

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life." "And *they feared* as they entered into the cloud."

A. R. SIMPSON.

*THE NON-SECONDARY CHARACTER OF
"EPHESIANS."*

BY the courtesy of the Editor I have been enabled to see in proof Dr. Moffatt's reply to my August article, "The Epistle to the 'Ephesians' not a secondary production." His article has not in the least shaken my position, and, though I fear I cannot hope to convert him, from the fact that our points of view appear to be irreconcilable, I welcome the opportunity kindly afforded by the Editor to write a rejoinder to his reply. This I do the more gladly, as it has been represented to me that the final note in my article might be taken as a charge of fraud against the learned author, whereas all, of course, that I insinuated was carelessness. It appears that even in this I was wrong, for he tells us that "the omission [to note the variants in i. 15] was deliberate." All that I can say, then, is that the author is convicted on his own statement of omitting deliberately a fact which has a cardinal bearing on his argument. If an author sets out to show by parallels the close relationship between two documents preserved in MSS., it is surely his duty to present the *variae lectiones* of these MSS., especially in a case like this, where, as it turns out, the purest Eastern and the purest Western evidence combine in a reading of importance. Yet he passes it over in silence.¹

It is my inability to understand a point of view like this

¹ I instance as a parallel case, worthy of imitation, the insertion by Dr. Huck in the later editions of his well-known *Synopsis* of the Gospels of the more important textual variants. Surely every one will admit that the value of his book is thereby much increased.

which makes me despair of convincing Dr. Moffatt, and I will confine myself to a brief discussion of various points in his reply.

Some readers of the EXPOSITOR will perhaps do me the justice to suppose that after many years' close study of the text of the Pauline Epistles, especially in Western documents, I have some acquaintance with the character of the DG text. I was not concerned in my brief article to express an opinion as to the genesis of this text, but I may say that I regard its insertion of *ἀγάπην* in Ephesians i. 15 as of a piece with the variants that Dr. Moffatt cites from iii. 14, v. 30 and iv. 19. In fact, there are scores, if not hundreds, of cases in the Pauline Epistles which are on all fours with these, and I have for long had no doubt whatever that these numerous simplifications of the language, especially in the way of addition, that are to be found in the DG text, are due to a reviser, who went through the Pauline Epistles, probably in Italy, in the second (or third) century. I say "in Italy," because quite apart from the general character of the Latin translation used by Cyprian, which is far removed from that (or those) employed by the Italians, we have seen that in i. 15 even Augustine possessed a text different in strain from DG. The Western Fathers who support the DG text are Italian (Roman) and Sardinian, not African.

Dr. Moffatt mentions that in reading *ἀγάπην* in i. 15, D and G are "buttressed by the fourth century Latin authority of "Ambrosiaster" and Victorinus, . . . the Latin and Syriac Vulgate versions, together with the Gothic, which are superior to the Bohairic." There are two statements here. The first is a statement of fact, the second is merely a statement of opinion. Let us first take the statement of fact, second the statement of opinion.

What does the support of these authorities amount to? I assume for the purpose of the argument that the text of

"Ambrosiaster" is here sound. I believe it is (though as yet no critical edition of his commentary has appeared); because the comment shows that *dilectionem* was in his text. "Ambrosiaster" lived and worked in Rome about 375, and used a text of the Epistles which rarely differs from DG, though in renderings it sometimes differs, now from *d*, now from *g* (rarely from both at once). The group DGdg Ambst is so constant, that the compiler of a New Testament apparatus gets weary of copying out these symbols. The adherence of Ambrosiaster here as elsewhere is what we expect: his text and DGdg go back to a common archetype. I am not so sure that we can safely combine Victorinus with this group. The text of his mutilated commentary depends upon one fifteenth century MS. It is true that the MS. is quite good for its date, and it may very well be right here. But how far does this take us? It only shows that a decade or so before "Ambrosiaster" wrote, and in Rome, too, the same reading was found. A special study of Victorinus' text of the Epistles, which I undertook a year ago, confirmed the view already adumbrated by Zimmer¹ and Monceaux² that Victorinus, though African by birth, used a Roman text of the Epistles, having been resident in Rome for the greater part of his life, and there converted.

The Latin Vulgate "version" is, as all the world knows, only a perfunctory revision of an already current Old-Latin text of the Epistles of Paul. Professors Burkitt and Lake would, I think, agree with my view that it was the "Ambrosiaster" type of text that Jerome used as the basis of this careless revision. This passage, Ephesians i. 15, like many another, was left alone.³ The sum total of the Latin

¹ *Der Galaterbrief im altlateinischen Text* (Königsberg, 1887).

² *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, t. iii. (Paris, 1905), pp. 373-422.

³ Jerome, however, did some revision in Ephesians, for he put in the *κατ' ἐπέγγελαν*, which old Latin texts omit, in iv. 16.

evidence is that three copies *in Rome* in the period 360 to 385 had *dilectione(m)* (*ἀγάπην*), the longer reading.

The Syriac Vulgate Version, as Dr. Moffatt surely knows very well, was made between 411 and 435 by Bishop Rabula of Edessa. He took the Old-Syriac version, such as Ephrem used in his commentary (before 373), and carefully revised it in accordance with the new Syrian-Antiochian (Constantinopolitan, ecclesiastical, what you will) type of Greek text. Of course this would contain *ἀγάπην*, as its most prominent characteristic is its fulness. It is, in fact, practically the same as our "Textus Receptus." It may be, however, that the Old-Syriac had the *ἀγάπην*. The Gothic is "largely Syrian and largely Western, with a small admixture of ancient Non-Western readings."¹ Here, it probably, like the Peshitta, depends on Greek MSS. of the late type.

As to the matter of opinion, that these versions "are superior to the Bohairic," Dr. Moffatt gives no grounds. If in textual criticism he is an adherent of Dean Burgon, he is bound to believe it, because the Bohairic is a strong supporter of \aleph and B. I have shown with regard to this very passage that, whereas the inferior MSS. of the Bohairic have the *ἀγάπην*, the better MSS., followed by the Rev. G. W. Horner in the edition of 1905, the final authority in such matters, are without the *ἀγάπην*. I have demonstrated for the first time how strongly entrenched that form of text is, which omits *ἀγάπην*. On a review of all the evidence, it is found to be the more ancient reading. The absence of *ἀγάπην* in a phalanx of authorities of such character and history as \aleph^*ABP 17, Bohairic version, Origen, Cyril, Jerome, Augustine (twice), the purest Greek MSS. and a cluster of Fathers distinguished for careful quotation, cannot be

¹ Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*, p. 158, section 218.

explained away. Westcott and Hort were so impressed by the strength of the authorities known to them,¹ that they omitted *ἀγάπην* in their text, even though they were unable to give a convincing English translation of the text they printed. This last I have (along with the Bohairic version) provided.

Other points than the merely textual are raised by Dr. Moffatt's article. The argument of his third paragraph is rather irrelevant from my point of view, because I follow Hort in believing that the Ephesian epistle shows the controversy between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians to be now dead. I thus consider *ἑμᾶς* in i. 15 to mean not "you" (Gentile Christians), but "you" Christians (both Jewish and Gentile), and am, therefore, at perfect liberty to consider *πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους* to mean "all the other Christians" (both Jewish and Gentile) in the world outside the Province of Asia. In spite of Dr. Moffatt, I consider this "makes perfectly good sense, and is relevant to the general tone of the epistle." Students of Paul do not need to be reminded that he constantly corrects or modifies the original form of a statement, which might cause misapprehension or (as here) conceit.

Underlying Dr. Moffatt's argument is the assumption that Ephesians was written last of the three (Eph., Col. Philem.), even on the theory of its genuineness. I have not argued this, and refuse to be driven into a corner of this sort. I have sometimes held that opinion, sometimes the other, but have not, so far as I remember, troubled the learned world by any expression of opinion on the subject. The likeness of Philemon 5 (to which I did not refer) and Colossians i. 4, over against Ephesians i. 15, I frankly admit, and

¹ To which I have added three from better editions of one version and of two Fathers.

it is natural, as the Epistle to Philemon went to Colossae only.

I am glad to admit the force of Dr. Moffatt's contention that "the encroachment of εἰς on the province of ἐν never occurs in Paul's epistles elsewhere," as here he has Blass¹ and Moulton² behind him. But there are many other solitary words and usages in Paul, the Pauline character of which is not denied. It is enough for my purpose that the first century shows many examples of εἰς equal to ἐν, and I fancy that a thorough search of the Epistles might reveal other passages, where it would be a gain to exegesis to interpret εἰς in this way. In any case, the *reading* in this passage stands firm, unless all our views of textual criticism are utterly wrong. I still maintain that no one could evolve the short text of Ephesians i. 15 out of Colossians i. 4, and I think I shall carry at least the majority of textual critics with me. Colossians i. 4 would have been taken over bodily by a compiler. What motive could he possibly have for altering the wording?³

Dr. Moffatt has misunderstood my reference to Harnack's recent paper as a "consolation." I do not mean more than that it is a consolation to those who have believed in Paul's authorship of "Ephesians." With the exact destination of the epistle in Harnack's view I am not so much concerned. I am thankful for what Harnack has conceded, though I hold to the circular theory, Laodicea being one of the churches intended to receive the epistle.

¹ *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 2te Aufl. (Göttingen, 1902), § 39, 3. I quote by section and subsection, so that my reference may be verified in the ridiculously expensive English translation.

² *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. i., 2nd ed. (Edinburgh, 1906), pp. 234 f.

³ If the shorter text of Eph. i. 15, though unquestionably the most archetypal text we have got, should not, after all, be translated as the Bohairic translator and I have done it, then the critic's duty is to mark the text as corrupt, and not to follow the soft and easy course of inserting an ἀγάνη of obvious provenance.

Finally, one or two remarks on Dr. Moffatt's article may be lumped together. Dr. Moffatt denies that my interpretation "makes good sense" or "is relevant to the general tone of the epistle." To this statement I have partially replied above, but it is easy to add that this is not the only passage in the Epistle where the other Christians in the world are mentioned. In chapter ii. verse 19, the recipients of the letter are referred to as *συνπολίται τῶν ἀγίων*, "fellow-citizens with the (other) Christians": again in chapter iii. verse 18, *καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀγίοις*, they are to "perceive in company with all the (other) Christians": and in chapter vi. verse 18, *δεήσει περὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων*, their "prayers" are bespoken "for all the Christians" in the world. Surely it is abundantly proved that the writer had the Christians throughout all the other provinces in his mind as he wrote, and that he might very well bring them in in chapter i. 15, in a truly Pauline way. Again, if Dr. Moffatt is to maintain that the longer text is the true and original text, it is his duty to explain why the best documents from East and West are here in the wrong, while the inferior are (in his view) right. Yet he does not, so far as I have observed, attempt to do this. The usual explanation, that of accidental omission because of the likeness of the letters, will not, I think, do in this case, if I may speak as one who has spent thousands of hours in intimate converse with manuscripts. Scholars have been forced to this explanation because they wanted to accept the shorter reading, as that of the best authorities and the more difficult of the two readings, but had to reject it because they could not translate it. Dr. Moffatt has paid me the compliment of looking out my old note in the *Expository Times*, xix. 44, but I think it hardly fair to attack individual points in that note at this time of day. The article in the *EXPOSITOR* was intended to supersede the old note altogether, and a man still in his thirties may surely be allowed to improve,

without having his former statements cast up to him.¹ My reference to Dr. Moffatt was solely due to the fact that he was the latest English writer on this subject, and that he associated himself with the opposite view to that which I hold myself.

The shorter form of text in Ephesians i. 15 is the original, or at least the nearest to the original, we can get. It can be translated, as it was by the Bohairic translator centuries ago, in a way consonant with first century usage and in perfect harmony with Pauline thought and the general tenour of the Epistle. This form of text proves that "Ephesians" cannot be a compilation from Colossians by a later writer.

ALEX. SOUTER.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

THE history of the Epistle to Philemon is a very curious one. The value attached to it by different generations, by different schools and by different individuals, provides an interesting criterion of their respective ethical attitude and development. The intellectualist and the dogmatician of any period have no use for such a document. In the fourth century there were those who denied its genuineness on internal grounds. Its subject, the fate of a fugitive slave, was felt to be beneath the dignity of an Apostle and of Scripture. It contributed nothing to doctrine or to edification. So Jerome had to defend it against those who said: "Aut epistolam non esse Pauli, aut etiam, si Pauli sit, non habere quod aedificare nos possit." Even Calvin, though he appreciates the witness of the Epistle to the "singular loftiness" of Paul's mind, makes a kind of

¹ I cited the old article myself simply to date the first modern appearance of this translation in print, and to claim it as my property, so to speak. I neither accept nor reject the entire wording of the note.