar practically on the same plane as Nabonidus, his father, five years before the latter's deposition, and the bearing of this will not be overlooked. Officially Belshazzar had not been recognized as king, as this would have necessitated his father's abdication, but it seems clear that he was in some way associated with him on the throne, otherwise his name would hardly have been introduced into the oath with which the inscription begins. We now see that not only for the Hebrews, but also for the Babylonians, Belshazzar held a practically royal position. The conjecture as to Daniel's being made the third ruler in the kingdom because Nabonidus and Belshazzar were the first and second is thus confirmed, and the mention of Belshazzar's 3rd year in Dan. viii 1 is explained.'

THE READING IN 2 CORINTHIANS iii 17 (τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου).

THE passage (v. 15-v. 18) runs thus: ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκονται Μωσῆς κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κείται. ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν· οὐ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου, ἐλευθερία. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνεύματος.

and two Yods in a short inscription of five words. Again on Plate XI, 122 a, compare the Yods and Samekhs in יְדֹסֶר and יְדֹסֶרֶל.

Dr Hort in his Introduction (*Notes on Select Readings* p. 119) noticed that a question arises as to the words in *v.* 17 οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου. His words will be the best starting-point for a discussion of the problem which this Pauline passage suggests. He wrote thus: 'These words contain no obvious difficulty: yet it may be suspected that Κυρίου is a primitive error for κύριον (Υ for Ν). First, the former clause of the verse does not in sense lead naturally up to this clause, whether the emphasis be laid on πνεῦμα or on Κυρίου (or κυρίου). Secondly, in ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος at the end of *v.* 18 neither principal word can naturally be taken as a substantive dependent on the other, nor both as substantives in apposition. The simplest construction is to take κυρίον as an adjective ("a Spirit exercising lordship", or, by a paraphrase, "a Spirit which is Lord") . . . This adjectival use of κυρίου in the genitive would however be so liable to be misunderstood, or even overlooked altogether, that St Paul could hardly use it without some further indication of his meaning. If he wrote οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κύριον, ἐλευθερία, not only do the two clauses of *v.* 17 fall into natural sequence, but a clue is given which conducts at once to the true sense of ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος'.

So far Dr Hort. I now propose (1) to examine somewhat more closely the words τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου; (2) to shew why in my judgement Dr Hort's solution of the problem is untenable; (3) to put forward and to support another solution.

(1) I take the words τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου. St Paul has just referred to Exod. xxxiv 34 as it stands in the LXX—*ἦνίκα δ' ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωσῆς ἔναντι Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, περιηρέιτο τὸ κάλυμμα ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι.* His quotation is substantially, though not verbally, correct. He at once identifies 'the Lord' in the quotation (πρὸς Κύριον . . . ὁ δὲ Κύριος: the article being the article of reference) and 'the Spirit' (see *vv.* 3, 6, 8). That identification is obviously meant to be of importance in the progress of St Paul's thought. We therefore expect that he will develop the idea or draw some inference from it. What, however, is the fact? The word ὁ Κύριος does indeed reappear in the Κυρίου of the next clause; but in the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου the notion of possession or source is substituted for that of identification. The result is that the emphatic clause ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν, which has the ring of triumphant assertion in it, is left isolated and aimless, and the succeeding clause (with the common-place phrase τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου) is unconnected in thought with what has gone before. Thus, if we look closely into St Paul's sentences at this point of a very characteristic passage where he is deeply moved and where therefore every word ought to tell, we are conscious of a sudden dislocation in the thought and of a halting in the language.

We next turn to the question of usage. St Paul has several times after πνεῦμα a genitive (expressing the divine possessor or source) as in the context of our present passage πνεύματι θεοῦ ζώντος (v. 3). Thus we have πνεῦμα θεοῦ (Rom. viii 9, 14, 1 Cor. vii 40, xii 3, Phil. iii 3); τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. ii 11, 14, vi 11, Eph. iv 30); πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (Rom. viii 9). But (unless it be in this passage) St Paul never has in any of its possible Greek forms the phrase 'the Spirit of the Lord'. Further, in the Greek O. T. the phrase πνεῦμα Κυρίου occurs some nineteen times but never the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου. In the N. T. St Luke (whose mind is saturated with the language of the LXX) is the only writer who uses the term 'the Spirit of the Lord'. In two passages—St Luke iv 18 (quoted from Isaiah lxi 1) and Acts viii 39 (based on 3 Kings xviii 12, 4 Kings ii 16)—he uses the LXX phrase πνεῦμα Κυρίου: while in one passage he has τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου (Acts v 9 πειράσαι τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου). Thus in only one other place of the Greek Bible is the exact phrase found which meets us in this passage of St Paul. If it is said that the article before πνεῦμα in 2 Cor. iii 17 is the article of reference, then I think that it must be said that a similar article of reference would naturally have been added before Κυρίου. It cannot of course be maintained that the argument drawn from usage—the usage of St Paul and the usage of the Greek Bible generally—is conclusive against the words τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου in the passage under discussion. But at least that argument confirms the conclusion to which a study of the context has already led us.

(2) If then we share Dr Hort's suspicions as to the word Κυρίου, can we accept his suggestion that it is a 'primitive error' for κύριον (an adjective)? Against this supposition there is, as it seems to me, an insuperable objection. Neither in St Paul's writings, nor in the other writings of the N. T., nor in the Greek O. T. is the adjective κύριος even once used.¹ It seems not unlikely that the use of Κύριος as a divine name made pious Jews shrink from employing the word as an adjective with a wide and indiscriminate application. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the adjective κύριος is unknown in the Greek O. T. and in the N. T. That St Paul therefore should so use it here seems to me an almost impossible hypothesis. The language of the Constantinopolitan Creed (τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν) belongs to a later age (see the passages quoted in Suicer *Thesaurus*, sub voce κυριολογεῖν).

(3) Dr Hort's instinct was true when it led him to think that the word Κυρίου is a wrong word in this context, however superficially and plausibly correct; and that it is not the word which St Paul meant his

¹ It is found, however, in 1 Macc. viii 30 (κύρια neuter plural) and (in the superlative) in 4 Macc. i 19.

amanuensis to write. The words which St Paul dictated to the scribe were, I believe,

ουδετοπνευμακυριεγειελευθερια.¹

Clearly it would be the easiest and most natural thing for the original scribe, or the transcriber of a very early copy, when he was in process of writing the word *κυριεγει* to substitute an *ο* for the first *ε*. When that was done, two results would at once follow.

(1) The simple, obvious, familiar *Κυρίου* would take an unquestioned place in the text. (2) The two letters *ει* would seem to be a blunder and be eliminated from the text. Possibly the copyist supposed that his predecessor had written wrongly the first two letters of the following word *ελευθερια* and had allowed them to remain in the text though he immediately afterwards wrote the word *ελευθερια* correctly.

My suggestion then is that St Paul intended the two sentences to run thus—*ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν· οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυριεύει, ἐλευθερία.*

What then are the arguments which support this conjecture?

(i) If we adopt this conjecture, the term used to denote ‘(the) Spirit’ is consistently maintained—*πνεύματος* (*v.* 6), *τὸ πνεῦμα* (*v.* 6), *τοῦ πνεύματος* (*v.* 8), *τὸ πνεῦμα* (*v.* 17 *a*), *τὸ πνεῦμα* (*v.* 17 *b*), *πνεύματος* (*v.* 18). The personality of ‘the Spirit’ becomes clearer in St Paul’s thought as he proceeds. In this connexion the unity of the passage is of real moment; and the unity of the passage largely depends on consistency of phraseology.

(ii) If we adopt this conjecture, there is in *v.* 17 a true sequence of thought. ‘The “Lord” and the “Spirit” are one. But this identification implies that the Spirit possesses a lordship. Where this lordship is exercised, there there is liberty.’

(iii) If we adopt this conjecture, we introduce in this passage a verb which St Paul uses five times in this group of his Epistles—Rom. vi 9 *θανάτος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει*, vi 14 *ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει*, vii 1 ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κτλ., xiv 9 *ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ*, 2 Cor. i 24 *οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως*. The word (which is fairly common in the LXX) is therefore characteristic of St Paul’s vocabulary at this time. If it is objected that in our passage emended as I propose the verb is used absolutely, whereas in the five passages cited above it is followed by a genitive indicating over whom or over what the domination is exercised, a twofold answer is ready to hand:

¹ There is another possible conjecture, viz., that St Paul meant the scribe to write *οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κύριος, ἐλευθερία*. But it seems to me that *κυριεύει* is greatly superior in force and vigour to *Κύριος*, the mere repetition of the word in the previous clause. The word *κυριεύει*, while it recalls that word, draws an inference from it. Moreover, the three substantives *πνεῦμα, Κύριος, ἐλευθερία*, standing one after another, would be, to say the least, awkward. It should be added that it is as easy to suppose that *Κυρίου* is derived from *κυριεύει*, as to suppose that it is derived from *Κύριος*.

(a) The absolute use is perfectly natural in itself. (b) The absolute use is found in the Greek Bible—Exod. xv 9 *κυριεύσει ἡ χεὶρ μου*, 1 Tim. vi 15 *κύριος τῶν κυριεύοντων*: comp. Ep. Barn. vi 18 *αἰσθάνεσθαι γὰρ ὀφείλομεν ὅτι τὸ ἄρχειν ἐξουσίας ἐστίν, ἵνα τις ἐπιτάξας κυριέσῃ*.

(iv) If we adopt this conjecture, the introduction of a verb brings the sentence into conformity with other sentences of a similar kind in this group of St Paul's Epistles—Rom. iv 15 *οὐ δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις*, Rom. v 20 *οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις*. Doubtless this argument ought not to be pressed overmuch, but it may, I think, be justly regarded as re-enforcing other arguments.

(v) If we adopt this conjecture, then we have the link between *ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν* of v. 17 and the *καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνεύματος* of v. 18 which Dr Hort desiderated and which is obviously needed. The words just cited from v. 18 lose greatly in clearness and in naturalness if the idea of the lordship of the Spirit in v. 17 is allowed to drop at once, and if another idea as to the Spirit is allowed to take its place. The three words *ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνεύματος* themselves demand a brief notice. They repeat two key-words of the preceding passage—the word 'Spirit' which throughout the paragraph, as we have seen, takes an important part in the development of the Apostle's thought; and the word 'Lord' suggested by the *πρὸς Κύριον* of v. 16. I have already given what appears to me a good reason for saying decisively that *Κύριον* in v. 18 is, not an adjective, as Dr Hort supposed, but a substantive. It should be printed with a capital. Both words—*Κύριον* and *πνεύματος*—therefore are substantives; and they are both anarthrous because the whole stress is laid on the *character* of Him who is spoken of—'as from One who is Lord and who is Spirit'. The words are curiously parallel to the *μονογενῆς θεός* of John i 18—a phrase which at the end of the Preface takes up two words which stand out in it, *θεός* from v. 1 and *μονογενῆς* from v. 14; and in which the two substantives—for *μονογενῆς* is virtually a substantive—are anarthrous.

(vi) Lastly, if we adopt this conjecture, it will not escape notice what animation and point are given to the passage by the paradox now introduced into it, and by the juxtaposition of the two antithetic words *κυριεύει* and *ἐλευθερία*. Similar paradoxes in St Paul occur to the mind at once—*φιλοτιμῆσθαι ἢ συχάζειν* (1 Thess. iv 11), *ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ . . . φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν* (Phil. iv 7); compare Heb. x 24 *εἰς παραξυσμὸν ἀγάπης*. A prosaic statement gives place to a spiritual epigram.

The question remains whether we must regard *Κυρίου* as a strictly 'primitive error' or whether we can point to any evidence for the reading *κυριεύει* having been ever current in the Church. So far as I know, there are only two passages in early Christian literature which have any claim to be considered evidence.

The first is found in Irenaeus III vi 4 Mass. (where the Latin Version alone is extant) 'Et ego igitur invoco te, Domine . . . qui fecisti caelum et terram, qui *dominarius* omnium . . . per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum *dominationem* quoque dona *Spiritus Sancti*'. The Latin words *dominari*, *dominatio* in this passage are almost certainly renderings of *κυριεύειν* and *κυριότης* (see the Greek and the Latin version in V ix 4). The words of Irenaeus might well have been suggested by the phrase *ὁ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυριεύει* in 2 Cor. iii 17 (a passage which Irenaeus, I believe, does not quote in his extant writings); but they are in themselves so natural that they do not require a Scriptural source to account for them. The second passage is Tertullian *de Baptismo* iv 'Spiritus enim *dominatur*, caro *famulatur*'. Tertullian here uses the Latin words which are an exact translation of *τὸ πνεῦμα κυριεύει*. The context, however, shews that the reference is rather to that spirit 'qui est auctor delicti'. It would be more than precarious to argue that Tertullian is unconsciously using a Scriptural phrase but giving it a new application. I conclude, therefore, that the emendation *κυριεύει* in 2 Cor. iii 17 must be regarded as reversing a strictly 'primitive error'.

F. H. ELY.

THE CHURCHES AT WINCHESTER IN THE EARLY ELEVENTH CENTURY.

THE Cathedral of Winchester has so large a place in my boyish recollections that it has been a special pleasure to me, when working at the early history and MSS of the Cathedral of Worcester, to find how close and intimate was the connexion between the two churches. In any Worcester kalendar of the eleventh or twelfth century we should be fairly certain to find that next in importance to the commemoration of the local saints Egwin and Oswald came the commemoration of the Winchester worthies, St Birinus, St Swithun, and St Judoc. Among Archbishop Parker's MSS at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, no. 146 is a Winchester Pontifical of about the year 1000 which has received additions, before and after the original nucleus, made for bishop Samson a hundred years later. The MS with which I am now concerned was also written at Winchester, not very much later than the C. C. C. book, and also taken at some early date to Worcester. It is still preserved in the Worcester Chapter Library, where it bears the number F 173; but the hand of time has dealt hardly with it, and only 30 leaves remain,