

a word. These *παθήματα*, inflicted by Sin, personified as a tyrant, are vividly described in chapters vi. and vii. The word *παθήματα* occurs sixteen times in the New Testament, and everywhere, except here and in Galatians v. 24, is translated by the Revisers "suffering." *Πάθος*, passion, in the ethical sense, is found three times, and in 4 Maccabees *passim*. St. Paul uses *πάθη* for passions, Romans i. 26, and *παθήματα*, sufferings, Romans viii. 18, which makes it highly improbable that "sinful passions" is the correct rendering in this passage.

JOHN ROSS.

ST. PETER'S SPEECH IN ACTS I. 15-22.

THE purpose of this paper is to plead for a return in one more instance to the sound exegetical instinct of the "Authorized" translators from the hasty conclusions of modern scholarship which were too often imposed upon the Revised Version of the New Testament. The interpretation of this particular passage maintained in the following pages is in part that put forward by Mr. Rendall in his admirable *Acts of the Apostles in Greek and English* (1897); but it appears to have obtained very little notice among editors; and I trust that incidentally a fresh discussion of the point will be interesting as showing the disadvantages of marking parenthesis in our texts of the New Testament. Our new knowledge of colloquial Greek has discredited the device in one striking instance. Even A.V. had felt compelled by considerations of grammar to disjoin the apparent nominative case of "full of grace and truth" from "the only begotten of the Father" in St. John i. 14. Now we know that the Greek for "full" was indeclinable, and can be interpreted, as its

position and the logic of the sentence demands, in close connexion with *μονογενοῦς*. (See Deissmann, *New Light*, Eng. ed., p. 44.) It would seem safer in all cases not to prejudge interpretation by the use of brackets, unless the cast of the sentence makes it absolutely clear that that was the writer's own intention.

For the sake of easy reference in a somewhat complicated argument, I will first venture to give the whole speech with the renderings and arrangement that will best make clear the view that is maintained—noting in the margin the chief alternative ways of presenting the passage that have been adopted by various authorities.

- I. 15. And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the brethren, and said:—the number assembled was about 120 persons—...^a (Quotation of Ps. lv.) . . .
16. Sirs and brothers, there had^b to be a fulfilment of this^c scripture, in which the Holy Spirit through David's mouth referred beforehand to Judas, who was guide to them that took
17. Jesus—I mean, as regards^d his having been numbered among us and having received his part of this ministry.^e Now, he purchased a field with the reward of iniquity, and in a headlong fall he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. This became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, earning for^f that field in their language the name "Aceldama," i.e.
- ^a The dots and insertion refer to a suggestion made below.
- ^b Reading *ἔδει*; *δεῖ* D* and Vulg.
- ^c Reading *ταύτην* with D, Iren., and the Textus Receptus. Most modern editors omit it.
- ^d Giving to *ὑπὲρ* the sense of "that" with Rendall. Most interpreters, including A.V. and R.V., "for."
- ^{e-f} Parenthesis marked by Westcott and Hort, R.V., and others.
- ^f This free rendering is adopted to avoid prejudicing the criticism of the passage by a tense in the indicative.

20. "Field of Blood."^a For it is written in the book of Psalms: "Let his homestead become desert, and let there be no man to dwell in it"; as well as "His office of oversight let another take."^b It is necessary, therefore, from the men that went with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us
22. beginning from the baptism of John to the day that he was received up from us, that one of these, I say, should be appointed as a witness with us of his resurrection.
- ^a Blass suggests marking off this section as standing apart from the rest, and adopting the variant *dei* in verse 16.
- ^b Rendall makes this the parenthesis.

The salient fact here is that Westcott and Hort and the Revised Version (who form the court of appeal for the average student of the New Testament) place verses 18 and 19 in a parenthesis; thereby implying that the words from the Psalms in verse 20, or at any rate those composing the former of the quotations (Ps. lxi. 26), are the passage of Scripture referred to in verse 16, while the narrative of Judas' death is an explanatory insertion due either to the speaker or to the author. According to the clearest exposition of this view known to me (in Messrs. Page and Walpole's edition, 1895) the quotation of the passage in the speaker's mind is suspended till two explanations of its applicability have been furnished. Having first reminded his hearers that Judas was an apostle ("because he was numbered," etc.), and then recounted the story of Aceldama, St. Peter can without fear of misunderstanding adduce, as the prophecy that was bound to be fulfilled, the words of the Psalmist about the *abandoned homestead* of one who held an *office*. A variation on this view, as

we have already mentioned, is to take the second explanation (the story of Aceldama) as the author's insertion. And Blass, in his "Editio Philologica" (1895), seems to suggest that at one time the speech ran thus: "It is necessary (reading $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$) that the scripture be fulfilled, which, etc. (continuing through vers. 16 and 17, but then going straight on to ver. 20 and giving there only the second quotation), for it is written: His office let another take." All these explanations, however, agree in the assumption that the passage of Scripture mentioned in verse 16 is not quoted or indicated till verse 20; and that interpretation has been riveted on our most popular texts by the use of brackets.

Now it must be owned that, if this view is correct, the citation of the Psalter in verse 20 strikes the careful reader as very inadequate and inappropriate for the purpose. Neither of the passages quoted has any special connexion with the treacherous friend of the Messianic prophecies; and, looking to the actual history of Judas, the ill repute of his field seems a somewhat insignificant detail to prove to the Apostle's mind the divine predestination of the tragic gap in their ranks; nay more, those words from Psalm lxix. are especially foreign to the main argument of the speech, because they might be interpreted as a command *not* to appoint a successor. Or, if the chief stress be laid on the second quotation, that of Psalm cix. 7, it is equally difficult to believe that the reference to the "oversership" seemed of such importance to St. Peter that he should make its fulfilment, as it were, the general premiss which was to prove the particular practical conclusion—"it is necessary, therefore, to appoint a successor." Unless, with Blass, we surrender the impressive inference from past to present ($\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\ \pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ .\ .\ .$) by reading $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ in the former place, the logic of the situation

demands a wider reflection on God's mysterious dealing with His servants than the noting of a popular nomenclature or of one aspect of the fallen man's previous position. Another *primâ facie* objection to the use of brackets as in W-H. and R.V. is that it breaks the simple and natural connexion between the story of Aceldama and the words "For it is written: Let his habitation be desolate, etc." Every detail of the historical statement—the ownership of the farm, the public knowledge of Judas' bloody death—leads up to the quotation of Psalm lxix. 26, just as that quotation is pointless without its historical explanation. Supposing that it were necessary to identify the words of the Psalmist as the "scripture" referred to in verse 16, still the explanation (whether of the speaker or of the historian) is so completely dovetailed into the argument of the speech, that it is a violation of language to place a bracket between verses 19 and 20.

But it is by no means necessary to look for the "scripture" at all in verse 20, seeing that St. Peter has already identified it, or at least indicated it, himself, in verses 16 and 17. It is with regard to the interpretation of these verses that I would draw attention to the sound instinct which led the scholars of 1611 to refer in their margin to another passage of the Old Testament than those given in verse 20, in explanation of the "scripture" "(ver. 16); and to refrain from marking any parenthesis in the subsequent verses. It was the good fortune, also, I believe, if not the merit of those translators, to give from the text they used the "*this* (scripture)" (ver. 16) of Codex Bezae and other authorities, which possibly supplies a clue to the reason why the particular allusion to the Old Testament does not appear so definite as usual. But leaving aside for the moment what is only a conjecture, it is strange that so many commentators have failed to see that the

speaker himself gives the *substance* of the scripture he is referring to in the clause introduced by ὅτι (ver. 17), which (with Mr. Rendall) may be quite well here translated "that," and not "because." It might be an interesting study in itself to "settle Hoti's business" as far as the New Testament is concerned; the investigation would very likely reveal that such dependent clauses seldom bear a more definite relation to the main sentence than is expressed by the original meaning of the particle "as to the fact that"; and that the translation "for" or "because" is only in a limited class of cases demanded by our idiom to express the relation. For our present purpose it is enough to contend that verse 17 must be taken in close connexion with the foretelling of the Holy Spirit, and not as an independent statement of the speaker. For an exact and conclusive parallel to this form of speech in drawing attention to the fulfilment of prophecy the commentator need go no further than the next chapter of this book. In Acts ii. 31 St. Peter, after quoting at length from a Psalm, goes on to make the comment that David by his foresight spake *concerning the resurrection of the Christ that he was not left in hell, nor did his flesh see corruption*. We note how the latter-day fulfilment of the prophecy is assigned as the scope (περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως) of David's words, and the substance of them is introduced by ὅτι, but stated *in the terms of their historical fulfilment* (ἐνκατελείφθη . . . αὐτοῦ—with change of tense and person). So in our speech, whether St. Peter had really begun with a verbal quotation or not—a suggestion to be considered presently—he in the same way states the true scope of David's utterance ("concerning Judas"), and then *gives its substance in the terms of its historical fulfilment*—"that he was numbered among us," etc. No one thinks of translating ὅτι "for" in that other pas-

sage; that it has been generally so translated here is doubtless the principal cause of the confusion into which the interpretation of this speech has fallen. It may be noted, in passing, that Latin versions do not determine the translation either way; the best text of the Vulgate has "quia," which of course means "that" as much as "because"; while the "quoniam" given in Irenaeus iii. 12 is equally indeterminate, for that writer's Latin translator again and again uses "quoniam" in the declarative sense.

So far, I venture to think, a strong case has been made out for two guiding principles in the interpretation of this speech; (a) that we cannot with appropriateness connect verse 20 with the reference to scripture in verse 16, or suppose that the quotation from Psalm lxix. ("Let his habitation . . .") has any wider application than its fulfilment in the story of Aceldama. Both these erroneous suggestions are involved in the bracketing of verses 18 and 19: (b) that the substance of the scripture referred to in verse 16 is, according to a just interpretation of the Greek words, indicated by verse 17; the gist of the prophecy being there declared to be the inclusion of the traitor within the Apostolic circle. This natural connexion has been obscured by the translation of $\delta\tau\iota$ "for" or "because."

There remain, however, some considerations of a more conjectural character which may be set down here with the hope that they may contribute something to the elucidation and criticism of this ever fascinating book.

(1) What was the passage of the Old Testament which the speaker said was bound to be fulfilled? The margin of A.V. refers to Psalm xli. 9, "Yea, even mine own familiar friend," etc., doubtless on the ground that that verse is used by our Lord in the same connexion in St. John xiii. 18. But that verse stands alone in the psalm as a reference

to the treacherous friend of the Messiah, and for a formal justification of the ways of God to man as regards the Betrayal, such as we suppose St. Peter to have been making, it seems far more likely that his thoughts should have turned to Psalm lv., where the significant allusions are more extended: "For it is not an open enemy that hath done me this dishonour . . . but it was even thou, my companion, my guide, and mine own familiar friend; we took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends. . . . He laid his hands upon such as be at peace with him, and he brake his covenant: the words of his mouth were softer than butter, having war in his heart," etc. I have never seen it suggested, but it seems not impossible, that the rather strange phrase "*guide* to them that took Jesus" in verse 16 was used with allusion to "my guide" (*ἡγούμενόν*, LXX) in the Psalm. And if this psalm was the recognized starting-point among the disciples for the interpretation of Judas' fall, the words "Let death come hastily upon them . . .," occurring as they do in close connexion with the lament over the friend's treachery, would, for the historian if not for the Apostle, lead on irresistibly to an account of God's judgment upon the traitor such as we have in verse 18.

But:—

(2) Whatever the prophecy was, is there any hint of a verbatim quotation, or is the author content with the mere mention of a *γραφή* and a brief indication of its substance? Three parallels in justification of the latter view can be adduced from St. John's Gospel, vii. 38, xvii. 12, and xx. 9, where definite "scriptures" are mentioned but not identified. That in xvii. 12 concerns Judas; and xx. 9 is strikingly apposite, because, as here, the substance of the prophecy is given in a *ὅτι*-clause. No instance, as far as I know, can be adduced from other parts

of *St. Luke's* writings. We should, however, I think, be compelled to take this view, supposing the reading *τὴν γραφήν* of most modern editors to be right. The bare article would seem to imply that the scripture is now mentioned for the first time—at any rate by the historian; if the Apostle may be supposed to have quoted at length, the author (granted that reading) has for the sake of brevity given only the gist of the scripture “proof.” On the other hand, it must be confessed that verse 16 sounds far more like an orator’s actual comment on a text already quoted (“These are the words of the Holy Spirit, and they were spoken beforehand with special reference to Judas,” etc., cf. ii. 30-1) than a historian’s sole representation of what the orator had said on the point. I should like, therefore, on the respectable authority of D and Irenaeus’ Latin interpreter, to go back to the *τὴν γραφήν ταύτην* of the *Textus Receptus*—to suppose that the speech as we have it begins with the second section, Psalm lv. having first been quoted at some length, as Psalm xvi. is quoted in ii. 25-8—and to conjecture either (a) that we have here an abbreviated edition of the book, *ταύτην* being a trace, inadvertently suffered to remain, of the longer form which gave the quotation in full; or (b) that *St. Luke* never gave the quotation, assuming that his readers would take it for granted and would quite well understand what “this scripture” meant in *St. Peter's* mouth; or (c) that the first part of the speech with the full quotation was in the original text, but dropped out at an early stage of the transmission of the book owing to the eye of the scribe passing from one “*Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*” to another (see the speech in chap. ii. *passim*).

It is, in any case, in favour of this reading and interpretation that the phrase “this scripture” is twice used by *St. Luke* elsewhere in referring back to a passage of the

Old Testament already quoted at length—in our Lord's discourse at Nazareth (St. Luke iv. 21), and in Philip's interview with the eunuch (Acts viii. 35), whereas "the scripture," without quotation, cannot be paralleled from his writings. It is also textually improbable that *ταύτην* is the insertion of a scribe, for it does not serve to identify the "scripture" with verse 17 any more clearly than the simple article; and, if the wish had been to identify it with verse 20, *ἐκείνην* would have been a more likely gloss; on the other hand, *ταύτην* would easily drop out as unnecessary when the true course of the speech, as we have conceived it, became obscured.

(3) Lastly, no one attempting to elucidate this speech can avoid forming some theory as to the literary character of verses 18–20—the story of Aceldama and the remaining quotations from the Psalter. There are grave reasons for thinking that the narrative in verses 18–9 bear only the most distant relation to any original words of the Apostle. Not only is there the phrase "their own language" and the translation of Aceldama into Greek, but the whole tone of the statement is too historical and "detached" to represent at all closely the words of an orator referring to what (*ex hypothesi*) could only have happened a week or two since. Indeed, could a popular nomenclature, such as that described, have possibly grown up in the time? It might fairly be urged, also, that the significance evidently attached in verse 20 to the word *ἐπισκοπή* belongs to the author's historical interest in the apostolic office rather than to St. Peter's thoughts of "ministry"; and that the grossness of the story and its likeness to other discoveries of divine judgments for the enemies of a good cause are in striking contrast to the tenderness and reticence of verses 16 and 25 ("from which Judas went astray"). All this, in my opinion,

puts verses 18-20 on a different level of *originality* from the rest of the words assigned to the Apostle. But that, is not to say that they, or any part of them, can be marked off, as regards the author's intention, from the rest of the speech. Mr. Rendall closes a parenthesis after verse 20, which is the least objectionable place for a bracket, if there is to be one at all; but the collocation of "His bishoprick let another take" with "Therefore one of these," etc., is too obviously apposite for us to suppose that the author intended any break there in the logical sequence. The simple connexion "and" forbids a break between the two quotations in verse 20, as the text stands at present; and the disjunction of the former quotation from the narrative of Judas' death has, I hope, been shown in these pages to be impossible.

I would suggest that the literary character of verses 18-20 is something like this. St. Luke in any case is obliged to give a strictly compressed account of St. Peter's address, which would very likely be an exposition and argument of some hours' duration. After giving the Apostle's treatment of the chief Old Testament passage which was interpreted as referring to Judas (vers. 16 and 17), he bridges over the transition to the practical business of the meeting with a rapid statement of the remaining Scripture "proofs" of Judas' history which were current in his own day—viz., of the horror which surrounded the traitor's death, and of the rightness of appointing another Apostle in his place. He supplies, also, in connexion with the former theme the particular tradition about Aceldama which he prefers. So he passes on naturally to the last section of the speech, beginning verse 21. He has not attempted or professed in the intervening passage (vers. 18-20) to give an exact account of the speech as actually delivered, but still he means the words to read as part of the literary "speech."

How closely St. Luke was here representing in abbreviated form corresponding matter in the original speech, and what materials he had for doing so, we can never determine, except conjecturally from internal evidence. At least let us take the speech as he gives it, and not pre-judge the interpretation and criticism of such passages by the indolent and rash use of brackets.

STEPHEN LIBERTY.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.¹

XII.

εἴσοδος.—Notwithstanding Grimm's dictum that in the N.T. *εἴσοδος* is used only of "the act of entering," there seems little doubt that it refers to "the entrance" itself in Hebrews x. 19 (cf. v. 20) and 2 Peter i. 11. This latter is the predominant sense in the papyri where the word is constantly found of the "entrance" of a temple, or a house. For the more metaphorical meaning as in 1 Thess. i. 9 *ὁποῖαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, cf. the Latin papyrus letter of ii/A.D., OP 32^{13t}, in which a military tribune commends a certain Theon to the good offices of Domitius, "et ideo peto a te, ut habeat introitum at te" (cf. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 129).

εἰσπηδάω.—This strong verb, which is found in the N.T. only in Acts xvi. 29, *αἰτήσας δὲ φῶτα εἰσπηδήσεν*, may be illustrated by OP 37¹⁶ (A.D. 49), *εἰσπηδήσεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου οἰκίαν καὶ τὸ σωματίον ἀφήρπασεν*, "made an incursion into my client's house and carried the foundling off" (G. and H.); TbP 304¹⁰ (ii/A.D.) *μετὰ ξύλων ἰσπηδήσαι*, "rush in with staves" (*ibid.*).

¹ For abbreviations see the February and March (1908) *EXPOSITIO*, pp. 170, 262.