

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

THE EXEGETICAL PUNCTUATION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT.¹

BY REV. CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

THE term "Biblical Criticism," which has been introduced into theological science, has not yet received a definition that is marked by distinctness and precision, or that has been unanimously adopted by theological writers. In the very comprehensive sense in which some German authors employ it (e.g. Ebrard, in Herzog's Encyk. viii. 90 ff.), the term embraces all the matter which belongs respectively to Isagogics or Canonics (Hagenbach, Encyk. §§ 46, 47), and to Apologetics. If this wide extent of signification be assigned to the term, it designates a comprehensive department of theological science, to which would belong all the investigations that are intended to demonstrate the authenticity,

¹ Some portions of this Article are extracted from an extended course of lectures on Hermeneutics and Biblical Criticism, which the writer had previously prepared, and delivered during several successive years before classes of theological students. But the great mass of the materials, including nearly all the passages from the Pauline and other Epistles which refer to the comma, were more recently collected by him for the purpose of illustrating the general subject to which the Article is devoted.

the genuineness, the integrity, or uncorrupted preservation, and the credibility of the sacred writings. In no sense, however, does the term "biblical criticism," in its genuine character, assume the office of deciding what the contents of these writings *ought* to be; it confines itself, even in this wide sense, to the task of ascertaining which of a certain class of ancient writings are properly component parts of the canon, what were the precise expressions of the writer, etc. When it has determined such points, it does not attempt to decide judicially on the competence of any inspired man; hence, its office simply is to exhibit as correctly as possible the true text, as it proceeded from the hand of a sacred writer. The term, however, may be employed in a restricted sense, and refer chiefly to the text of the books which are acknowledged to be canonical. In this case it discusses mainly the subject of ancient manuscripts, various readings, versions, early printed editions, and kindred topics, and it designs to determine by historical and other arguments the true meaning of the writer, as far as the editor can exhibit it to the eye in a printed form.

THE SYSTEM OF PUNCTUATION.

It cannot be doubted that the subject of the Punctuation of the text legitimately belongs to textual biblical criticism. As the masoretic points were attached to the text of the Old Testament at a comparatively late period (after the sixth century of the Christian era, Keil, *Einl. in Alt. Test.* §§ 169, 210; Herzog, *Encyk.* ix. 133), and were intended to preserve or define the exact meaning of the original; so, too, the marks of punctuation with which we are now familiar, were introduced into the text of the New Testament; and in many cases the sense of the original is materially affected by them. Although the autographs or original manuscripts of the sacred writers have long since perished, it is still possible to obtain a satisfactory view of the manner in which they were written when the appearance of the oldest manuscripts extant is studied. The apostles and their amanuenses (e.g.

Tertius, Rom. xvi. 22) employed the uncial (majuscule) characters, or capital letters exclusively,¹ without any spaces between the words (*scriptio continua, serie continua*) so that each line appeared to the eye to consist of a single word. They introduced no accents and no marks of punctuation whatever (Tischendorf; Herzog: Encyk. ii. 159, 160).

The original practice of writing without any spaces between the words led to various misconceptions in defining the sense of certain passages. Even Chrysostom read *σὺν ἐπισκόποις*, Phil. i. 1, as one word in the sense of fellow-bishops. The true reading in Phil. ii. 4 is now generally conceded, in accordance with the results of the investigations of Lachmann, Tischendorf, etc., to be *ἕκαστοι*. But the initial letter of *σκοποῦντες* (the more approved reading) was sometimes supposed to belong to the foregoing word, and the remainder of the latter (*κοποῦντες*, from *κοπῶ*) would give the translation if the imperative form of the English version (which adopted *σκοπεῖτε*) is retained: "Labor not every man," etc. In Gal. i. 9 the last syllable in *προειρήκαμεν* was sometimes detached from the word, leaving the former part in the singular number, while the plural verb in the preceding verse should have at once indicated that here too the plural was intended. In James v. 12, the English version reads, "Lest ye fall into *condemnation*," whereas the German exhibits, "into *hypocrisy*." The Textus Receptus which here presents the Erasmusian reading (the one to which the German version adheres) exhibits *εἰς ὑπόκρισιν*, according to some manuscripts. The omission of *εἰς* in others required a resolution of the compound word into *ὑπὸ κρῖσιν*, and this reading was adopted by the English translators.

No cursive (minuscule) manuscripts, that is, those written with small letters, the forms of which at length differed

¹ This circumstance explains the fact that *ἄσων* (Acts xxvii. 13) was originally (Erasmus, Textus Receptus, Vulgate, etc.) printed with a capital initial letter (*Ἄσων*), and was supposed to be the name of a city, as in Acts xx. 13, 14; while later editors and commentators generally agree with the English version, and treat the word as an adverb.

widely from those of the uncials, are now known to exist, that were written previously to A.D. 900. A few of the uncial MSS. e.g. B.D. E. (Gospels), and E (Pauline Ep.) exhibit accents and the *spiritus asper et lenis*; but critics seem now generally to agree that these do not proceed *a prima manu*, but were added by a later hand. They were not generally employed until the cursive characters were introduced. Tischendorf (*loc. cit.* p. 161) remarks, however, that spaces between the words, and the simple point or period, were introduced as early as the fourth or fifth century. The Iota subscript, which had sometimes been annexed to its vowel as a co-ordinate letter in form, and was thus Iota post-script, appeared invariably as subscript only in the cursive manuscripts. Horne (Introd. i. 214) derives an argument from the mistakes of the church Fathers, and from their uncertainty respecting the meaning of various passages, to prove that the apostles employed no points for marking the sense (see also Gerard, *Bib. Crit.*, Part ii. Chap. iii.). The introduction of the system of punctuation, including the breathings, and the plan of exhibiting spaces between the words, are usually assigned to the period extending from the eighth to the tenth century. The points or marks were at first few and simple; the Alexandrian grammarians employed only three, corresponding to our comma, colon, and period. It was only during the sixteenth century, after the invention of printing, that the system received its fuller development, having been first applied in some editions of the classical writers. The present punctuation of the Greek New Testament, the credit of which is sometimes (e.g. Brande's Dict., Art. Punctuation) given to the celebrated printers of Venice, named Manutius,¹ was not first employed

¹ Aldo Manuzio the elder, born in 1447, was not only a printer, but also an accomplished scholar. He opened a printing-office at Venice for the purpose of furnishing correct and elegant editions of the Greek and Latin Classics. Of his learning he gave ample proof in the dissertations which he wrote and prefixed to his editions of the classic authors. He was the inventor of the Italic character, which was for a considerable time called the Aldine, and the exclusive use of which was for many years secured to him by patents of the pope and the

by Robert Stephens (Stephanus, or, more correctly, Estienne), but had already been introduced by Erasmus in his first editions (Reuss, *Gesch. d. h. S. N. T.* § 378). The first two editions of the former appeared in 1546 and 1549, while those of Erasmus were published in 1516 and 1519.

The true principles of punctuation are not yet determined with such precision that doubtful cases cannot occur. Fowler (*Engl. Gram.* p. 743), who says that "the current practice is generally more in accordance with the grammatical than the rhetorical view," adds with great truth that "there is considerable diversity among authors and printers in their application" of the rules of punctuation. Any one who has read "proofs" sent from two or more printing-offices, or who compares different editions, British and American, of the same work, can easily understand that this "diversity" still continues. Of all the modern points none creates greater difficulty than the comma; writers and printers cannot always agree respecting the insertion or omission of it. The difficulty which existed respecting the precise use of the comma when the Article on Punctuation was written in England for the *Cyclopaedia* of Rees (reprinted in Philadelphia in forty-one volumes many years ago), is still painfully felt. The writer of that Article, who believes that certain expressions in the writings of Cicero and Seneca, which are sometimes quoted in this connection, by no means prove the antiquity of pointing, complains of the great "difficulty in pointing," and says that "there is scarcely anything in the province of the grammarian so little fixed and ascertained as this." It can therefore create no surprise that the punctuation of the earlier editions of the Greek Testament should be somewhat irregular and indefinite. Besides, the idiom of different languages modifies the modern system of punc-

senate of Venice. His son Paulo sustained the reputation of the family by his abilities as a printer and scholar. His grandson Aldo, born in 1547, also distinguished in the typographical art, was even more favorably known as an author. His library, consisting of thirty thousand volumes, was sold to pay his debts; and, as he left no children, the glory of the Aldine press terminated with him.

tuation ; a Greek or a German sentence, which exhibits at once by the inflections or terminations of words the relations which the several words constituting a clause or sentence sustain to one another, may dispense with the commas which the same sentence, when translated into English, would require.

THE EXEGETICAL CHARACTER OF PUNCTUATION.

As soon as the punctuation of the Greek Testament was recognized as a system, even before it received a fuller development after the appearance of Griesbach's editions, it at once assumed an exegetical character. In the section which Winer has introduced in his *Grammar of the New Test.* (§ 7, sixth ed., Leipsic, 1855), he says that a distinction may, in some cases, be made between the logical and the grammatical punctuation of a sentence. In 1 Tim. vi. 3, for instance, he remarks that the words, "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words," logically considered, contain two propositions or clauses, and hence the Vulg., Engl., Germ., and French (Martin and Ostervald) versions place a comma before "and"; whereas (Winer adds in reference to the Greek) the words, in a grammatical point of view, form only one proposition, and hence Lach., Tisch., Stier (*Polyglot N. Test.*) insert no comma before the first *καί*, while Knapp, like Erasmus, has placed one there, Winer (*loc. cit.*) gives Knapp the credit of having been the first editor who paid special attention to the punctuation of the Greek New Testament. — In such cases the idiom of a modern language, as we have just remarked, may require a modification of the punctuation necessarily adopted in a Greek passage ; the Greek relative pronoun, for instance, may grammatically connect two clauses, as they would appear logically in a modern language, so closely as to constitute only one in Greek. Winer objects to the insertion of a comma after *τρίτην* in Mark xv. 25, evidently assuming that it was the intention of the sacred writer to state only *one* fact, namely, that they crucified the Lord at the third hour ;

the German version and the two French (*da . . . quand*, being the equivalents for *καί*) present the same view ; whereas the English version, following the Vulgate, exhibits two distinct facts ; first, that the third hour had now arrived, and secondly, that they crucified the Lord. So, too, Winer maintains that a comma should not precede *ἀλλά* when this conjunction introduces a clause that is itself incomplete, and that belongs essentially to the foregoing ; hence, he expunges the comma after *σάρκι* in Rom. viii. 9 (inserted by Erasmus, Text. Rec., Knapp, Stier, etc., but not by Lach., Tisch., etc.), while the Vulg., Germ., Engl., and French versions introduce it. As the principles which regulate the use of the comma are still somewhat unsettled, Winer expresses the wish that a "half-comma" were in existence, which would precisely suit cases like Luke xvi. 10 (after "least" ; see his Gram. § 7, 2). In this passage, which Winer instances in reference to the Greek, the earlier editions of the American Bible Society introduced, in the English translation, a comma in both cases after "least," while the more recent editions uniformly omit both commas. The British editions exhibit the same uncertainty.

Finally, while Winer remarks that a translator ought not to obtrude on the reader his exegetical views by means of his marks of punctuation, he also says, with equal truth, that cases occur in which a colon, a period, or a note of interrogation *must* be inserted, while the precise place in which such a mark is found, will necessarily decide the exegesis of the passage. He refers, as an illustration, to John vii. 21, 22, where an editor is compelled to declare his opinion, whether he agrees with Chrysostom and some other church Fathers and also modern commentators in exhibiting *διὰ τοῦτο* as the commencement of v. 22, or with Theophylact and many modern editors and commentators in presenting these two words as the conclusion of v. 21. The position assigned to them materially influences the interpretation.

The importance of the punctuation of the New Testament,

not only in an homiletical, but also in an exegetical respect, may be further illustrated by a case furnished by the English version. In Matt. xix. 28 the Lord assures his disciples that "in the regeneration" when he shall sit, etc., then they who had followed him should also sit, etc. The earlier editions of the American Bible Society (e.g. the 8vo. Reference Bible, 1833; the 12mo. Reference Bible, 1853, etc.) exhibited a comma after "regeneration," and placed none after "followed me." The meaning plainly indicated by this pointing was, that the Lord spoke of his disciples as having already followed him in that regeneration which belonged to a distant future. The British editions seem to be free from this serious error. We owe it, doubtless, to the Committee of Revision, to which we shall afterwards refer, that now an intelligible and correct sense is expressed by the punctuation. The German version and the French of Osterwald give the true sense; but Martin's French version exhibits: "ye who have followed me in the regeneration."

One of the most striking illustrations of the necessity imposed on an editor of the Greek New Testament to indicate his exegetical views by the punctuation of a passage is furnished by John xiv. 2, the construction and punctuation of which even Stier, who rarely lacks confidence, regards (Discourses, etc. *ad loc.*) as very difficult. The English version implies that it places a full stop between *ὑμῖν* and *πορεύομαι*. The objection to this punctuation, which Knapp sanctions, is, among others (see Stier, Lange, etc.), that if there are (*εἰσω*) many mansions, the act of going to prepare a place that is already prepared, seems to be unnecessary. The German version places a colon (indicating that *words quoted* follow) after *εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν*, and the verse appears thus: "If it were not so, then I would say to you: 'I go to prepare the place for you.'" The objection to this punctuation, as urged by Meyer, is, that in the next verse the Lord appears to say that he does or will go. Lange endeavors to avoid all these difficulties by placing a note of interrogation at the end of v. 2, and translates: "If it were not so, would I then

have said (*ὅτι*) ‘I go to prepare a place for you?’” Alford, in accordance with A. B. C. D. K. L. X. (to which Cod. Sin. may now be added), Vulgate, etc., inserts *ὅτι* before *πορεύομαι*, like Lach. and Tisch., and regards this word as the conjunction “because, for,” and not as the frequent *ὅτι recitantis*, which is equivalent to a mark of quotation.

A similar difficulty occurs in John xiii. 34. The English version places a semicolon after the first “another,” which throws some obscurity on “that” (*ὅνα*) in the last clause. The German version introduces only commas, and renders the second *ὅνα*, *so that*. By placing a semicolon before this word, that is, after *ὑμᾶς*, the sense would be obtained: I give you a new commandment, in order that ye may love one another even as (*καθώς*) I have loved you; so that (*ὅνα ecclastic*, Rob. Lex. p. 352), as the result, ye too (emphatically, *καὶ ὑμεῖς*) may love one another indeed — with an ardent and disinterested love like mine. — Three different modes of pointing John i. 3, 4, have frequently been noticed; see Reuss, *Gesch. de h. S. N. Test.* § 376 for this case, as well as others. Horne also (*Introd.* i. 214 n. 9) refers to it. See also 1 Cor. iii. 18; John xiii. 30, 31; 1 Cor. vii. 34. The last passage has led to a surprising variety of opinions, with regard both to the reading and the punctuation; the efforts of recent commentators to adjust these two have not yet produced a satisfactory result.

We shall add only one other case before we proceed, as it is well adapted to demonstrate not only that an homiletical, but also a grave doctrinal, interest may be connected with the punctuation of a passage. Some early interpreters whom Theophylact rebukes, connected, in Luke xxiii. 43, with *λέγω σοι* the adverb *σήμερον*, that is, virtually placed a comma after that word. Doctrinal considerations, very different in their nature, induced Roman Catholics in some instances, Socinians, and others to adopt the same course, which, as Alford says, is “surely something worse than silly,” and which even Kuinoel regards as furnishing a “frigid” sense, namely: “I say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be with me in paradise.”

The English, German, and French versions alike assume that a comma at least, if not a colon, should separate σοι from σήμερον, and, doubtless, few would now be inclined to expose their doctrinal and exegetical reputation to danger, by adopting any other punctuation and interpretation.

MATTHEW CAREY'S RESEARCHES.

This well-known Philadelphia publisher of a former day presented to the public an edition of the English Bible in 1801, in quarto form. He states, in a series of letters which he published many years afterwards (Letter xi.), that, in accordance with arrangements which he had made, eighteen different British editions were collated by his proof-readers, besides two others published in this country by I. Collins and I. Thomas. The discoveries which were made of errors and discrepancies in the several texts surprised and embarrassed him; he found, for instance, that the Oxford, Cambridge, London, etc. editions exhibited Luke xxiii. 32 thus: "And there were also two other malefactors, led with him," etc. This construction implied that Jesus also was a malefactor. Bagster (e.g. London, 1826) correctly points: "two others, malefactors, led" etc.; the American Bible Society exhibits the latter reading and punctuation. The Queen's printers, in their edition of 1859, which was intended for the British and Foreign Bible Society, retain the earlier form "other," but place "malefactors" between commas. Alford, in a note on this passage, by an oversight, says that a comma is usually placed after *two* in the English version. Just as the original indicated that *κακούργοι* should be interpreted as if placed between commas, so too in Luke x. 1, the word *ἐβδομήκοντα* should be understood. The present version: "appointed other seventy also" implies that the Lord had previously appointed a company likewise consisting of seventy, whereas Luke alludes by *καὶ ἑτέροις* to chap. ix. 1, where the twelve are called and commissioned; now, he proceeds, the Lord appointed also others (namely), seventy, etc.

Many changes, not only in the marginal matter of the English version of 1611, but also in the text, were gradually introduced. In 1769, for instance, Dr. Blaney dropped the article in the clause: "He casteth out the devils," etc. (Matt. ix. 34), and his example has been followed by all the later editors. In Matt. xii. 23 the word "not" was not found in any edition printed before 1660. In the same year the important change of "none" for "no man" (Mark x. 18) was made; the latter, which is not a strictly literal translation of *οὐδεὶς*, seemed to imply that God was a man. While important verbal changes of the text of 1611 were thus occasionally made, it is not surprising that the original punctuation was also altered to a certain extent. The revision of it constituted a part of the task assigned to Dr. Blaney; but later editors or printers, intentionally or unintentionally, introduced new variations. Mr. Carey incidentally remarks that Gen. xxvi. 8 had eight commas in the Edinburgh, six in the Oxford, and only three in the Cambridge and London editions which he collated.

THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY'S COMMITTEE ON VERSIONS.

The Society assigned to this Committee, in 1847, the work of collating the editions of the English Bible which it had published with those issued in Great Britain. The Committee subsequently presented a Report which was adopted in 1851, and published; it furnishes very valuable information. Five changes in the punctuation, affecting the sense, were made by the Committee, and adopted in a new edition (see Report, p. 25). In Rom. iv. 1 the comma after "flesh" was removed; but it has since been restored, to the manifest injury of the true sense. The German version and the French of Martin, agree with the Committee in translating: "hath found as pertaining to the flesh," and Stuart, Olshausen, etc., adopt the same construction. But Ostervald (French), whom other interpreters sustain (see Lange, *Bibelwerk*, *ad loc.*) translates: "our father according to the flesh"—In 1 Cor. xvi. 22, a period (now a comma) was inserted after

“Anathema.”—In 2 Cor. x. 8–11, an important change, affecting the exegesis of the passage, was made; but later editions conform to the earlier and less accurate punctuation. In Heb. xiii. 7 a period was substituted for the colon at the end of the verse, and it has been retained; in some editions a comma had been employed.—In Rev. xiii. 8 a comma was inserted by the Committee after “slain,” which has since been cancelled. Here, too, an exegetical question is involved; it is obvious, however, from chapter xvii. 8, where precisely the same expressions occur in the original, that the words “from the foundation of the world,” belong to “written” (as Ostervald understands the passage) and, not to “slain” (which is Martin’s view); the recent editions of the Society do not seem to have gained in accuracy by expunging the comma which the Committee had placed after “slain.”

The Society’s Committee on Versions were embarrassed by another exegetical problem, in exhibiting the text to the eye, which they could not possibly solve to the satisfaction of all critics—a problem, however, unknown to German critics, in whose language all nouns, when written or printed, must begin with a capital letter. The English version seems to have originally followed the rule of printing the word “spirit” with a capital, “when it refers to the Spirit of God a divine agent,” but with a small initial letter “when it denotes other spiritual beings or the spirit of man”; and the Committee on Versions re-adopted this rule (see Report, p. 24). It compels the editor to decide exegetically, in certain cases in which commentators widely differ, whether *πνεῦμα* means the Spirit of God or another spirit. Now even the British editions did not exhibit uniformity in the application of the principle. Bagster prints (1826) “My Spirit” in Gen vi. 3, whereas the British and Foreign Bible Society (1859) exhibits: “My spirit.” The American Bible Society appears to recognize the principle in all of its editions. By a singular inconsistency, or through ignorance or neglect of the rule, Bagster and the British and Foreign Bible

Society exhibit in Rev. iv. 5, "seven Spirits of God." The American Bible Society had here adopted the same capital letter in its earlier editions, but printed "spirits" in the Committee's edition of 1853. It has now returned to the early practice, and represents the "seven lamps" as being "the seven Spirits of God." The same rule was adopted by the French; hence the latter, like the English, employ a capital in Acts ii. 17. But in John iii. 5, 6, 8, the English version and Ostervald teach that the Spirit of God is meant; while Martin (also published by the Society) holds that "another spirit" is meant, by exhibiting "esprit."

If editors or printers will insist on adopting the rule of employing a capital only when the word "Spirit" designates one of the Persons of the Trinity, they will, doubtless, be sustained by orthodox interpreters in their interpretation of many passages, such as John vii. 39; Acts viii. 29; Rom. viii. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 10; xii. 4; Gal. v. 22, as well as when they exhibit "spirit," for instance, in Luke viii. 55; 1 John iv. 1, and elsewhere. But very grave questions are involved in other cases. In Heb. ix. 14, is *πνεύματος αἰωνίου* the Holy Ghost, as our English version, possibly influenced by the reading *ἀγίου* for *αἰωνίου* (adopted by the Vulgate. — "sanctum") positively decides by the capital (Spirit), sustained at present by Bleek, Bengel, Tholuck, etc., or does the phrase mean the "celestial life" of Christ (Storr, Olsh.), or his "spirit of absolute love" (Ebrard), or the "divine nature of Christ" (Beza, Calov., etc.), or something else? Stuart hesitates, but is "rather inclined to believe" that the sacred writer meant a "divine influence," and not "the divine Spirit" (see his Commentary on Heb. *ad loc.* and on Rom. i. 4). In 2 Thess. ii. 2, does *πνεύματος* refer to the Holy Ghost, which our English translators deny ("spirit"), or is it to be understood of a "pretended inspiration" (Auberlen, Lange's *Bibelwerk*), or of the *charisma* styled the "gift of prophecy" (Olsh., Lünemann, in Meyer's Commentary, de Wette, Grotius, Bengel)? Ostervald, "inspiration"; Martin, "esprit." — In 1 Tim. iii. 16, was our Saviour

justified "in the Spirit," that is, in the Holy Ghost, as our English Bibles positively decide, or is *πνεύματι* not the Divine Spirit, but rather antithetic to *σαρκί* (Bengel, Olsh., Wiesinger, "Christ's divine nature"), or does it mean "divine miracles" (Grotius), or his "indwelling spirit" (Oosterzee, Lange's *Bibelwerk*), or "spirituali virtute" (Calvin)? Ostervald has "Esprit." Martin explains the passage differently by exhibiting "esprit."

In Jude 19, is the *πνεῦμα* which the mockers had not, the Holy Ghost, as our English Bibles teach (Spirit), with which interpretation de Wette agrees, or is it "that higher life of the soul which is wrought by the Spirit" (Huther, Meyer's Commentary), or "a rational spirit or mind," which they do not possess (Stier, Fronm., in Lange's *Bibelwerk*), or "soul" (Bengel)? Ostervald translates: "rien de spirituel," while Martin decides that the Holy Ghost is meant: "l'Esprit." — In James iv. 5 is the "spirit that dwelleth in us (and) lusteth to envy" the Holy Ghost, which the English Bible denies, but which Calovius, Wiesinger (cont. of Olsh.) and others affirm, or is it the "human mind" (Grotius), or "the soul" (Oecumenius), or "the human spirit"? Ostervald's punctuation differs widely from that of the English version, and, besides, exhibits here "Esprit," and Martin agrees with him. — In Rom. i. 4 is the "Spirit of holiness" the Holy Ghost, as some of the British editions maintain with those of the American Bible Society (with the exception of the editions published according to the directions of the Committee on Versions), and with Chrysostom, Lange, etc., which is denied by Olsh., Stuart, etc., or is it the "divine nature of Christ" (Clem. Rom.), or the "spirit which animated" him, as contradistinguished from the spirit which ordinarily governs men, or the "gifts of the Spirit" which he possessed, or the "spiritual aspect of the life of Christ" (de Wette), or are *κατὰ σάρκα* (v. 3) and *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγλασύνης* antithetical expressions? Ostervald and Martin agree (in opposition to the recent editions of the English versions) in denying that the Holy Ghost is meant, for they exhibit "esprit."

Our English version and the two French uniformly exhibit "spirit" in 1 Cor. xv. 45. But commentators differ respecting the meaning of *πνεῦμα*. Does the word indicate Christ's divine nature (Beza), or his human nature (Calov.), or something else? (See de Wette, etc. *ad loc.*).—In 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, the word *πνεῦμα* occurs thrice. In all these cases our English version and the two French decide, in opposition to the exegesis of eminent theologians, that *πνεῦμα* is the Holy Ghost, although our translators were embarrassed by the two genitives at the close of the passage. They exhibit: "the Spirit of the Lord" in the text, but in the margin: "the Lord of the Spirit." Calvin believes that the apostle here alludes to the "spirit" mentioned in v. 6; in that case, the general rule would require that the word should in all these cases (vs. 6, 17, 18) be printed alike.—In 1 Peter iii. 18, the English and the two French versions decide by the capital letter (Spirit — Esprit) that Christ was quickened by the Holy Ghost, whereas earlier and later commentators of the highest distinction regard *σαρκί* and *πνεύματι* as anti-thetic terms, in which there is no reference to the Holy Ghost.

While the English New Testament expresses its exegesis by the types in these cases, it occasions in others great perplexity. For instance, it agrees with most commentators in explaining in Matt. iv. 1, in accordance with Luke iv. 1 (in which there is an unfortunate introduction of two different words, an Anglo-Saxon and a Latin — *Ghost* and *Spirit*, for the one Greek *πνεῦμα*), that the "Spirit" is the Holy Ghost, but denies, in Matt. xxii. 43 ("spirit") that David at the time spoke by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, although such is usually the explanation of orthodox commentators; see Lange's Commentary *ad loc.* (English translation), and Dr. Schaff's note 7, page 402. Ostervald and Martin exhibit a capital letter in both passages, and employ the same word, like the German (Esprit — Geist).—So, too, in Acts vi. 10, and xx. 22, commentators are by no means agreed as to the interpretation (see Lechler, Lange's *Bibelwerk*, *ad loc.*).—In Acts xviii. 5, even the reading of the *Textus Receptus* is

doubtful, or rather, incorrect. It is not surprising that in such cases the printed editions of the Bible (British and American,— English and French) should exhibit great variations, and even inconsistencies. An important doctrine is, to a certain extent, here involved, or at least certain important facts connected with the Holy Ghost are affirmed or denied by the employment or non-employment of the capital letter. We hence ask the question: Would it be expedient, in view of the imperative rule, that the Bible should be printed “without note or comment,” to print in Greek all words like *θεός, πνεῦμα*, etc. without capital letters (which is often done), and in modern languages to employ no capital letter in any case for “spirit”?

In the remarks which we now propose to make, we shall confine ourselves chiefly to two marks of punctuation; viz. the note of interrogation and the comma. The great diversity which these respectively exhibit, not only in different versions of the New Testament, but also in different editions of the same version, and the very different interpretation which they indicate, show very clearly the vast responsibility which an editor or commentator assumes, even in matters of punctuation.

ACCENTUATION, ETC.

The subject of punctuation furnishes such a large amount of materials for this Article that we cannot discuss that of the *accentuation* of the Greek New Testament. Should the editor, for instance, in Rom. ii. 22; Gal. v. 2, exhibit ἴδε or ἰδέ? Is the word in all cases a verb in the imperative, or is it merely a particle of exclamation, or do both cases occur? In John v. 39 *ἔρευnäte*, whether it, as an indicative, states a fact (Ye search), or, as an imperative, contains a command (Search ye), is accented alike. But in 1 Cor. iii. 14, is the reading *μένει* (pres. tense), as Chrys., Theod., Olsh., etc., and modern versions assume, or is it *μενεί* (fut. tense), as Vulg., Griesb., Lachm., Tisch., Knapp, de Wette, Kling (Lange's Bibelwerk) assume? The latter seems to conform

to *κατακαίσεται* (v. 15). Thus, too, in John vii. 34, 36, does the Saviour say "I am" (*εἰμι*, Vulg., Text. Rec., Erasm., Germ., Engl., French: *serai*, de Wette, Knapp, Stier, Lange (Bibelwerk), Olsh.), or "I go" (*εἶμι*, Theophyl., H. Steph., Beza, Bengel, etc.)? Various other cases in which an editor of the Greek New Testament must decide such exegetical questions, we omit.

It had been usual in the earlier (Erasmian, etc.) editions of the Greek New Testament to insert a Greek colon (a point at the top of the line) when the direct words of any person were immediately quoted. Winer seems disposed to retain this plan; for he remarks (Gram. § 7) that the innovation of Lachm. and Tisch., who cancel the colon, rarely insert a comma, and begin the quoted words with a capital letter (after the manner of the English version), is one for which he cannot find a sufficient reason. Knapp, Stier, etc. even insert marks of quotation (e.g. Matt. ii. 6; Acts ii. 17; Rom. x. 21; 2 Cor. vi. 2) in those cases in which words are quoted from the Old Testament, but not when the direct words of Christ, or of any one who lived in or after his day, are introduced after words like *saying*, *saieth*, *said*, etc. Is this system characterized by consistency, or is it not? Knapp, Stier, etc. even introduce the dash, e.g. before *μένει* in Heb. vii. 3, where the English version places a semicolon. These innovations only occasionally assume an exegetical character, such as is unquestionably the case in Acts xxiii. 9. The Vulgate here inserts a note of interrogation at the end of the verse; the Engl., Germ., and French versions exhibit the whole as an affirmation. But Knapp, as an editor and interpreter, explains that we have here a case of aposiopesis; for he prints: *ἡ ἄγγελος Πολλῆς δέ* etc., omitting the intervening *μὴ θεομαχῶμεν*. On the whole passage and this reading, see Lechler's Com. (Lange's Bibelwerk).

Reiske, in his Annotations on the oration of Demosthenes, *De Falsa Legat.*, speaks very sarcastically of the excessive fondness of the British editors of his day for the *dash*. In his note on *ὡς*, p. 364 (Orat. Attici, etc., edited by Dobson,

London, 1828, Vol. ix. 96), he says: "Conveniret huic particulae adjungi illam virgulam transversam, quam nostrates *einen Gedankenstrich* appellant, indicantem aposiopesin, seu auctorem plura cogitasse, quam prolocutum esse, eosque suos sensus lectori vestigandos atque supplendos reliquisse. In usum hujus virgulae *Britanni*, gens acris, aetate nostra ita *furiose excarsit*, ut loco verborum excusorum totas saepe paginas in eorum libris videas his virgulis obsitas, quibus profunditatem et ubertatem cogitationum eminentias, jejunitatem et paupertatem ingenii produunt."

The apostrophe, which is introduced in the text of the classic Greek writers for the purpose of avoiding an hiatus, more frequently than in the manuscripts of the New Testament and the Septuagint, does not affect the sense. The same remark applies to the crasis, to the form of *sigma* in compounds (e.g., *ὄσπερ, ὄσπερ*), and to the mere orthography (e.g., *λήμψομαι, λήψομαι*). The editor can here decide on the mode of printing, without reference to the exegesis of a passage. But there *is* a difference in the sense or shade of thought between the simple *αὐτοῦ* and the reflexive *αὐτοῦ*. Some editors and commentators have reached the conclusion that the writers of the New Testament were not acquainted with the latter contracted form, and therefore, when the force of that pronoun was to be expressed, employed the fuller form *ἐαυτοῦ*. Winer seems to have formed no definite opinion on this point at the date when the sixth edition of of his Grammar was published.

MODERN VERSIONS, ETC.

We may here remark that in this Article we usually quote from the Greek New Testament, which constitutes the last volume of Stier and Theile's Polyglot Bible. It is imported as an independent volume in two styles. Both contain the Latin, Greek, and German texts, with various readings. In the fourth column, one of the styles presents the English version; the other exhibits, in place of it, the cases in which the German translations made by de Wette

and others differ from that of Luther. The fourth edition (1863) contains an appendix which furnishes the *variae lectiones* of Codex Sinaiticus.

Luther's German version of the New Testament appeared in 1522. The normal edition of the whole Bible, which corresponds in rank, authority, and general use, to the English "authorized version," was that which, after numerous corrections had been made in the earlier editions, appeared in 1545. The authorized English (King James's) version was first published in 1611. A French translation of the Bible had appeared at an early period (the whole Bible in 1530), which was ascribed to Jacques le Fèvre, that is, J. Faber, surnamed Stapulensis, from Etaples, near Boulogne. He was, however, persecuted by the Papists; his work was suppressed, and very few copies are now known to exist. Much obscurity still attends the history of this translation, although Prof. Reuss, who is distinguished for the ability and success with which he conducts such investigations, has probably devoted more time and attention to it than any recent writer. (See his *Gesch. d. h. S. N. Test.* §§ 473, 474, 486, and especially his Article in Herzog's *Encyk.* Vol. xiii., entitled *Romanische Bibelübersetzungen*).

It was a cousin of Calvin, named Peter Robert Olivetan, who furnished the French Reformed church with a translation of the Bible. Reuss remarks that it was quite imperfect; that the translator devoted only one year to the preparation of it; that it had been repeatedly revised by others, including Calvin himself; that, while it had received the sanction of the Reformed church in France, it had been often altered and corrected; and that, nevertheless, it at no time exhibited a text which could be regarded as normal and as equal to the just demands of modern philology.

As we shall have frequent occasion below to refer to *two* revisions, we add the following details: Olivetan's version was first published in 1535, at the expense of the Waldenscs, although their dialect at that time differed from the French. Very few copies of this French Protestant version, or of the

earliest reprints of 1540 and 1541 have been preserved. Calvin's revision of 1545 was somewhat hastily performed. Beza devoted more time to the same work, substituted a new version of the Psalms, made by L. Budé, appended the Apocrypha, and published the whole in 1551.¹ The entire translation was revised and published in subsequent years, although even the editions prepared by the *Vénérable Compagnie* of Geneva exhibited many defects. Two² of these revisions of the old translation have been selected by our American Bible Society. The first is that of David Martin, whose revision of the New Testament first appeared in 1695 (the whole Bible in 1707). Our Bible Society furnishes it in a neat pocket edition. It exhibits very little resemblance to Calvin's old version, says Prof. Reuss, whose statement is at once confirmed by a comparison of the two texts; it is, nevertheless, a revision of it. Several Bible Societies in Europe circulate this text. The other is that of J. F. Ostervald (Ostervald, according to the orthography of German writers, e.g. Herzog, Encyk. x. 730). It first appeared in 1744. He had previously, in 1724, published a revision of the last Geneva revision. His more original work, nevertheless, takes that of Martin as the basis. Reuss remarks that Ostervald attempted to modernize the antiquated French of former revisions, but laments that his work is inferior to

¹ Our own copy, of the year 1553 is complete, except that the title-page of the Old Testament is wanting. It is a folio. The title-page of the New Testament exhibits in the old orthography the following, very near the top: "Le Nouveau Testament, c'est a dire, La nouvelle alliance de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ." A large tree is exhibited on the middle of the page. A man stands under it with his right hand pointing upwards, and from his mouth proceed the words: "Noli altum sapere." Below are the words: "L'Oliue de Robert Estienne. MDLIII."

² A French New Testament was printed by A. Paul in New York in the year 1826, at the expense (*aux frais*, as the title-page informs us) of the American Bible Society. It does not, like the later editions, which specify respectively the names of Martin and Ostervald, mention any editor's name; but simply states in French that it is a reprint of the Paris edition of 1805. On comparing it with the more recent editions, we find that the text is that of Ostervald's version, with a few unimportant variations.

that of Martin in strength, and does not seem to regard it very favorably in reference to style and accuracy. The French Bible Societies circulate almost exclusively this revision; and this fact probably furnishes the correct explanation of the circumstance that when Frenchmen apply at our depositories for Bibles they generally, as we are informed, prefer Ostervald to Martin. Our Bible Society has chosen the revision of the former for the volume which exhibits the French and English New Testament in parallel columns. The truth is, as Professor Reuss clearly shows, that the French Protestants do not, like their German and English brethren, possess a standard or national translation, or one that is officially sanctioned. So that the American Bible Society is not justly subjected to any reproach for publishing two distinct French texts. It is, on the contrary, entitled to our thanks that it does not reprint a later revision, or rather translation, proceeding from Geneva, which is by no means characterized by fidelity to the original. It is undoubtedly an awkward circumstance that the Society circulates two French texts, which, verbally at least, widely differ. Ostervald's revision certainly possesses merit; still, we trust that, under present circumstances, the Society will not yet accede to the request which has already been made, that the printing and circulation of Martin's revision should be discontinued.

THE NOTE OF INTERROGATION.

Matt. xxvi. 45. "Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand," etc. English version, Martin's, Lachm., Tisch., Winer, Lange, Alford. This punctuation indicates a kind permission. — "Will ye now sleep and take your rest?" German version, Ostervald's, Knapp, Stier (Gr. Test., but not in his "Discourses," etc. *ad loc.*). This punctuation indicates a reproof.

Luke iv. 34. "Art thou come to destroy us?" English and both French versions, Oosterzee (Lange's *Bibelwerk*); Lachm., Tisch. — "Thou art come to destroy us." German version, Alford, Stier, de Wetze, Knapp.

Luke ix. 55. "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." English and both French versions; Alford, with some hesitation. The sense, according to this punctuation, might be thus stated: Ye know not that a spirit of revenge, or an unforgiving spirit, influences you.—"Know ye not what manner of spirit ye are of?" German version, Oosterzee, de Wette, Stier, Knapp. The sense now might be: Know ye not, or, Do ye forget, that the spirit of the gospel is one of forgiveness? Lachm. and Tisch. omit the words altogether, on manuscript authority.

Luke xviii. 6. "Hear (*ἀκούσατε*) what the unjust judge saith." The four versions. "Have ye heard what?" etc. de Wette and others.

John i. 50. "Because I said believest thou?" English version, de Wette, Lach., Tisch., Knapp, Alford, with some hesitation. — "Thou believest, because I said," etc. German and both French versions, Stier. Lange says: "Not, properly speaking, a question, but an expression of wonder."

John ix. 27. "I have told you already, and ye did not hear." English, Alford, de Wette, Martin's French. — "I have told you already, (and) have ye not heard it?" German; Lange, Ostervald's French.

John xii. 27. "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour." English and both French versions; Calvin, Lücke, Meyer, de Wette, Stier (in his Discourses, etc.), Tisch., Alford. (This punctuation exhibits the Lord in a state of perplexity; he first prays that he may be saved from this hour; but then he immediately corrects himself on recollecting that he had come for this cause).— "And what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause," etc. German; Knapp, Schott, Lachm., Tholuck, Lange. (This punctuation, which differs from the former essentially only in placing a note of interrogation instead of a colon after *ταύτης*, implies the following: Shall I pray to the Father to save me, etc.? No; for this was the purpose for which I came).

Acts xiii. 35. "Whom think ye that I am? I am not he." English and both French, with various editors and commentators.—"I am not he whom ye suppose me to be." German, with another series of editors and commentators. Winer (Gram. § 25, 1) does not positively decide as to the superior claims of either mode of pointing.

Rom. ii. 21-23. In these three verses the English version exhibits five notes of interrogation; de Wette believes that this punctuation adds to the strength of each sentence. The German introduces no note of interrogation, but exhibits the three verses as containing five affirmative sentences; Knapp approves of this mode, but Stuart regards it as "a disadvantage to the sense." Ostervald (French) introduces five notes of exclamation, while Martin places a note of interrogation after the first sentence, and full stops in the other four cases. Lange, sustained by Meyer, exhibits the first four sentences as questions, but in the fifth case places a full stop, regarding v. 23 as an affirmative proposition—"a categorical accusation." How did Paul mean to be understood?

2 Cor. xii. 15. "Nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile." English; so, too, both French versions, Kling (Lange's Bibelwerk).—"But, because I was crafty, have I caught you with guile?" So some editions of the German; others (Stier) place the exclamation point at the end, expressing Paul's grief that such a charge should be made; others, again, e.g. Teubner, whose editions claim to be very accurate, places, like the English, a full stop at the end. But does not the note of interrogation accord best with the animation with which the apostle speaks? Knapp is peculiar: *ἔλαβον* *Μή*.

Heb. ix. 17. This passage is very differently explained by commentators, as some take *διαθήκη* in the ordinary sense of *covenant* (the Greek church Fathers, many Reformed interpreters, Grotius, Tholuck, etc.; see especially Ebrard, continuation of Olsh.). Others assign to the word the unusual meaning of *testament* (Engl., Germ., French, Vulg.,

Chrysost.). Lachmann places a note of interrogation at the end of v. 17, implying that the words *ἐπεὶ . . . διαθέμενος* constitute a question; he is sustained by eminent authorities (see Moll, Lange's *Bibelwerk*, *ad loc.*); but even this punctuation does not, of itself, furnish a solution of the exegetical problem.

Heb. x. 2. "For then would they not have ceased to be offered?" English version, Stuart. — "Otherwise the sacrificing would have ceased, etc." German and Ostervald's French version. Martin exhibits the entire verse as constituting a question, and this punctuation has been adopted by Knapp, Lachm., and many editors; Moll (Lange's *Bibelwerk*). In this case the reading is adopted according to which *οὐκ* is inserted between *ἐπεὶ* and *ἄν* (which is now generally conceded to be the genuine reading), and the whole assumes the form of a question.

Heb. xii. 5. The whole verse appears in the modern versions as an affirmative proposition ("Ye have forgotten," etc.), conveying a serious rebuke. But Calvin, Lachm., Tholuck, Stuart, etc. (but not Knapp) prefer the punctuation according to which a note of interrogation is affixed to the whole, thus softening the rebuke by representing the sacred writer as asking, not in indignation, but in sorrow: "And have ye forgotten?" etc.

Heb. xiii. 6. "I will not fear what man shall do unto me." English and the two French versions. — "And I will not fear; what should man do unto me?" German version. This punctuation, which exhibits more animation in the language of the speaker than the former, inserts a colon, if not a period, after *φοβηθήσομαι*, which the English version does not adopt. The original Hebrew (Ps. cxviii. 6) is rendered in the English Bible: "I will not fear; what can man do unto me?" but in Ps. liv. 4, 11 this version drops the note of interrogation, whereas Dr. J. A. Alexander (Commentary on the Psalms) prefers the interrogative form in the three cases. Stuart had already chosen the note of interrogation here, as in the German version, and this Erasmian punctuation is adopted by Knapp, Lachmann, de Wette, Ebrard, etc.

James ii. 4. "Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?" English and the two French versions. — The German version, which, in other respects also, differs from the English, exhibits the verse in an affirmative form: "Ye are become," etc. Lange (Bibelwerk) exhibits various interpretations when the negative particle *οὐ* is taken as in the German version affirmatively (with Knapp), and also several others, if the particle is taken interrogatively; he prefers the latter interpretation, and Wiesinger (continuation of Olsh.), who cancels *καί* before *οὐ* with A, B, C (to which may now be added Cod. Sin.), agrees with him. Winer (§ 30, 1, ult.; § 63, 1, ult.) is disposed to regard the verse as a "question of indignation"; but, if vs. 2-4 constitute the protasis beginning with *ἐάν*, then, as in 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4 (which he explains, § 64, 7, in the sense of the English version, which supplies in italics the words: *that day shall not come*), the apodosis is omitted, and the note of interrogation is inappropriate. Recent commentators agree with de Wette that the note of interrogation adds to the force of the passage. Other exegetical difficulties connected with this passage are independent of the punctuation.

James ii. 6. "But ye have despised the poor." All the versions interrupt the series of questions by placing a colon or period after *πτωχόν*. A note of interrogation in place of it would, as some believe, materially add to the concinnity of the passage.

James iii. 14. "But if hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth." English, German, and the two French versions. Winer remarks (§ 57, 3, with which comp. § 55, 7, and § 54, 2, note 4) that some (Griesbach), with whom, however, he does not agree, have taken *μή* before *κατακαυχᾶσθε* in the sense of *nonne*—"Do ye not (then) glory, and lie against the truth?" Editors generally, with de Wette, Wiesinger, Lange, etc. decidedly sustain the categorical or affirmative form.

The instances which we have now adduced, and to which others could be added, seem to furnish the following result:

The sense of a passage may gain or lose in vivacity, directness, power, and emphasis, in accordance with the punctuation (note of interrogation, or a comma, colon, etc.); but it is not, as a necessary consequence, essentially altered. The chief interest attaching to these cases is of an homiletical rather than of an exegetical nature. The preacher may find that one mode of punctuation will suggest thoughts for a sermon, which could not always be justified by another.

THE COMMA.

The circumstances are, however, widely different when we investigate the use, or the effect of the presence and the position of the comma. In such cases the interpretation is sometimes very materially affected. We propose to illustrate this point (to which Trench has not adverted in his admirable treatise on *The Authorized Version of the New Testament*, etc.), by adducing a number of cases furnished by the Epistles; and shall again compare the punctuation of the English, German, and two French versions.

Rom. xi. 13. The punctuation of the English version, of Erasmus (Greek and Latin), and of the *Textus Receptus*, that is, three commas, embarrasses the reader. Does Paul speak to the Gentiles, because he is the apostle of the Gentiles (which would be the first impression made on the mind of the reader by the repetition of the word "Gentiles"), or does he magnify his office, because he is the apostle of the Gentiles? Even in some German editions (Stier's, for instance, but not Teubner's) the same uncertainty is occasioned by the punctuation. In other German editions a semicolon precedes "inasmuch as (denn dieweil)," and in the Greek text of Stier, Knapp, Lachm., Tisch.; in accordance with this interpretation a colon is placed after *ἐνεωκ*. The sense is then perfectly clear; i.e. Paul magnifies his office because he is the apostle of the Gentiles. Martin unequivocally adopts this exegesis, by both pointing and translating in accordance with it. Ostervald, whose translation differs considerably from that of Martin, as far as the

mere words are concerned, appears to take the same view; but as he employs only commas, his version is nearly as indefinite as the English. Stuart very decidedly concurs with the latter view, by even placing "inasmuch as office" in a parenthesis. Such, too, is the opinion of de Wette and Lange. Olshausen, who adopts the same view connects, however, in his Commentary and translation, the conclusion of v. 13 with v. 14, more closely than the English version, by placing simply a comma at the end of the former verse, and thus expressing more distinctly Paul's object in magnifying his office as the apostle of the Gentiles.

1 Cor. vii. 34. The punctuation of the English, German, and Ostervald's French version is the same; the sentence begins with *Μετέπειτα* (Textus Receptus; Erasmus, vs. 33). But the Vulgate and Martin's French version connect that word (prefixing *καί*, with some manuscripts) with the foregoing verse. Various readings, different admissible modes of placing the points, and other internal difficulties, have combined to convert this passage into a *crux criticorum*. A summary of the conflicting views of editors and commentators may be found in Kling's (Lange's Bibelwerk) Commentary.

Gal. ii. 20. The punctuation, and consequently the sense also, of this important passage, which is designed to give a view of the believer's Christian life, are encumbered with difficulties. The English version is the following: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh," etc. — The German version (Stier, Teubner, etc.) appears in the following form: (v. 19) "I am crucified with Christ. (v. 20) But I live; yet now not I, but Christ liveth in me. For the life which I now live in the flesh," etc. Stier's Greek text exhibits the following: (v. 19) "I am crucified with Christ. (v. 20) But no longer do I (*οὐκέτι*) live, but Christ liveth in me. But the life which I now live in the flesh," etc. Ostervald: "I am crucified with Christ, and I live, no longer I myself, but Christ liveth in me," etc.

Martin: "I am crucified with Christ, and I live, not however I, but Christ liveth," etc. — Schmoller (Lange's Bibelwerk): "I am crucified with Christ. But I do not live unto myself, but much rather (vielmehr) Christ liveth in me," etc. Ought a comma to be placed after *ζῶ δέ*, separating these words from *οὐκέτι*, with Beza, Knapp, etc., or with others, be omitted? The editor must decide, and thus determine the shade of thought which Paul intended to express.

Eph. vi. 6, 7. Two questions here arise. First, do the words *ἐκ ψυχῆς* belong to *ποιῶντες* or to *δουλοῦντες*? Secondly, do the words *μετ' εὐνοίας* belong to the former or the latter participle? The English, German, and two French versions concur in connecting *ποιῶντες* with *ἐκ ψυχῆς*; they exhibit: "doing from the heart." As to the latter question, the English and the two French versions assign *μετ' εὐνοίας* to the second participle: "with good will doing service." The German, in accordance with the interpretation of Theophylact, assigns *μετ' εὐνοίας* also to the first participle: "doing the will of God from the heart, with good will." Lachmann's and Knapp's punctuation, in accordance with the interpretation of Chrysostom, assigns both *ἐκ ψυχῆς* and *μετ' εὐνοίας* to the second participle, so that the translation would be: "from the heart with good will doing service, as to," etc. This is also the view which Harless and de Wette take of the case.

Col. i. 3. "We give thanks Christ, praying always for you." The English, German, and both French versions (with Chrysostom, Calvin, etc.) connect *πάντοτε* with *προσευχόμενοι*, and so Olsh. understands the passage. Others, however, place a comma before *προσευχόμενοι*, or as Knapp does, immediately after *πάντοτε*, and connect this adverb with *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* (to which there is an analogy in Eph. i. 16). The passages 1 Cor. i. 4 and 2 Thess. i. 3 demonstrate, in the opinion of de Wette (who enumerates many commentators entertaining the opposite view), that *πάντοτε* can belong only to *εὐχαριστοῦμεν*. In that case the translation should be: "we give thanks always to," etc. A similar case occurs in

Philem. 4. Here the modern versions connect closely πάντοτε with the two following words, whereas recent editors and commentators place a comma after πάντοτε, according to which the translation would be: "I thank my God always, making mention," etc. Even if no fundamental doctrine is endangered by either mode of punctuation, it would still be desirable to know with precision which one of two facts Paul really intended to state. The exegetical instinct of the editor may here decide for him.

Col. ii. 14. "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took," etc. English version. The German is as follows: "And blotted out the handwriting, that was against us, which arose through ordinances and was contrary to us," etc. There is here less conformity to the Vulgate than the English exhibits. Martin, whose revision Ostervald adopts, with two non-essential alterations, translates thus (as far as we can reproduce the French in English words): "Having effaced the obligation which was against us, which consisted in the (Ostervald: *des* for Martin's *les*) ordinances, and was contrary to us," etc. The English version is exposed to the objection that it apparently charges Paul with a tautology ("that was against us, which was contrary to us"), which he is always very careful to avoid. The whole difficulty may be removed, as Olshausen believes, by placing a comma after χειρόγραφον, introducing τοῖς δόγμα. as an exegetical parenthesis, and translating thus: "Blotting out the handwriting that was against us (which was, in consequence of its ordinances, opposed to us), and took," etc. But others adduce very serious objections to this punctuation. The English translation takes τοῖς δόγμασιν as equivalent to a genitive, assuming that the preposition ἐν prefixed before it without manuscript authority (σύν in one minuscule; in in some Latin church Fathers), gives this dative the force of "consisting of," which is, however, regarded by some as inadmissible. No explanation, of the many which commentators suggest who omit the comma

after *χειρόν.*, is free from the objection that it obtrudes on the passage a grammatically harsh construction. Here, too, an editor decides to a certain extent as to the exact exegesis, by the position which he assigns to the comma.

Col. ii. 21–23. A grave question is here presented, which the punctuation of the editor is required to answer. The words in v. 21 are confessedly those of false teachers. But is it Paul who expresses his own thought in the words, “which all are to perish with the using,” or are these latter words, as the parenthetical mark in the English version after “using” implies, the continuation of the words of the false teachers? The German and the two French versions omit the parenthetical marks altogether; the German, however, introduces v. 21 with the words supplied, “die da sagen”; Martin supplies “Savoir”; Ostervald, “en vous disant.” The words “which using” (v. 22) are regarded by many (by Knapp, for instance, who inserts “Touch handle not” between marks of quotation) as those of Paul. He exposes (if this is the correct view) the folly of such prohibitions, by referring to the fact that the objects forbidden to be touched, tasted, and handled were made to be consumed, and thus to perish; that here the question of the salvation of the soul is not involved; and that, therefore, these Jewish prohibitions had no ethical foundation (Chrysostom, Luther, Olsh., etc.). One objection to this exegesis is the unusual sense which it assigns to *φθοράν*. Others (Ambrose, Augustine, Calvin, etc.) believe that Paul, to whom they also ascribe the words, intended to say that such “ordinances,” when used (obeyed), lead to destruction. In this case, the relative *ἃ* at the beginning of v. 22 refers to the prohibiting words. But as *ἀπόχρησις* seems to be used only in the sense of *abuse, misuse*, others, again, take v. 22 without any break by a parenthetical mark, but also as Paul’s words in the sense; All these things are morally ruinous by an abuse which the commandments and doctrines of men sanction (de Wette). But then, apparently, the relative *ἃ* could have no definite antecedent, and the prohib-

iting words *μὴ ἄψυγ*, etc. no object. Hence other interpreters include the words "which using" in the parenthesis, and suppose that the false teachers, to whom these words in that case belong, forbid not only the abuse, but even the use, of the objects to which they refer. Here, accordingly, the punctuation of the editor may absolutely decide whether the whole or only a part of the English parenthesis belongs to the false teachers.

Col. iii. 16. The English version indicates that it places a comma between *πνευματικαῖς* and *ἐν χάριτι*, and hence, attaching the latter to *ᾄδοντες*, translates: "spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." The German version, on the other hand, with Calvin and many others, places the comma only after *ἐν χάριτι*, and accordingly exhibits, "hymns and spiritual pleasing (*lieblichen*) songs, and sing to the Lord in your heart." Ostervald (French) differs from both versions. He translates, "spiritual songs, singing *from the bottom* (*du fond* in italics, as words supplied) of your hearts to the Lord, with thankfulness," for he so translates *ἐν χάριτι*, i.e. *avec reconnaissance*; and this is the definition which Robinson assigns to *χάρις* in this passage (*Lex. New Test. ad verb. no. 4, p. 779*). Wahl (*Lex. p. 511*) defines the word here, and in Eph. iv. 29, *venustus, suavitas* (Germ. *Anmuth*), etc., but also refers to Harless, who discusses the point elaborately in his Commentary, on Eph. iv. 29, and decidedly objects to such definitions. Martin seems undecided; he translates and points: "spiritual songs, with grace, singing from your heart to the Lord." The position of "avec grâce" between commas imposes the task on the reader to decide whether Paul's true meaning requires "with grace" to be connected with the words that precede, which is the impression which his version makes to some extent, or with those that follow. Knapp creates the same perplexity by an opposite course; for he omits the comma altogether.

1 Thess. ii. 13. "The word of God, which effectually worketh also in you," etc. English version. Although it

might at first seem uncertain whether the word "which" refers to "God," as in Matt. v. 9, or to "word," the comma after "God" appears to indicate that the translators connected *ὅς* with *λόγον* as the antecedent. This is very plainly the interpretation of Martin and Ostervald (la parole de Dieu, laquelle aussi agit, etc.). In this case a comma should, in the Greek, follow *θεοῦ*. This punctuation, with its corresponding exegesis, is adopted by Olsh., Winer (§ 38, 6, influenced by the Pauline *usus loquendi* of *ἐνεργεῖν*), Grotius, etc. The German version differs thus: "the word of God who (*welcher*, masculine, referring to 'Gott,' and not *welches*, neuter, as it is sometimes erroneously printed, referring to 'Wort,' a neuter noun) also worketh," etc. In this case no comma, if great precision is desired, ought to follow *θεοῦ* in Greek, or "God" in English, so that this divine name might the more clearly appear as the true antecedent of *ὅς*. The German and French might employ the comma, as the gender of the relative would prevent any misunderstanding. This is the interpretation preferred by Bengel and most recent commentators (see Lange's *Bibelwerk ad loc.*). The Vulgate, too, sustains this view, as *qui* refers to *Dei*, and not to *verbum*. An analogous case, 1 Pet. i. 23, will be found below. In both an homiletical interest predominates.

1 Thess. iv. 14. "Even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." English version. The German essentially concurs, adhering even more closely to the Vulgate: *per Jesum*. Martin (French) agrees precisely with the English. This punctuation, which closely connects *κοιμηθέντας* with *διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, is adopted by Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, etc., and Knapp even places a comma after *Ἰησοῦ*. Ostervald (French) differs widely; he connects *κοιμηθ.* with *ἄξει*, but evidently supposes that one of Winer's half-commas, referred to above, would be appropriate after the participle, and accordingly translates: "God will bring again (*ramènera*) through Jesus those who shall be dead." The question here arises: Ought any point, even if only a half-comma, to be inserted *before* or *after* *διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*? In

the former case, Ostervald gives the apostle's true meaning; but in the latter, the Engl., Germ., and French of Martin alone are correct. The expression "to sleep in Jesus" is a favorite one. Still, recent commentators generally (see Riegenbach, Lange's *Bibelwerk ad loc.*) sustain Ostervald, on philological and other grounds, by connecting *διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* with *ἄξει*.

2 Thess. iii. 14. "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man." This is the text of the English version; but our translators insert in the margin a version determined by a different punctuation, viz. "signify that man by an epistle." This marginal version is precisely the one found in the German. The former, which is also that of Martin and Ostervald, places a comma after *ἐπιστολῆς*, and this punctuation is preferred by Olsh., de Wette, Riegenbach (Lange's *Bibelwerk*). But according to the German and the marginal rendering of the English a comma precedes *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς*. Such is the punctuation of Calvin, Grotius, Bengel. It is also fully sanctioned by Winer (§ 18, 9 ult.), if we assume that Paul expected an answer to his epistle, in which case the presence of *τῆς* is fully explained. The position of the comma decides whether the editor understands by *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς* this second Epistle to the Thesalonians, or one that was to be written by the latter.

1 Tim. i. 17. "The only wise God." English version. The German and two French versions essentially concur. (We take the *Textus Receptus* as we find it, since we are not now occupied with the *variae lectiones*; *σοφῶ* is now generally cancelled, on the authority of manuscripts, including Cod. Sin.; the Vulgate had already omitted it: *solī Deo*). If commas are inserted after the preceding adjectives respectively, the question arises whether one ought not also to be inserted between *μόνῳ* and *σοφῶ*. The present version seems to imply that other gods are not wise, while their existence is implied. A comma after *μόνῳ* would give emphasis to the truth that there is only one God, thus: "to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only One, the wise One, to God be

honor," etc. We cannot apply the same remark to John xvii. 3, as τόν is not repeated before ἀληθινόν.

1 Tim. iii. 15, 16. Besides the very serious difficulty which editors find in deciding on the true reading of this passage, another is connected with the punctuation. The English, German and two French versions agree both as to the reading and the punctuation, but editors and commentators differ materially even with respect to the latter point. The versions connect the words: "the pillar truth" by a comma with "church," as expressive of a predicate of the latter, and begin v. 16 with "And without controversy," etc. This punctuation is sanctioned by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Calvin, Calovius, Grotius, de Wette, Huther, Wiesinger (Olsh. com.) etc., although they differ in their respective modes of interpretation. Others, and first of all the Basel edition of the New Testament of 1540, with Bengel, Moshelm, Olsh. (in his manuscript), Knapp, etc., place a full stop after "living God" (θεοῦ ζῶντος), and regard the following words: "the pillar truth," as expressing a predicate of "the mystery of godliness." With them the most recent commentator, Oosterzee (Lange's Bibelwerk) essentially agrees; he also reads ὅς in place of θεός, and introduces parenthetical marks in his translation, thus: "the living God (a pillar of godliness) who was manifest," etc. He remarks that each mode of punctuation has been defended by learned and devout men.¹

Titus i. 6. "Having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly." In some of the earlier editions of the American Bible Society, e.g. the royal 8vo. Reference Bible of 1833, the smaller Reference Bible of 1853, etc., a comma was un-

¹ This passage illustrates another point—the importance of the punctuation (depending on the exegesis) in controversies. The force of an argument or citation adduced by one party may be materially weakened, or exercise no influence whatever on the other party that punctuates differently. A writer, for instance, in the Mercersburg Review (July, 1867, p. 410) makes the following remark, which will have force only with those who adopt the punctuation of the modern versions: "The Bible itself, when asked, 'What is truth?' says, the 'church is the pillar and ground of the truth.'"

fortunately inserted after "children," thus implying that the elders should not be "accused unruly," whereas the original (*τέκνα ἀνυπότακτα*) shows that Paul refers to the children of the elders, and this is the sense distinctly presented in the Vulgate, German, and two French versions. This comma is properly cancelled in the later editions of the American Bible Society. It disfigured even some of the earlier British editions.

Titus i. 9. The English version, not recognizing a comma after *ὑγιαίνουση*, implies that a bishop should be able "by sound doctrine to exhort the gainsayers," and "by sound doctrine to convince the gainsayers." The Vulgate, German, and both French versions, on the other hand, concur in assuming, in accordance with the whole construction of the original, that a comma is indicated after *ὑγιαί.*, which Stier omits, but which Knapp has inserted. The sense then is, that the bishop should be able to perform two distinct acts; first, to exhort (edify) his hearers, or believers generally, by sound doctrine; and secondly, if any contradicted him, to refute them.

Tim. ii. 4. "That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands," etc. The English, German, and two French versions essentially agree in their construction, and Knapp even inserts a comma after *τὰς νέας* which, however, Stier omits. This translation implies that a Greek verb exists in the original for "to be sober," in the infinitive, and assigns a disproportionately full meaning to *σωφρουνίζωσι*, thus tautologically anticipating *σώφρονας* in the next verse (translated *discreet*). The verb *σωφρουνίζω* is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. Etymologically considered, the word is, according to Wahl (*Clavis New Test.*), equivalent to *facio aliquem σώφρονα*, i.e. *mentis compotem*, but the definition which he gives is: *in officio contineo, adhortandi sensu*. Robinson (*Lex.*) also defines it here as signifying *to moderate, to correct, to teach*. This interpretation is sustained by Oosterzee and by Wiesinger (continuation of *Com. of Olsh.*). The latter regards *σωφρουνίζειν* as

very nearly equivalent to *νουθετεῖν* or *παιδεύειν*, as Theophylact explains it. If this view is correct, no comma should follow *νέας*, and the translation would be: "teach (admonish, exhort) the young women to love their husbands."

Titus ii. 13. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, etc." In the several British and American editions of the English Bible, a comma is inserted after "hope" and the article "the" follows. According to the punctuation of the Greek which this version implies (independently of the indefiniteness of the phrase "to look for a hope," and the inaccuracy of rendering the article *τήν*, which occurs only once, by the demonstrative "that," which no various reading supports), two objects are looked for; "that hope" and "the appearing," etc. The French versions of Martin and Ostervald make the same distinction. The German, on the contrary, does not recognize a comma after *ἐλπίδα*, but exhibits the following: "waiting for the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of the great God," etc. This punctuation is sustained by eminent authorities (de Wette, Wiesinger, Oosterzee, etc.). According to it, "hope" stands here for the object of hope, and the words which immediately follow, without the intervention of a comma and a second article, are taken exegetically, that is, the (object of the) believer's hope is "the appearing," etc.

The same verse suggests another grave question, as the punctuation may or may not express a fundamental doctrine. Does the name, "the great God" refer specially to the Father, and should a comma indicate that the following words refer to the Son, or do both appellations, not separated by a comma, refer to the same subject, i.e. Jesus Christ? Here a wide difference of opinions exists among commentators. Winer had, in earlier editions of his Grammar, held the former opinion; in the sixth edition (§ 19, 5, Aum. 1) he concedes (note 2) that on grammatical grounds the latter interpretation (viz. that both *θεοῦ* and *σωτήρος*, as two predicates, refer to one subject, namely, Jesus Christ) is quite tenable, but dogmatical considerations, derived from the

Pauline system, still prevent him from adopting it. The English version by omitting a comma after "the great God" very distinctly and satisfactorily teaches that this divine name like that of "Saviour," is applied by the apostle to Jesus Christ.

Heb. iii. 9. "When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years." English version. In Ps. xcvi. 9, 10, the passage quoted, as Stuart remarks, the words "forty years are joined in the Hebrew with the following verse (Forty years was I grieved, etc.). But this depends on the punctuation system of the Masorites," etc. (Com. *ad loc.*). But Stuart appears to overlook the circumstance that the Septuagint (much older than the Masoretic system) conforms to the present Hebrew text. Moll's explanation (Lange's Bibelwerk) of the point is somewhat more satisfactory than that of Rosenmüller (Scholia in Ps. *ad loc.*). Indeed, the sacred writer himself in this chapter (v. 17) recognizes the present pointing of the Hebrew. The German is as follows: "When your fathers tempted me; they proved me, and saw," etc. This punctuation connects only "proved" and "saw" with "forty years"; it is preferred by Stuart and Ebrard, and essentially agrees with that of Knapp and Stier. Moll follows a different reading.

Heb. vi. 2. "Of the doctrine of baptisms," etc. English and both French versions. — "Of baptism, of (the) doctrine." German. The omission of a comma between βαπτισμῶν and διδαχῆς produces the English version; the insertion necessarily leads to the German. While editors and commentators generally prefer the former punctuation, they differ widely with respect to the construction of the entire passage, and variously explain the connection of the several genitives, etc.

Heb. x. 12. The position of the comma before or after εἰς τὸ δημεκέες decides whether Christ "offered one sacrifice for sins," and then "forever sat down," etc., or whether he "offered one sacrifice for sins forever," and then "sat down," etc. The former punctuation was adopted in the earlier American editions of the English Bible, and implied

that Christ's sitting on the right hand of God was eternal. But the later editions, like those of the British and Foreign Bible Society, exhibit the comma after "forever," implying the perpetual validity of the one sacrifice offered by Christ. This is also the sense of the German (Ein Opfer das ewiglich gilt), while Martin and Ostervald connect "forever" with "sat." Editors and commentators are here much divided in opinion, and are guided by exegetical and other considerations in assigning a place to the comma. In an homiletical respect the question possesses much importance.

Heb. xi. 1. In this case, the early or Erasmian punctuation of the Greek text seems to be generally abandoned. A comma had been placed after *πίστις* by Erasmus, and his Latin translation appears in the following form: *Est autem Fides, earum rerum quae sperantur substantia, etc.* Knapp retained this punctuation, and Winer sanctioned it in the earlier editions of his Grammar. The sense would then be: There is (*ἔστι δὲ π.*) a faith, i.e. Faith has been already exhibited in its reality and power, as the following cases, found in the Old Testament, will demonstrate. — According to this interpretation, the words after *πίστις* and the comma are in apposition, or are expegetical. But the modern versions and later interpreters regard *ἔστι* simply as the copula, and the words "the substance seen" contain the predicates. Winer subsequently changed his opinion, and in the fifth and sixth editions (§ 7, 3) seems inclined to cancel the comma after *πίστις*, and adopts the prevailing opinion that the verse is intended to furnish a definition of faith. Other questions belong strictly to the exegesis of the passage.

Heb. xii. 22, 23. "To an innumerable company of angels, To the general assembly and church," etc. English version. The same punctuation appears in the German and two French versions, and it is adopted by Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Grotius, etc. A comma is here placed, not before, but after *ἀγγέλων*, hence "innumerable company of angels." But others place a comma between *μυριάσιν* and *ἀγγέλων*, and none between the latter word and the next, that is, *πανηγύρει*.

So Moll (Lange's Bibelwerk) punctuates; and his German translation, which we reproduce here as far as it is practicable, is the following: "to myriads, the festive assembly (*πανηγυ.*) of the angels, and to," etc. (see his Com. *ad loc.*). This punctuation is preferred by Knapp, Stier, Bengel, Lachm., deWette, Ebrard, etc. Stuart also adopts it, and translates: "to an innumerable multitude, the joyful assembly of angels; and to the church," etc. Other opinions, for the details of which we have no room, are also entertained. The exegesis decides respecting the punctuation, or rather, the latter expresses the exegesis preferred by the editor.

Heb. xiii. 8. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." English version. — "Jesus Christ, yesterday and to-day, and the same also forever." German. — "Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday and to-day, and will be so (lit. *ἔ et le sera*) forever." This is the version of Ostervald, who simply changes the tenses of the verb supplied by Martin; the latter translates: "Jesus Christ has been the same yesterday and to-day, and he is so (*ἔ ἔστω*) also forever." Moll says on this passage: "Luther erroneously places a comma after *σήμερον*, in accordance with the Vulgate and Oecumenius. It is not the eternity of Christ (Ambrose, Cyrillus of Alex., Calovius, and others), but his unchangeableness, which is here intended to be prominently set forth; hence *ὁ αὐτός* is the predicate which refers to the three specifications of time." Moll accordingly translates, without inserting any point: "Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day the same and forever." Ebrard, whose exegesis varies somewhat from that of Moll, places with Knapp a comma after *ὁ αὐτός*. DeWette, who does the same, concisely reviews the numerous attempts already made to explain the passage. While Stier rejects all the commas in the Greek, Stuart inserts them after *χθές* and *σήμερον*. In this case interpreters may agree in the punctuation, and nevertheless differ widely with respect to the sense.

Heb. xiii. 15. "The fruit of *our* lips, giving thanks to his name." English version. The comma after "lips," and

the italicized pronoun "*our*" prefixed to the word, suggest to the reader that the subject of the participle "giving" which follows, is "we," as if "giving thanks" were epexegetical, referring to "let us offer," etc. But the original is: *χειλέων ὁμολογούντων* without an intervening comma (so Erasmus, Textus Receptus, Knapp, etc.); the sacred writer obviously means that the "sacrifice" is the fruit of lips which give thanks. Hence the Vulgate exhibits: *fructum labiorum confitentium*. The German version is: "the fruit of lips which confess his name." (The margin of the English version exhibits: "Gr. confessing to"). Ostervald's version precisely agrees with the German, but Martin adopts the erroneous interpretation which the English version might suggest, as he translates: "le fruit des lèvres, en confessant son nom." Moll avails himself of the German participial construction, which resembles that of the Greek language, and translates: "the fruit of lips gratefully confessing (that gratefully confess) his name."

Heb. xiii. 20. "Now God that brought Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant," etc. The English, German, and two French versions, which perfectly agree, imply that they insert a comma after *μέγαν*, and they evidently connect *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης* with *ὁ ἀναγαγών*. Oecumenius, Calvin, Bengel, Bleek, etc. adopt this punctuation, and interpret: "God brought that great Shepherd through the blood," etc. Others—Baumgarten, Ebrard (cont. of Olsh.) etc.—closely connect *ἐν αἵμ. διαθ.* with *μέγαν* in the sense: "that Shepherd of the sheep who was made great through (or by) the blood," etc.; that is, his greatness arises from the circumstance that through his blood he established an everlasting covenant, precisely (says Ebrard) as in John x. 11 he is the good shepherd because he gave his life for the sheep. In this case, the usual comma after *μέγαν* should be cancelled, as Knapp, but not Stier, has done. While Stuart rejects the punctuation, and with it the interpretation, indicated by the English version, which he regards as unintelligible, his own punc-

tuation, and his translation appended to his Commentary, are not perfectly clear; his rendering is the following: "our Lord Jesus (who is the great Shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an everlasting covenant), perfect you," etc. For other solutions of the exegetical difficulties presented by this passage, see de Wette, Moll, etc.

James iv. 5. Lange (Bibelwerk) remarks on this passage, vs. 5, 6, that it is one of the most difficult which can be found in the New Testament. Stier inserts among the *var. lect.* in his Polyglot New Testament the remark that eleven different modes of adjusting the punctuation have already been proposed, e.g. a colon after λέγει, or a note of interrogation, or that note or else a colon after φθόνου, etc. Lange and Wiesinger (continuation of Olsh.) have here furnished elaborate articles in their respective Commentaries. The punctuation is the same in the English and German versions, but Martin and Ostervald, although exhibiting verbal variations, agree in introducing two notes of interrogation. Almost every question that can embarrass an interpreter, e.g. as to the pointing, the reading (ἡμῶν or, as in the Vulgate, ὑμῶν), the relation in which the several expressions stand to each other, the initial letter of "spirit" (or "Spirit" = Holy Ghost), etc., is suggested by this text.

Jas. iv. 15. "If the Lord will, we shall live (ζήσομεν), and do this, or that." English version. — "If the Lord will and we live (ζήσωμεν, Textus Receptus) we will, etc." German and versions of Martin and Ostervald. The Vulgate implies that a full stop precedes and that a comma follows the first καί, and repeats εἰάν before ζήσωμεν, thus: "If the Lord will And, If we live," etc. On the whole passage (readings, punctuation, and sense), see Winer, § 41, a. 4.

1 Pet. i. 13-15. "As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves," etc. English, German, and both French versions. A comma or semicolon precedes γ. 14, and a comma follows "children" in these versions, and generally, in the editions of the Greek Testament and Vulgate. According to this punctuation, the words "not fashioning yourselves," etc.

are explanatory of "as obedient children." Winer says (§ 45, 6, b.) that the negative and participle *μη συζηματιζόμενοι* may be regarded as depending on *ἐλπίζατε* in v. 13 (= "hope," etc., and, as the effect of that hope, "not fashioning yourselves," etc.); but he prefers to consider the negative and participle as parallel with *κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα* etc. in v. 15, and connected with the imperative *γενήθητε*, which construction would require the usual colon at the end of v. 14 to be changed into a comma, which is accordingly done by Knapp, Stier, etc.; de Wette concurs. Fronmüller (Lange's *Bibelwerk*) places a full stop at the end of v. 13, and cancels the comma in v. 14 after "children," translating thus: "As children of obedience so conduct yourselves, that ye no longer yield to the lusts," etc. According to this view, the words "not fashioning," etc. are not so much explanatory as inferential, in their reference to "as obedient children" = "Since you are obedient children, therefore, etc." Huther (Meyer's Commentary) also begins a new sentence with v. 14, but differs from Fronmüller in his exegesis, which would require a comma after *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς*,

1 Pet. i. 23. "By the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." English version. Independently of the punctuation, a difficulty exists here in deciding whether "word" or "God" is the antecedent of "which." (A similar case in 1 Thess. ii. 13 is noticed above.) The translators used this relative both of persons and of things. Their *usus loquendi* in the present chapter is embarrassing, and does not decide whether here the word "which" is a masculine or a neuter pronoun. Thus in v. 3 we read: "the God of Christ, which hath," etc., while in v. 17, we read: "the Father, who judgeth," etc. But as the Vulgate which often guided them, refers "liveth and abideth" to God (*verbum Dei vivi*), our translators, no doubt, regarded "God" as the antecedent; in this case, however, they should have omitted the comma before "which," in order to prevent a misconception of their real meaning. Luther, on the contrary (German version), refers the pronoun (necessary

only in a modern language, but not found in the Greek) to "word," for the neuter *das* can agree only with the neuter noun "Wort." The two French translations which the American Bible Society circulates, exhibit a striking difference in this case. Ostervald translates: *par la parole de Dieu, qui vit, etc.* Although the French *qui* is used both for the masculine and the feminine genders, Ostervald makes the impression on us that his *qui* refers to "God;" if he had wished to designate unmistakably that he regarded *parole* (fem.) as the true antecedent, he would unquestionably have employed another French relative, namely, *laquelle* as he does in Col. ii. 14; 1 Thess. ii. 13. Martin, on the other hand, unequivocally states that "word" is the true antecedent to "which," or rather that it is not *God*, but the *word* which "liveth and abideth," for he translates: *la parole de Dieu, vivante et permanente, etc.*; the gender of the predicates plainly shows that the latter refer to "word." Luther (German) and Martin (French) cannot have been influenced in adopting this exegesis by the term occurring in v. 25 ("the word of the Lord endureth for ever"), for there the Greek, translated "word," is *ῥῆμα*, while here (v. 23) it is *λόγου*. Frommüller (Lange's *Bibelwerk*) appears to have overlooked this circumstance, for he attempts to confirm his first remark on the passage (viz. that the words "liveth and abideth" refer to "word") in saying that the language in v. 25 shows this to be the case. But his reference to Heb. iv. 12 has more weight, for there we find *ζῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, apparently corresponding to *λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ* in the passage before us. Wiesinger (continuation of Olsh.) very decidedly adopts Frommüller's opinion. Huther (Meyer's Com.) quotes the words of Calvin, viz. that we may translate, either "the living word of God," or "the word of the living God," and adds that the Vulgate, Oecumenius, Beza, etc., with Calvin, prefer the second mode of interpretation, while others (Luther, Calovius, Bengel, de Wette, etc.) prefer the former, and with these he agrees. Grotius, on the other hand, connects the predicate *ζῶντος* with *θεοῦ*, and remarks that the whole

phrase is taken from the Greek version of Daniel vi. 27 (26), where we find the words: *θεὸς ζῶν καὶ μένων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, to which our present passage undoubtedly exhibits a striking conformity. The force of this argument is, however, somewhat impaired by the well-known circumstance, attested by Jerome (Praef. in Dan.), that the Christians substituted Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel (made about the middle of the second century, Herzog's Encyk. ii. 188) for the original version of the Septuagint which Peter read; this was done, according to Credner, about the close of the third century (Keil, Einleit. § 179, ii. n. 10, p. 604). The original version, current in Peter's age, was supposed to be lost; but a manuscript containing it was found in a library at Rome in the last century, and published in a separate form by Simon de Magistris, J. D. Michaelis, and others (Herzog, Encyk. i. 229). The Greek participial construction in our text does not admit of a comma. As we are here concerned only with the punctuation, we refrain from inserting additional exegetical remarks, but cannot forbear to allude to the homiletical importance of the punctuation in this case. An English clergyman, before whose eyes a comma separates "which" from "God," or a French clergyman who uses Martin's revision of the old French translation, would probably enlarge in his sermon chiefly on the efficacy and power ("liveth") and enduring nature ("abideth," — notwithstanding the hostility of persecutors and the ravages of time) of the revealed word. But another, who should remove the comma, and thus immediately connect "God" with "which," or who used Ostervald's French version (although a comma here follows *Dieu*) would probably believe that the text required him to discourse on the eternity of God. Winer (Gram.) does not refer to this passage. In the Old Testament the terms אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים וְקַיִּים Deut. v. 23 (Hebr.; vs. 26 Eng.); Jer. x. 10, or אֱלֹהֵי חַיִּים Josh. iii. 10; Ps. xlii. 3; lxxxiv. 3; Hosea ii. 1 (Hebr.), etc. are frequent. The Septuagint version, *θεὸς ζῶν*, is very often reproduced in the New Testament; e.g. Matt. xvi. 16; Acts xiv. 15, and especially in 1 Thess. i. 9.

(*θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ*, strikingly resembling the passage before us). These facts seem to justify the reference of the two participles to *θεοῦ* rather than to *λόγου*, and to require the following translation: "the word of the living God, who also (*καὶ*) abideth for ever." In this case the comma should be cancelled in the English version before "which."

1 Pet. iii. 7. The English and German versions evidently place a comma after *γυναικέω*, or else after *τιμῆν*; hence, the translation: "giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel," etc. They concur here with the construction of the Vulgate, and are sustained by Bengel and Grotius. Robinson (*Lex. art. γυναικείος*), who adopts the punctuation of Lachm. and Stier, removes the comma after *γνώσει* ("knowledge"), inserts one after *γυναικ.*, and translates: "dwelling according to your better knowledge with the female vessel as the weaker." So, essentially, Martin and Ostervald; they, like Robinson, connect *ὡς ἄσθεν. σκέυει* with *συνοικ.*, and not with *ἀπονέμ.*, as the English and German, as well as Calvin, Beza, Grotius, etc. Frommüller (*Lange's Bibelwerk*), de Wette, Wiesinger (continuation of Olsh.), Huther (*Meyer's Com.*) fully adopt the pointing recommended by Robinson. The judgment of the editor in the capacity of an exegete must here decide as to the punctuation.

1 Pet. v. 12. "By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, as I suppose," etc. English version, with which the German essentially concurs. *Notre*, in the edition of Ostervald's version (1860) of the American Bible Society, which is not supported by any manuscript authority, must be a typographical error for *votre*. The latter is the reading of the edition of 1826. It should, however, not be forgotten that in the edition of 1553 (Calvin's) the paraphrastic version was given: *par Siluain nostre frere, qui vous est, fidele, etc.* This version assumes that a comma precedes *ὑμῶν*, and that another follows *λογίζομαι*. In that case the construction is: "faithful unto you." Martin and Ostervald, however, by translating, *Je vous ai écrit*, imply that,

as in Gal. vi. 11, *ὑμῖν* really belongs to *ἔγραψα* = I have written to you. So de Wette interprets, and Wiesinger, after some hesitation, occasioned by a possible but a very feebly supported various reading (*τοῦ* after *ὑμῖν*, omitted in Cod. B. and one minuscule manuscript), adopts the same view. With these Frommüller agrees. Huther concurs on the whole, but concedes that *ὑμῖν* may also be connected with *πιστ. ἀδελ.* Knapp and Lachm., who place commas after *ἀδελ.*, *λογίζ.*, and *ἔγραψα*, appear to sanction the pointing of the English version.

2 Pet. ii. 12. "But these, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed," etc. English version. Here *φυσικά* is closely connected with *ζῶα*. Martin and Ostervald concur in adopting this construction, but understand, with verbal variations, *φυσικά* as Robinson (Lex.) takes the word, i.e. "following their natural bent." — "But they are like the irrational beasts, which by nature are born to be taken," etc. German. Here a comma placed after *ζῶα*, as in the Vulgate, connects *φυσικά* closely with *γεγεννημένα*. Frommüller adopts this view of the construction; *φυσικά* in that case is taken for *φυσικῶς* (on which grammatical point see Winer, § 54, 2).

1 John i. 9. "He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." English version. Here a comma after *δίκαιος* is not recognized, and *ἵνα*, which follows that word, and is represented in the Vulgate by *ut*, is almost entirely lost in "to," the English sign of the infinitive. — "He is faithful and just, (so) that he forgives," etc. German version. Here the comma after "just" divides this part of the whole verse into two clauses. In the two French versions *ἵνα* with its verb is represented by *pour* and an infinitive. Commentators are not agreed whether *ἵνα* is equivalent to *ὥστε*, whether it is used in a telic (de Wette) or ecbatic sense, etc. See Winer § 53, 6.

1 John iii. 11, 12. "That we should love one another. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one," etc. English version. The efforts of translators and others to adjust the

punctuation and sense of this passage are various. The German and the Vulgate, like the English, supply a relative pronoun after "Cain." Martin and Ostervald supply, in addition to the relative, also a verb. The former renders: "that we should not be (soyons) as Cain; the latter: "Let us not do (faisons) as Cain." Branne (Lange's Bibelwerk) translates: "not, as Cain was of the wicked one," and explains thus: "The proposition 'Not, as brother' is incomplete, like Jno. vi. 58 [where the same *οὐ καθὼς* will be found]. It is a case of breviloquence, which in comparisons occurs in the Greek classics in very great variety. Compare Winer's Gram. p. 549." Winer here (§ 66, 2 f.) remarks that it is not necessary to supply any particular word, that the comparison is not expressed with strict precision, and that the reader himself can easily supply, for instance, words like these: "so must, or will not it be in our case." The example which Winer adduces from Demosthenes (*Κατὰ Μειδίου. ξά*) is very striking; he objects to the insertion by Reiske of *ὅς* after *Ἀριστοφῶν*. Spalding, who also objects to Reiske's explanation, says, in a note on the passage, that a change in the punctuation which he proposes renders the insertion of the relative unnecessary (Dobson's *Oratores Attici*. vii. 129, Reiske's ed. p. 564). Branne agrees with Winer that in the verse before us no word like *ὄμεν* before *ἐκ τοῦ πον.*, or *ὅς*, etc., should be supplied. Still, even his exposition does not entirely remove the apparent harshness of the construction. Perhaps if a comma were placed after *ἀλλήλους* at the end of v. 11, and a colon after *Καίιν*, the verb to which the latter would be the nominative might, as is common in such cases, be supplied from *ἀγαπῶμεν*, thus; "that we should love one another, not as Cain (loved); he was of the wicked one," etc.

Jude 20, 21. "Building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love," etc. English version. Here a comma is implied after the first *ἐαυτοῖς* (v. 20), and "praying" is intimately connected in one clause with "Holy Ghost." This is the punctuation

found also in the Vulgate, Martin, and Ostervald. — “Build up yourselves on your most holy faith, through the Holy Ghost, and pray, and keep yourselves,” etc. German version. Here the comma after the first *ἐαυτοῦς* is cancelled (which appears in Knapp, but not in Stier), and this word is immediately connected with those that follow, viz. *ἐν πνεύμ. ἁγ.*, thus representing the *building up* as accomplished through the Holy Ghost. This is also the punctuation of Oecumenius, de Wette, etc. Fronmüller (Lange’s *Bibelwerk*) also appears to prefer it, or, rather, cancels every point between *τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ* and *προσευχόμενοι*, after which word a period is placed. He then translates: “Build up yourselves on your most holy faith in the Holy Ghost amid prayer.” Wiesinger prefers a transposition of some of the Greek words, authorized by certain manuscripts, and hence his punctuation cannot be compared to advantage with the modes adopted in the cases just mentioned. Not only grammatical and homiletical considerations are here involved, but others also which are intimately connected with the believer’s religious experience.

ITALICS, ETC.

In the list which we have now given, we have abstained from introducing passages in which various readings that affect the punctuation occur, as well as those in which the English translators have supplied words in italics, and thus modified the punctuation. The latter class of passages embraces many in which the English and German versions differ, indicating a difference in the exegesis: e.g. in Luke x. 22, the English version supplies *him* as the object of the verb “reveal,” referring to the “Father”; the German version supplies “it,” referring to the whole subject of the revelation. In this class of texts, the modern versions exhibit many variations. We have, further, not referred here to the orthography of the earlier and later editions of the English Bible, as the sense of any passage is not often affected by it. There are, it is true, even in this respect,

some words, the spelling of which may affect the sense, e.g. *cloths* or *clothes*, in Exodus xxxi. 10; *sometimes* or *some-time*, Eph. v. 8 (the latter in the sense of once, formerly); in these cases the British and American editions vary. Nor have we referred to the insertion or omission of a hyphen in words like handmaid (hand-maid), burnt offering (burnt-offering), etc. There is another large class of passages, in which some of the editions of the Greek, Vulgate, etc. insert parenthetical marks, while these are omitted, or differently distributed, in other editions; in many cases the exegesis is materially influenced by the presence or absence of such marks. We have introduced only one of these cases above, viz. Col. ii. 21-23. There is only one instance in which brackets are introduced, viz. 1 John ii. 23. The edition printed under the supervision of the Committee on Versions, had here omitted them; the later editions have reproduced them, while there is still an uncertainty whether "but" alone should be thus marked, or else the entire succeeding clause, the whole being now again printed in italics in the English version. It is true that the Textus Receptus omits the clause, and it was not found in the earliest Erasmusian editions from which the German version was made. Still, critics like Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Knapp, de Wette, etc. receive it as genuine; Ostervald, like Martin, introduces it. Braune (Lange's Bibelwerk) receives it on decisive manuscript authority, and the American Bible Society has no reason to decline, as it now again does, to decide this critical question in the English version (by the awkward brackets and the italics), when it does decide it in versions in other languages.

We have, besides, not referred to a class of texts in which, independently of various readings and the punctuation, the difficulty in the construction of the Greek leads to a difference in the interpretation of the several versions. This class may be illustrated by the following case, selected from a long list. In Acts iii. 21, *ὃν* may be the subject of the infinitive *δέξασθαι* (accusative before it), and *οὐρανόν* is then the object (accusa-

tive), governed by the latter; or *ὅν* may be the object (accusative), and *οὐρανόν* after *δεῖ* (accusative before the infinitive) includes or specifies the subject. The sense is much affected by the decision; the Lutheran, or else the Reformed doctrine concerning the Person of Christ will materially gain by the result. The German version adopts the former construction ("who must receive the heaven"); the English, with which Ostervald and Martin (Reformed) agree, the latter ("whom the heaven must receive").

The editors of the critical editions of the New Testament have, as far as we have investigated the subject, usually directed their attention to the *variae lectiones*, and, with some exceptions, have adopted the punctuation which appeared in the early printed editions (the Complutensian, Erasmusian, Stephens, Elzevir). The older commentators have been occupied in determining the meaning of words and phrases, and seem also to have given less attention to the punctuation than its importance deserves. It is one of the merits of the new Commentary of Lange and his associates, that they have in many instances referred to the modification of the sense of a passage by any change in the usual punctuation. They generally exhibit, in this respect, far more attention to the shades of thought indicated by the position of a comma, etc., than many of their predecessors.

CONCLUSION.

One object which we have had in view in directing attention to the subject of this Article was to show its homiletical importance. Revealed truth is of inestimable value. We cannot afford to lose one iota of it, and we dare not cast it aside. When the preacher of the gospel occupies the pulpit, and professes to explain God's word, or set forth the "mind of the Spirit" who inspired the prophets and apostles, ought he not to be very sure that he really states divine truth in its purity and in its fulness? Ought he not to furnish all the practical instructions which his text presents? Now, the insertion or the cancelling even of a comma, as many of the

passages quoted above demonstrate, may either prompt him to express thoughts which after the alteration of the punctuation are found to lie in the text, or else may imperatively require that he should withhold thoughts, instructions, etc. which are usually suggested by the text, but which after altering the punctuation he finds that the sacred writer did not intend to convey. In the latter case the established hermeneutical principle, that we are not authorized to obtrude thoughts on a passage which evidently did not occur to the writer, ought to be conscientiously followed in our exegetical and homiletical practice. We will illustrate this point, by selecting a passage which, in whatever mode it is pointed, does not affect any form of doctrine respecting which evangelical Christians differ. We have refrained as far as possible in the cases adduced above from expressing any personal or private doctrinal views, and have mainly endeavored to show objectively the great variety of opinions which the modern system of punctuation can express. In John i. 9 some editors (Knapp, Stier, Alford, etc.) place a comma after *ἄνθρωπον*, thus indicating that the participle *ἐρχόμενον* (as nom. neut.) refers to *φῶς*. If we should write a sermon on the text thus pointed, we would dwell at considerable length on the comparatively feeble light afforded by the Old Testament (e.g. the future state of rewards and punishments), and make much use of 2 Tim. i. 10; and we should not fail to dwell on John i. 17. We would refer to the fact that since this "true light" had come into the world the privileges of men had been greatly enlarged, and that their responsibility had also become more weighty and solemn. We might then refer to Sodom, Tyre and Sidon, Chorazin, Capernaum (Matt. xi. 20-24), and Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 37). Such is the punctuation of Ostervald; he places a comma after *les hommes*, and proceeds: *en venant*, i.e. "when the light comes," etc. Bengel, who adopts the same view, presents in his Gnomon additional remarks on the high value which we ought to ascribe to Christ, the light of the world, as compared with John, to whom v. 6 refers. See Alford, Lange, etc. on the passage.

Others cancel the comma after *ἄνθρωπον*, which Erasmus had introduced into the Greek text, although, like the Vulgate, he translates *ἐρχόμενον* by *venientem*, referring to *hominem*, and not to *lux*. If this comma is cancelled, *ἐρχόμενον* (now acc. masc.) agrees with *ἄνθρ.* which immediately precedes, and this, in accordance with the Vulgate, is the form of the English and German versions, as well as that of Martin (*éclairé tout homme venant*, etc.). Olshausen regards this construction as involving a pleonasm; for obviously all who are in the world must have come into the world. Many of the older interpreters, however (Origen, etc.), and of those of more recent times (Luther, Calvin, Meyer, etc.) cancel the comma, and translate after the manner of the Vulgate and English version. Now, if we should prepare a sermon on the text with this punctuation, we should be able simply to refer to the fact that after we have come into the world we assume certain responsibilities. But as *ἐρχόμενον* is now divested of much of its meaning and force, we would be compelled to omit very much of the matter stated above which the other punctuation suggests.

Our space, however, does not allow us to add other illustrations which we have collected, but which we are compelled by the length of this Article to omit. We close with the remark, that, as all revealed truth, even in its minutest details, is of inestimable value, it is, or ought to be, the great object of every theologian and teacher of religion to acquire, not merely general, but also very particular and distinct views of the meaning which any inspired writer expresses in any passage.