

expressed himself as a rhetorician, 'I changed (by a trope) the names of the party leaders to Paul and Apollos, and in doing so also used the "figure" of *συγκατάβασις*.' The 'trope' of course, on this view, consisted in using the names of Paul and Apollos instead of the real leaders, the 'figure' in conciliating his readers by suggesting that any depreciation he meted out to them extended also to himself.

F. H. COLSON.

ON I CORINTHIANS XV 26.

It must surely have occurred to others besides the present writer, when listening to the Lesson in the English Burial Service, that the asyndeton in I Cor. xv 26 is very odd. 'The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' Good: but how is this connected with what goes before? How has it been led up to? And if it be odd in English, a language that easily admits simple juxtaposition of sentences, with no conjunction but their inner logical appropriateness, it is still odder in Greek, which of all languages has most developed the use of connecting particles. The absence of any connecting particle at the beginning of I Cor. xv 26 ought to indicate a break in the thought, and yet there is no such break.

I am convinced that the current punctuation is wrong, that a comma should be put at the end of *ver.* 25 instead of a full-stop, and that τὸ τέλος at the beginning of *ver.* 24 does not mean 'the End of all things' but is adverbial (= 'finally'), as in I Pet. iii 8.

The passage will then run:—

'²³ But every one in his own order: Christ as first-fruits, then those that are Christ's at his coming, ²⁴ then finally . . . when he has abolished all rule and all authority and power (²⁵ for he must reign till he "put all the enemies under his feet") ²⁶ death will be abolished as the last enemy, ²⁷ for "He hath put all things in subjection under his feet".'

It is all one long sentence. The general sense is much the same as before, but the syntax I venture to think is better. And the nomenclature is better, for according to St Paul's presentation τὸ τέλος in *ver.* 24 is definitely not 'the End'. It is not the beginning of the End, for that surely is the Coming, the *Parusia*, of Christ. Nor again is it the absolute End, for St Paul goes on immediately to speak of a further event after the abolition of death, viz. the subjection of the Son to the Father. But if we take τὸ τέλος as an adverb, in conjunction with εἶτα, and in contrast to ἀπαρχή and εἵπειτα, all these difficulties are avoided.

In the above I have given an independent translation, in order to make my meaning clear. But all the change that is needed in the

familiar Authorized Version is to change 'Then *cometh* the end' (*ver.* 24) into 'Then at the end', and to alter the punctuation by putting a semi-colon instead of a full-stop at the end of *ver.* 23, and commas instead of full-stops at the ends of *vs.* 24, 25, and 26.

F. C. BURKITT.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE subject treated in my note in the January number of the JOURNAL is of so great importance that I am glad that Mr McLean's rejoinder in the April number gives me the opportunity of returning to it. I think there is a difference as to the principles of textual criticism between Mr McLean and myself, and I should like to state quite clearly what my own principles are.

There is, indeed, nothing new in them; they are familiar to every student of the New Testament, but they apply (I believe) equally well to the Old.

(i) In the case which I discussed in January (Ps. xcvi 11) two of these principles are specially applicable. They are (1) Parallel passages are specially liable to corruption by assimilation; (2) The difficult reading is generally to be preferred to the easier. I need not say that both these principles are amply illustrated in the text (e.g.) of the Synoptic Gospels. The state of the Lucan text of the Lord's Prayer illustrates (1); while several rugged passages in the Second Gospel illustrate (2).

But are not these principles to be applied also to the textual criticism of the Psalms? I say without hesitation that it is just, simply just, to keep in mind in the study of the text of the O. T. the danger of textual assimilation of parallel passages. Here is an undeniable case of a near coincidence in language which a scribe would be tempted consciously or unconsciously to make more complete.

Ps. xcvi 11 אור זרע (זרוע) ו. ל. לצדיק
ולישרי לב שמחה:

Ps. cxii 4 זרה בחשך אור לישרים

The first of these two parallel passages is afflicted with a (presumed) various reading (זרה) which in fact coincides with the reading of the second. When such a case occurs in the New Testament, critics give careful consideration to the possibility that an attempt has been made to assimilate one passage to the other.

The second principle, that of giving preference generally to the harder reading, also applies to Ps. xcvi 11. I think no one will deny