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

library discovery, edits the book, and writes on

Babylonia and Assyria; Benzing writes on

Palestine; Stein dorff on Egypt; Hommel on

Arabia; and Jensen on the Hittites. All the
great 'finds' will be illustrated in the book.

Little Contributions to the Greek Testament.

By Professor Eberhard Nestle, D.D., Mauleronn.

Acts ii. 47, iii. 1.

A passage which has not yet received sufficient attention is the last verse of Ac 2. The ancient reading was: 'And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.' If we disregard Mt 16:18 and 1817, this is the first passage where 'the Church' makes its appearance in the New Testament; but the text is far from certain. Bengel, in the first edition of his Greek Testament (1734), classified the omission of την ἑκκλησίαν among those readings which are not to be approved, though they have been approved by some; in the second impression of the minor edition which he finished just before his death, he valued the omission higher, among the readings equally good as those of the text; and in his Gnomon (1742) he has the important note—

'την ἑκκλησίαν est haec Chrysostomi, ut videtur glossa, per Syrum et alios propagata. Non habent antiquiores.'

Now I have already (in The Expository Times vol. xiii. p. 563) hinted at the possibility that the relation 'seems to have been the opposite, that Chrysostom took it from the Syriac version, and not the Syriac from Chrysostom, and this seems to be confirmed by the fact that the oldest witness for this reading has not την ἑκκλησίαν, but exactly as the Syriac version, εν την ἑκκλησίαν, connecting it with σωσάμενον and not with προσέλθει. Thus Codex Bezae in the Greek and in the Latin, καθ ἡμέραν εἰς τὸ άνδρα εν την ἑκκλησίαν, coetidie in unum in ecclesia. In a similar way has the Oxford Codex 58, which has been lately collated by Pott, ἡμέραν εν την ἑκκλησίαν. 'Επί το άνδρα δὲ Πέτρος.

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

Porro 'Εν δέ τοις ἡμέραις ταύταις ισχύος capitis habet Cant. [= D], εν τοῖς ἡμέραις  

ἐκεῖνος Lectionaria. Ex quibus si hunc flosculum deceptis, ut apparat, Codex Cant., antiquitatis suae opinioem ipse valide imminuit. nam lectionaria separata ipso Lectionum ecclesiasticarum usus longe recentiora sunt.'

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

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

1 Cor. xvi. 22.

'If any man loveth not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema.' When we read this closing of 1 Co in the Syriac version, we find that the cusive-printed words form a very significant pun between דוד and דוד. That St. Paul is thinking here in his mother tongue is proved by the addition of Maranatha. There are two words for love in Aramaic, בַּל and דוד, the former is apparently in Paul's mind to form another pun with בַּל, to owe, when he writes, in Ro 13:8: 'Owe no man anything, but to love one another.' And it is interesting to observe that here the Syriac version uses בַּל, as it uses דוד in 1 Co. For similar examples of Aramaic puns to be discovered under their Greek dress, see The Expository Times, viii. 138, x. 525.

Matt. v. 37.

In the second edition of the second volume of Westcott-Hort's Greek Testament there was made
an addition to this verse '[see note].' This must refer, as in other similar cases, e.g. 16 4 34 5 3, to the 'Additional Notes to Notes on Select Readings,' or to the 'Supplementary Notes by F. C. Burkitt,' printed on pp. 140 ff. of that volume. But in neither of these sections can I find the note which is here referred to. As it is difficult to imagine what additional note was intended, some communication about it seems desirable. Syr. sin has, like Syr. cur and Syr. vgr, val val kai ou vnu, and seems to have taken ποιησα as masculine.

John viii. 56.

For the difficult words of the second half of this verse the R.V. proposes as alternative translation: 'How is it that I even speak to you at all?' This translation has not only the high authority of Chrysostom, as Fred. Field remarks in his Notes on this passage, but is confirmed by a very exact parallel in the Clementine Homilies. There a certain Apion is giving an explanation, his hearer does not appear to him to be attentive, therefore he interrupts his speech (των λόγων ἐγκώμας) and says to him: Ἐι μὴ παρακολουθεῖς οἷς λέγω, τί καὶ τὴν ἄρξην διαλέγατα; 'If you do not follow my words, why do I speak (or discuss) at all?' See Clementina, ed. P. de Lagarde, p. 77, ed. Dressel, p. 163, bk. vi. chap. 2.

The Altar of the Unknown God.

In the article 'Unknown God' in the D.B. iv. 835, it is not mentioned that the inscription may be translated 'to an unknown God,' with the indefinite article (see R.V.), nor do I find in any of our German commentaries a very nice story about the occasion at which this altar is said to have been erected. In the commentary on Acts which is attributed to Oecumenius, bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, about the middle of the tenth century, consisting chiefly of extracts from earlier writings (Migne, Patrologia Graec., vol. 118), we read: 'Two occasions are mentioned for this inscription of the altar. For some people say, when the Athenians sent Philippides to the Lacedæmonians for help at the time when the Persians came against Greece, there appeared to him on the way, near the Mount Parnassus, a vision of Pan (Πάνος φάσμα), complaining that the Athenians had hitherto neglected him, while they honoured other gods, and promising his help. After they had won the victory, they erected him a temple and built an altar, and to guard themselves against the danger of suffering the same again, if they were to neglect another God unknown to them, they erected that altar with the inscription ΑΓΝΩΣΤΟ ΘΕΟ, that is to say, if there be another God unknown to us, in his honour this altar be erected by us, that he be gracious to us if we do not worship him, not knowing him. Καὶ ὡς φιλανθότημα μὴ τὸ αὐτὸ δὴ καὶ ἄλλοτε πάθος, παραγόντες τινα Θεόν ἄγνωστον; αὐτοῖς, ἄνεστησεν τὸν βωμὸν ἑκαίνον ἑπεράπαντες ΑΓΝΩΣΤΟ ΘΕΟ, τοῦτο λέγοντες, ὅτι καὶ εἰ τις ἐγγονὸν παρ᾽ ἡμοῖοι, εἰς τιμὴν ἑκαίνον στόχος δὴ παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἐγγέγραψεν, διὸ ἐν Λεωσ ἡμῶν εἰς ἀεὶρ ἄγνωστον μὴ βασιλεύσειν.'

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

The other occasion to which, according to Oecumenius, the erection of the altar is attributed by some, is a great pest, which was so severe that the Athenians could not bear even the finest underclothing upon their bodies (ὅσι μηδὲ τῶν λεπτοτάτων, συνθόνων ἀνέχεσθαι). This tradition coincides with that mentioned by our commentaries from Diogenes Laertius about the pest and the way by which Epimenides put an end to it. The former I have not found mentioned in any German commentary, and, as it will be of special interest to those versed in Greek history, I call attention to it, in the sure expectation that in England, where the combination of classical and theological studies is livelier than with us, it will be known at least to some commentators of Acts.
By the way, it may be added that the mentioning of the name Athens in 2 Mac 6:9 is found no place in the first volume of the D.B.

The Names of Peter in the New Testament.

Surely the Apostle Peter had very bad luck with the different names which he bears in the N.T. Is it credible that bishops and archbishops of the Greek Church should not have recognized that Symeon, of whom James speaks in Ac 15:14, was the same person with Peter who had spoken in v.7-9? And yet it is so.

1. John Chrysostom in his thirty-third homily on the Acts, commenting on chap. 15, begins with saying, that James, speaking here, was the bishop of Jerusalem; and as he had not to refer to such results as Peter and Paul, he strengthens his words by referring to new and old prophets (ἐκ της τεως, ἀνω της παλαιως βεβαιωμμενων των προφητων των λογων). The old prophecy to which he refers is of course the quotation from Am 9:12, "Surely the new prophet is for Jerusalem; and as he had not to refer to such communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose."

But first we will look at the different names of Peter. It is of course the quotation from Am 9:12, "Surely the new prophet is for Jerusalem; and as he had not to refer to such communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose."