

## ON ὡφθη ἀγγέλοις, I TIM. III. 16.

PROF. R. W. MICOU.

PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL.

THE agreement among exegetes in rendering this clause (as in both English versions) "was seen of angels," is remarkable. Very few names of note, among them, however, Hofmann, Grimm, (Lexicon of the New Testament), and Vaughan, can be quoted for the simpler "He appeared to messengers, or heralds." Yet the arguments in favor of the latter rendering seem to me overwhelming, though I do not remember having met with any full statement of them.

All agree that the passage is a quotation and metrical in structure ; yet none have noticed that to refer the ὡφθη to an appearance to angels breaks the order and progression of the six clauses and deprives the stanza—for such it seems to be—of its otherwise remarkable harmony and consistency. It is a fragment of some ancient symbol or hymn, which the writer uses as a familiar statement of the truth of which the Church is the pillar and ground, and which was manifested in the historic life of the Christ, himself the mystery, *i.e.* the revelation, of godliness (Col. i. 27).

The metrical structure, as Winer points out, is Hebrew rather than Greek, due possibly to the use of the Psalms in Christian worship. The parallelisms are sharply defined—more so, indeed, than is common in Hebrew poetry :

1. "Who was manifested in flesh : justified in spirit ;
2. Appeared unto heralds : preached among the nations ;
3. Was believed on in the world : received up into glory."

Each sentence expresses two aspects of one thought :

1. The manifestation of the Eternal Son, outwardly in flesh and inwardly as righteous in spirit.
2. The confirmation of this manifestation, outwardly by the resurrection and spiritually by the preaching of the Gospel with power over the souls of men.

3. The present and abiding result of this manifestation, in the believing Church and the rule of the exalted Christ.

The contrast between *ἐν πνεύματι* and *ἐν σαρκί* is the same as in 1 Pet. iii. 18, "put to death in the flesh, but quickened in spirit." Ἐδικαιώθη is "declared, or proven, righteous" in his claims to be the Messiah. An exact equivalent is found in Ps. l. 6 (LXX.) ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε.

The definite sign of this justification and acceptance with God, throughout the Acts and Epistles, is the resurrection, followed by the preaching of the Word in the power of the Spirit (Acts iv. 10, 33); "Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4); "They went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word with signs following" (Mark xvi. 20). Hence (2) naturally follows (1) and connects it with (3), in which are joined after Scripture analogy the believing Church and the ascended Christ. "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations," etc. (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Ephes. iv. 8-12).

Again, in each sentence the parallelism is founded on the contrast between the outward and the inward, the visible and the spiritual sides of the manifestation of Christ. On the one side, manifest in the flesh; appearing visibly to the disciples; believed on in the world by the Church which is his body, his witness to men: on the other, justified in spirit; preached among the nations as the object of a spiritual faith; received up into glory beyond human sight.

The sequence of the six clauses is historically correct, except that the ascension preceded in time the preaching of the Gospel and the believing of the Church; but apart from the ascension's being the fitting close of the series, it is to be remembered that in the Gospel narrative the command to preach and the implied promise of the Church's believing are between the resurrection and the ascension; Luke xxiv. 47; Mark xvi. 15.

Both the historical order and the parallelism between the outer and the spiritual aspects of the Gospel are destroyed if ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις be rendered "was seen by angels." This takes it entirely out of the series of outward facts to which the corresponding members in the other sentences belong; for an appearance to angels would be different, as regards vision, from that to men; might not take place on earth at all, and certainly not visibly, as Christ in the flesh and the Church were visible.

Again, instead of forming a natural link between "justified in spirit" and "preached among nations," it divides them by the sudden introduction of something which does not concern men in the least, which forms no part in Scripture of the mystery or revelation of godliness, and which has no such recognition in patristic writings as its presence in such a concise summary of important doctrine would lead us to expect, — contrasting in this respect strikingly with St. Peter's teaching of the descent into Hades.

Though agreeing in their rendering, the commentators differ widely in their ideas of what this appearance to angels was, and fail to suggest any of sufficient import to justify the prominence here given it. That the angels at the sepulchre saw him first seems trivial, — it could be taken for granted; any reference to his ascending to the hosts of glory above is forbidden by the position of the clause and the explicit mention later of the ascension, as Huther admits though apparently favoring this explanation himself. Christ's headship over all spiritual beings (Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 6) cannot be meant, for that is a permanent relation which could not be described by ὤφθη, which means more than simply "was seen," implying a voluntary appearance, at some definite time or place. Giving ὤφθη this scriptural force, "making oneself visible to eyes unable before to see," we feel how inadmissible is Chrysostom's comment, ὤφθη ἀγγέλους ὥστε καὶ ἄγγελοι μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, πρότερον οὐχ ὄρωντες, for the angels who announced his birth and surrounded him all through his earthly life with their ministrations certainly saw him, and did not need the resurrection to teach them what the evil spirits already knew (Mark i. 24), that He was the Son of God. Theodoret's suggestion that even the angels needed the incarnation in order to behold τὴν ἀόρατον τῆς θεότητος φύσιν is irrelevant for the same reason, viz. that it is a permanent beholding.

Thus ὤφθη seems to be the key to the whole passage, and about its meaning in Scripture there is no room for controversy. As Huther says, "it always presupposes the activity of the person seen." It is almost a technical term for a definite and transitory manifestation of spiritual beings, whether God, angels, or the risen Christ. It is thus used repeatedly in the LXX. of the Old Testament theophanies and angelic appearances; as Gen. xii. 7 (Acts vii. 2); Ex. iii. 2; Jer. xxxviii. 3; etc.

In the New Testament it is used of angelic appearances, Luke i. 11; xxii. 43; of Moses and Elijah at the transfiguration, Matt. xvii. 3; Mark ix. 4; and especially of appearances of the risen Christ,

Luke xxiv. 34; Acts ix. 17; xiii. 31; etc.; also of the dead who arose after his resurrection, Matt. xxvii. 53. It is the only word used in 1 Cor. xv. 1-8, which must have been among the familiar statements of the resurrection, and have done much to determine the words used in connection with it. Scripture analogy therefore would seem to determine its meaning here as referring to the appearance of Christ to the disciples, rather than to some mysterious manifestation to the angels, in which case, as they were spiritual beings, the word, which implies physical vision, would be peculiarly inappropriate.

Equally important is the consideration that such a rendering deprives this summary of the faith of any reference to the resurrection, of which the apostles were ordained to be witnesses and which formed the central point in the preaching,—an omission so incredible that, before admitting it, we must ask stronger arguments than the two commonly alleged, viz. the omission of the article, and the usual meaning of ἄγγελος.

As to the first, it should be noted that the article is omitted in all the clauses; we have ἐν κόσμῳ, ἐν ἔθνεσιν, as well as ἀγγέλοις. It may have been intentional, in order to include all to whom Christ appeared, such as the five hundred (1 Cor. xv. 6) and Mary Magdalene and the other women. The latter certainly were ἄγγελοι of the resurrection; for we read that Mary Magdalene came ἀγγέλλουσα ὅτι εὔρακα τὸν κύριον, and the others ἔδραμον ἀπαγγέλλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν.

As to the Apostles, the accredited preachers of the resurrection, they could be called angels of the Lord as fitly as John the Baptist (Mal. iii. 1; Matt. xi. 10). In the Old Testament ἄγγελος is used as often for "messenger" as for "angel," the context easily determining its signification. It is true that in the New Testament it commonly means "angel"; but that the primary meaning—the only one in classic Greek—was never forgotten is plain from its application to the messengers of John the Baptist (Luke vii. 24), to the disciples Christ sent before him (Luke ix. 52), and to the spies of Joshua (Jas. ii. 25).

The context here, as we have seen, determines its meaning; and its use of the Apostles without qualification is no more surprising in a poetical passage than our use of its exact equivalent in the hymn, "Go forth, ye heralds, in my name." It is so closely connected with the Gospel words εὐαγγελίζω, εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελιστής, that, for aught we know, it may have been in common use. One example of such a usage is suggested by the angels of the seven churches.

The remnants of subapostolic writings are too scanty to authorize us to dogmatize negatively on such a point. We did not know till the finding of the *Διδαχή* that the word *apostle* was the accepted designation of a certain class of evangelists in the early Church.

## St. Paul's Handicraft: Acts xviii. 3.

PROF. EBERHARD NESTLE.

TÜBINGEN.

AMONG the various explanations of the rare word *σκηνοποιός*, Acts xviii. 3, that of the Peshito has in recent times been almost entirely overlooked. This "queen of the versions," as it used to be called, renders *lulârâ*, or rather *lâulârâ*. The Syriac word is extremely rare — almost unique — and has hitherto remained unexplained. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 1910, says that Karmesedinâyâ derives it from *lâurâ*, i.e., the Latin *lorum*. In this Karmesedinâyâ is quite right; *lâulârâ* is — what he did not see — nothing but the Latin *lorarius*.<sup>1</sup> This is proved by a very curious passage in the legend of the Discovery of the Cross. The Syriac text runs thus:<sup>2</sup> אָן שְׂאוּל דְּעַל גַּב הַיְכְלָא אִתְּוּדוּ דְּהוּא וְבִאֲרֻמְנֻתָא דְּלוּלָרָא פְּלַח דְּהוּא; in the Latin recension,<sup>3</sup> "Paulus, qui ante templum sedebat exercebat artem scænografiã" (scene-painting! — a new occupation for St. Paul; unless we should regard the word as equivalent to *σκηνογραφίαν*); but in the Greek,<sup>4</sup> Σαῦλος ὁ πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν καθεζόμενος ὁ καὶ ἱμαντοτόμος. Wotke has recently published a new recension of the Greek, in which he thinks he discovers the original of the Latin form of the legend.<sup>5</sup> In this we read, Σαῦλος ὁ πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν καθεζόμενος ὡς κοιτοτόμος ἦν, for which we must, of course, restore, ὡς σκυτοτόμος ἦν. Chrysostom, too, who probably

<sup>1</sup> For the interchange of *r* and *l* the single example *lelriov*, *lilium*, will suffice.

<sup>2</sup> In my *Syriac Grammar*, 117, 90 = *de sancto cruce*, 28, 90.

<sup>3</sup> A. Holder, *Inventio sanctae crucis*, 1889, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 33.

<sup>5</sup> Wotke, *die griechische Vorlage der lateinischen Kreusauffindungslegende*, in *Wiener Studien, Zeitschrift für classische Philologie*, XIII. (1891) 305.