

cussion of the Origin of the Law of Moses. The large book is a complete history of all the discoveries of the century in Biblical Archæology. Professor Hilprecht, the director of the American Expedition, which has lately made the sensational

library discovery, edits the book, and writes on Babylonia and Assyria; Benzinger writes on Palestine; Steindorff on Egypt; Hommel on Arabia; and Jensen on the Hittites. All the great 'finds' will be illustrated in the book.

Little Contributions to the Greek Testament.

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

ACTS ii. 47, iii. 1.

A PASSAGE which has not yet received sufficient attention is the last verse of Ac 2. The ancient reading was: 'And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.' If we disregard Mt 16¹⁸ and 18¹⁷, this is the first passage where 'the Church' makes its appearance in the New Testament; but the text is far from certain. Bengel, in the first edition of his *Greek Testament* (1734), classified the omission of τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ among those readings which are not to be approved, though they have been approved by some; in the second impression of the minor edition which he finished just before his death, he valued the omission higher, among the readings equally good as those of the text; and in his *Gnomon* (1742) he has the important note—

τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ est hæc Chrysostomi, ut videtur glossa, per Syrum et alios propagata. Non habent antiquiores.'

Now I have already (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES vol. xiii. p. 563) hinted at the possibility that the relation seems to have been the opposite, that Chrysostom took it from the Syriac version, and not the Syriac from Chrysostom, and this seems to be confirmed by the fact that the oldest witness for this reading has not τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ, but exactly as the Syriac version, ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ, connecting it with σωζομένους and not with προσετίθει. Thus Codex Bezae in the Greek and in the Latin, καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ, cottidie in unum in ecclesia. In a similar way has the Oxford Codex 58, which has been lately collated by Pott, ἡμέραν ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ Πέτρος.

On the singular reading of D at the beginning of chap. 3 it is worth while to repeat the statement of Bengel's Apparatus—

'Porro 'Ev δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις initio hujus capituli habet Cant. [=D], ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις Lectionaria. Ex quibus si hunc flosculum decerpserit, ut apparet, Codex Cant., antiquitatis suae opinionem ipse valde imminuit. nam lectionaria separata ipso Lectionum ecclesiasticarum usu longe recentiora sunt.'

This observation is not unsound; it must however be remarked that even if this be the origin of this 'flosculum,' it cannot have been borrowed from a 'separate lectionary,' it may have been ascribed to the margin of the codex from which D was copied, and then received into the text.

At all events, the origin of the reading τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ deserves more careful attention than it has found hitherto.

I COR. xvi. 22.

'If any man loveth not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema.' When we read this closing of 1 Co in the Syriac version, we find that the cursive-printed words form a very significant pun between רחם and רחם. That St. Paul is thinking here in his mother tongue is proved by the addition of *Maranatha*. There are two words for love in Aramaic, רח and רחם, the former is apparently in Paul's mind to form another pun with רח, to owe, when he writes, in Ro 13⁸: 'Owe no man anything, but to love one another.' And it is interesting to observe that here the Syriac version uses רח, as it uses רחם in 1 Co. For similar examples of Aramaic puns to be discovered under their Greek dress, see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, viii. 138, x. 525.

MATT. v. 37.

In the second edition of the second volume of Westcott-Hort's Greek Testament there was made

an addition to this verse '[see note].' This must refer, as in other similar cases, e.g. 1¹⁶ 4¹⁰ 5^{4, 5}, to the 'Additional Notes to Notes on Select Readings,' or to the 'Supplementary Notes by F. C. Burkitt,' printed on pp. 140 ff. of that volume. But in neither of these sections can I find the note which is here referred to. As it is difficult to imagine what additional note was intended, some communication about it seems desirable. Syr. *sin* has, like Syr. *cur* and Syr. *vg*, *ναὶ ναὶ καὶ οὐ οὐ*, and seems to have taken *πονηροῦ* as masculine.

JOHN VIII. 56.

For the difficult words of the second half of this verse the R.V. proposes as alternative translation: '*How is it that I even speak to you at all?*' This translation has not only the high authority of Chrysostom, as Fred. Field remarks in his Notes on this passage, but is confirmed by a very exact parallel in the *Clementine Homilies*. There a certain Apion is giving an explanation, his hearer does not appear to him to be attentive, therefore he interrupts his speech (*τὸν λόγον ἐγκόψας*) and says to him: *Εἰ μὴ παρακολουθεῖς οἷς λέγω, τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διαλέγομαι;* 'If you do not follow my words, why do I speak (or discuss) at all?' See *Clementina*, ed. P. de Lagarde, p. 77, ed. Dressel, p. 163, bk. vi. chap. 2.¹

THE ALTAR OF THE UNKNOWN GOD.

In the article 'Unknown God' in the *D.B.* iv. 835, it is not mentioned that the inscription may be translated 'to an unknown God,' with the indefinite article (see R.V.), nor do I find in any of our German commentaries a very nice story about the occasion at which this altar is said to have been erected. In the commentary on Acts which is attributed to Oecumenius, bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, about the middle of the tenth century, consisting chiefly of extracts from earlier writings (Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, vol. 118), we read: 'Two occasions are mentioned for this inscription of the altar. For some people say, when the Athenians sent Philippides to the Lacedæmonians for help at the time when the Persians came against Greece, there appeared to him on the way, near the Mount Parthenion, a vision of Pan (*Πανὸς φάσμα*), complaining that the Athenians had hitherto neglected him, while they honoured

other gods, and promising his help. After they had won the victory, they erected him a temple and builded an altar, and to guard themselves against the danger of suffering the same again, if they were to neglect another God unknown to them, they erected that altar with the inscription *ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ*, that is to say, if there be another God unknown to us, in his honour this altar be erected by us, that he be gracious to us if we do not worship him, not knowing him. *Καὶ ὡς φυλατόμενοι μὴ τὸ αὐτὸ δὴ καὶ ἄλλοτε πάθειεν, παρέντες τινὰ Θεὸν ἄγνωστον αὐτοῖς, ἀνέστησαν τὸν βωμὸν ἐκείνον ἐπιγράφαντες ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ, τοῦτο λέγοντες, ὅτι καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερος ἀγνοοῖτο παρ' ἡμῶν, εἰς τιμὴν ἐκείνου οὗτος δὴ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐγγέρθω, ὡς ἂν ἴλεως ἡμῖν εἴη, εἴπερ ἀγνοούμενος μὴ θεραπεύοιτο.'*

Whether this story is found in earlier commentaries I have not been able to trace. The report about the mission of Philippides, or Phidippides, from Athens to Sparta, and the introduction of the worship of Pan in Athens at this occasion is well known from *Herodotus*, vi. 105. John Chrysostom, to whom the commentary of Oecumenius is largely indebted, says on Ac 17 only (Migne, vol. 60, 268): 'As the Athenians received at various times many gods even from abroad, as the image of the Athena and Pan, and many others from various places (*ἐπειδὴ κατὰ καιροὺς πολλοὺς ἐδέξαντο θεοὺς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπερορίας, οἷον τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνῶν ἱερὸν, τὸν Πᾶνα καὶ ἄλλους ἀλλαχόθεν*), fearing there might be some God, whom they knew not, worshipped by others, they erected also to him an altar for greater safety, and, as the God was not known, the altar was inscribed *ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ*.'

The other occasion to which, according to Oecumenius, the erection of the altar is attributed by some, is a great pest, which was so severe that the Athenians could not bear even the finest underclothing upon their bodies (*ὡς μὴδὲ τῶν λεπτοτάτων συνδόνων ἀνέχεσθαι*). This tradition coincides with that mentioned by our commentaries from Diogenes Laertius about the pest and the way by which Epimenides put an end to it. The former I have not found mentioned in any German commentary, and as it will be of special interest to those versed in Greek history, I call attention to it, in the sure expectation that in England, where the combination of classical and theological studies is livelier than with us, it will be known at least to some commentators of Acts:

¹ I see now that the passage is quoted by Blass in his Grammar, § 50, 5.

By the way, it may be added that the mentioning of the name *Athens* in 2 Mac 6¹ 9¹⁵ found no place in the first volume of the *D.B.*

THE NAMES OF PETER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Surely the Apostle Peter had very bad luck with the different names which he bears in the N.T. Is it credible that bishops and archbishops of the Greek Church should not have recognized that *Symeon*, of whom James speaks in Ac 15¹⁴, was the same person with *Peter* who had spoken in vv. 7-9? And yet it is so.

1. John Chrysostom in his thirty-third homily on the Acts, commenting on chap. 15, begins with saying, that James, speaking here, was the bishop of Jerusalem; and as he had not to refer to such results as Peter and Paul, he strengthens his words by referring to new and old prophets (ἀπό τε νέων, ἀπό τε παλαιῶν βεβαιουμένων τῶν προφητῶν τὸν λόγον). The old prophecy to which he refers is of course the quotation from Am 9¹¹ adduced in vv. 16^{ff.}, the new prophet is for Chrysostom *Symeon*, who declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, and he states then expressly (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* 60, 239): Τινὲς τοῦτον εἶναι φασὶ τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Λουκᾶ εἰρημένον· ἄλλοι δὲ ἕτερον ὁμώνυμον τοῦτο. Εἴτε δὲ οὗτος, εἴτε ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν, οὐκ ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι χρή, ἀλλὰ μόνον ὡς ἀναγκαῖα δέχεσθαι, ἃ ἐξηγήσατο. Both these statements, that James confirms his words by old and new prophets, and that *Symeon* was the one intimated by Luke, are repeated by Oecumenius, bishop of Tricca in Thessaly. He writes (Migne, 118, 217): Τινὲς τὸν ἐν τῷ Λουκᾶ προφητεύσαντα· νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα, φασί.

Finally, Theophylact, the archbishop of Achrys (Okrida, the first church of Bulgaria), living about 1077, and chiefly following Chrysostom in his commentary, repeats the same statements, and says shortly and expressly (Migne, 125, 717): Συμεών, ὁ ἐν τῷ Λουκᾶ προφητεύσας· νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα (cf. further, col. 980, 1103).

If a Sunday-school child to-day were to make such a confusion we would not be satisfied, yet the highest dignitaries of the Greek Church are found in this condemnation. Then it is conceivable that the other names of Peter were also misunderstood.

A strange thing is, further, that already Origen saw in Simon of Lk 24³⁴ ('the Lord is risen indeed,

and hath appeared to Simon') the fellow of Cleopas: *dicentes* of the Latin Bible and *saying* of the English can be referred to the 'eleven,' and to 'they returned'; Origen read apparently λέγοντες (instead of λέγοντας), a reading preserved in the Codex Bezae, and maintained as the true reading by Resch, *Paralleltexte zu Lukas*, pp. 779 ff.

2. That *Cephas*, who came to Antioch, to whom Paul withstood to the face, was the same with Peter the Apostle, many Fathers of the Church could not understand or were unwilling to acknowledge. Only a few examples may be given.

Already Clement of Alexandria distinguished *Cephas* and Peter. In the 'Coptic Life of the Virgin,' published by Forbes Robinson in the *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels (Texts and Studies, iv. 2, 1896)*, Peter, Simon, and *Cephas* are considered as three different persons.

The Διαταγαὶ διὰ Κλήμεντος, as published by Lagarde (*Reliquiæ juris ecclesiastici antiquissimæ græcæ*, 1856, p. 74) begin: 'Rejoice, ye Sons and Daughters, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ: John and Matthew and *Peter* and Andrew and Philip and *Simon* and James and Nathanael and Thomas and *Cephas* and Bartholmew and Judas of James.' In the context of this piece different ecclesiastical rules are attributed to *Peter* and *Cephas*.

In the so-called *Chronicon Paschale* (pp. 521-522) he is called the namesake of Peter (Κηφᾶς ὁμώνυμος Πέτρου), and in the *Menologium Basilianum* he has his day with six other disciples of Christ on the 9th December (p. 197 f.); see Nilles, *Calendarium* (2nd ed. i. 54).

That *Cephas* was one of the Seventy was already the conviction of Clement, whom Eusebius quotes in his *Ecclesiastical History*, i. chap. 12. In the list of their names as given in the *Book of the Bee*, by Salomon of Basra, his name occurs (ed. Budge, p. 113). In the same source we read (p. 110): 'Cephas, whom Paul mentions, taught in Baalbec, Ḥimṣ (Emesa) and Nathrôn (Batharûn). He died and was buried in Shîrâz' (instead of Emesa Lipsius, *Apokryphe Apostelgeschichten, Ergänzungsband*, p. 22, printed 'Edessa'). On the names of these places, see the note of Budge, and on the whole question the dissertation, quoted by the same, of P. M. Molkenbuhr, *An Cephas . . . fuerit Simon Petrus*, 1785, 4to. It is strange, that even on Syriac ground, where the meaning of *cepha* = rock (*Peter*) was well known, such a mistake could take hold.