

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 16.—October, 1883.

I.

MILTON AND TENNYSON.

“ Blessings be with them and immortal praise,
Who gave us noble lives and nobler cares,
The Poets, who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth and pure delight by heavenly lays.”—WORDSWORTH.

TWO rivers, rising in the same lofty region and fed by kindred springs, are guided by the mountain-slopes of their environment into channels which, though not far apart, are widely different. The one, deeper and stronger from its birth, after a swift and lovely course through fair uplands of peace, is shattered suddenly by the turmoil of a fierce conflict, lifting but one foam-crested wave of warning, is plunged into the secret and tumultuous warfare of a deep cañon, emerging at length with wondrously augmented current, to flow majestically through a land of awful, thunder-riven cliffs, towering peaks, vast forests, and immeasurable plains,—a mighty land, a mighty stream. The other river, from a source less deep, but no less pure and clear, passing with the same gentle current through the same region of sweet seclusion, meets with no mighty obstacle, is torn by no wild cataract in its descent, but with ever-growing force and deepening, widening stream sweeps through a land less majestic, but more beautiful, not void of grandeur, but free from horror,—a land of shadowy vales and gardens; mysterious cities hung in air, and hills crowned with ruined castles,—a stream brimming and bright and large, whose smooth, strong flow often conceals its unsounded depth, and mirrors, not only the fleeting shores, but also the eternal stars, in its bosom.

Such is the figure in which I see the poetry of Milton and of Tennyson flowing through the literature and life of our English race.

The reading "Ἑλληνας" in Acts xi. 20.—Westcott and Hort have reversed the judgment of preceding critical editors in regard to this text, and have returned to "*Ἑλληνιστάς*," the reading of the Text. Rec. This return was so unexpected, and at the same time appears to agree so entirely with Westcott and Hort's canons of textual criticism that we are led to ask whether it must indeed be sustained, or whether the very strong considerations which have led most critics to the other reading should still outweigh the opinion of the new editors. The settlement of the text in such a case as this may in turn become a partial test of the principles themselves by which the critics are governed.

sition was (ver. 1) *there is left a promise of entering the rest*. There might be a rest, and yet no promise of it to the people of God now. Accordingly we have seen the Author establish that the rest remains as a premiss to establishing farther that there is a promise of it offered now.

(4). As a conclusion (and even as a reiterated conclusion, which no once supposes it to be) our ver. 9 would be flat, because the conclusion has been presented already at verse 6, "*there remains the rest for persons to enter into it*." Moreover, that conclusion is the glorious one that *God's rest remains*, while this would only be a conclusion that *a rest remains*.

(5). Most decisive of all, *σαββατισμός* means, *to observe the Sabbath*. This, of course, is undisputed. The only question is, Does the Author mean to use it in an exalted sense? There is nothing to intimate that he does. The word must have some history to be able to stand itself for such a meaning. But the fact is, it has no history previous to its present use, being found in antecedent or contemporary Greek literature only in the one other place mentioned above. Or it must have such a meaning lent to it in the context by qualification or previous use. Of this there is nothing. Only the assumption, that in this verse the Author sums up the result of his reasoning, has induced the notion that he means by *σαββατ*, the same as God's rest, and thus that he calls that rest a keeping of Sabbath. It is better to do as we have done—seek a meaning for the context consistent with the primary and common sense of the word.

(6). We may ascribe the traditional interpretation to something more than a mistake. Here may be found one of the most important effects of our owing that traditional view to Gentile interpretation. It is obvious that the rendering we have given ver. 9 involves the most important consequences concerning the observance of the Sabbath. It makes our verse the most pointed New Testament proof-text for the perpetual obligation of the Fourth Commandment. We have only to represent to our minds the apprehension with which these consequences must be regarded by those that now deny that obligation, and we will represent to ourselves the feelings with which Gentile Christians of the second century would approach the statement of ver. 9. As in the modern, so in the ancient mind, the assumption would be that the *prima facie* meaning of the words *could not be that which was intended*. Comp. de PRESSENSE, *Trois Premières Scécle, II., chap. vi., § 1*. The *οὐ σαββαρίζουεν* of JUSTIN (*Dial. com. Tryphone*, c. x.) may be taken as representing the fixed attitude of their mind that determined their interpretation of the Scriptures, as *Hoc est corpus meum*, chalked on the table of the castle of Marburg, determined LUTHER'S. Consequently, they would look for another sense, to which the allegorizing and imaginative exegesis of that period would easily accommodate itself, with a haughty disregard of any correction that might be offered from Jewish Christian quarters. The traditional interpretation, we may suppose, was the consequence. (Comp. TERTUL., *adv. Judeos*, c. 2; EPIPHAN., *adver. haeres. Lib. I., Tom. II., xxx. c. 32*.)

Those that maintain the obligation of the Fourth Commandment according to the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, will observe that the rendering now given of vers. 9, 10, brings into the problem no element that was not there before, except a proof-text that more directly than any other in the New Testament affirms the doctrine there taught.

The MS. authorities stand in this instance as follows: For Ἑλληνιστάς, B D ** E₂ H₂ L₂ P₂ 61, all cursives but one, and probably Γ which has εὐαγγελιστάς, a mistake due to εὐαγγελιζόμενοι following, but implying that Ἑλληνιστάς was intended; for Ἑλληνας, A D X^c 112. In this evidence we note first that the group X B, with some unimportant additions, is strong evidence for Ἑλληνιστάς, so strong as in W. and H.'s judgment to decide the question. Secondly, the testimony of A is peculiar. It deserts the "Syrian" text and its casual companions, the cursives, and hence would seem to give specially strong testimony for Ἑλληνας. Its testimony is, however, somewhat weakened by the fact that in the Acts A seems to betray a tendency to put unduly forward the Gentile work of the Church, for in ix. 29 it alone reads that Paul in Jerusalem "spake and disputed πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας" instead of "Ἑλληνιστάς." It may possibly be a further indication of the same tendency when in xvii. 4, in the sentence "certain of them (the Jews of Thessalonica) believed and consorted with Paul and Silas, and of the devout Greeks (Ἑλλήνων) a great multitude," etc., both A and D insert a καί before Ἑλλήνων, thus making the conversion of pure Gentiles more marked. Nevertheless A is still a strong witness for Ἑλληνας, for which, besides X^c there remains the older testimony of D. It must be confessed A D are much less powerful friends for a reading to depend on than are X B, and if external authority is to rigidly overrule all other Ἑλληνιστάς must be retained. The versions are unfortunately in this instance ambiguous and afford little aid. But this is a passage where internal considerations are so strongly in favor of Ἑλληνας as to render the other reading very difficult of interpretation. If we are to understand the two words in their common New Testament senses of "Greeks" and "Greek-speaking Jews," the use of the latter in this verse appears scarcely comprehensible. Thus the immediate connection seems to require Ἑλληνας. "They that were scattered abroad upon the tribulation that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phœnicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to none *save only to Jews* (Ἰουδαίοις). But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the *Grecian Jews* also." Is not that obviously a strange sentence? Were not Hellenists Jews? Evidently the antithesis requires a word denoting Gentiles. Moreover, the Gospel had been preached to Hellenists from the beginning; see vi. 1; v. 9. Why then should their conversion in Antioch have led the mother church to send Barnabas to inquire into the matter, and why should he at once have brought Paul on the scene, whose mission, as he knew well, was to the Gentiles (cf. Acts xxii. 21)? Furthermore, vi. 1 shows that the natural antithesis of Ἑλληνιστής is with Ἑβραῖος; whereas Ἰουδαῖος and Ἕλλην are regularly antithetical to each other (cf. Acts xiv. 1; xvi. 1; xviii. 4; xix. 10; Rom. i. 16, etc.). When, therefore, the internal evidence is considered, it seems overpoweringly in favor of the idea that this preaching was to Gentiles, for which Ἑλληνας would be the natural word to use; so that absolutely decisive evidence would be required to cause another reading to be accepted.

But, say Westcott and Hort, while "Ἑλληνας has *prima facie* intrinsic evi-

dence in its favour, as being alone in apparent harmony with the context," "this is true only if it be assumed that *Ἰουδαῖοι* is used in a uniformly exclusive sense throughout the book; whereas it excludes proselytes in ii. 10, and (τ. *σεβομένοις*) xvii. 17 (compare xiii. 43; xvii. 4 [taken with 1]; and the double use of *Ἰουδαιῶν* in xiv. 1), and may therefore exclude 'Hellenists' here." But, even supposing these "*σεβομένοι*" to have been always proselytes, the latter were Gentile-born. In xvii. 4 *Ἑλλήνων* is explicitly added to *τῶν σεβομένων*. In the face of the expressed antitheses already mentioned (*Ἐβραῖος-Ἑλληνιστῆς* and *Ἰουδαῖος-Ἕλλην*), as well as in view of the inferior position of proselytes in the Jewish system to that which the Hellenists occupied, it is quite too much to say that because *Ἰουδαῖος* excludes proselytes it may also exclude Hellenists. Nor can we admit that "the language of vv. 19, 20 would be appropriate if the 'Hellenists' at Antioch, not being merged in the general body of resident Jews, were specially singled out and addressed (*ἐλάλουν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἑ.*, not as in verse 19, *λαλοῦντες . . . Ἰουδαίους*) by the men of Cyprus and Cyrene." The imperfect indicative *ἐλάλουν* only the more points to these unusual acts, and surely preaching in a synagogue of Hellenistic Jews, or even specially directing efforts toward them was not unusual, as we have noted above. Moreover, the antithesis of *Ἰουδαίους* would still weigh against this explanation.

The question therefore remains, can these internal considerations outweigh the heavy authorities of X B and their less important companions? Westcott and Hort say that "a familiar word [viz. : *Ἑλληνας*] standing in an obvious antithesis was not likely to be exchanged for a word so rare that it is no longer extant, except in a totally different sense, anywhere but in the Acts and two or three late Greek interpretations of the Acts; more especially when the change introduced an apparent difficulty." But, while the principle of this remark is certainly true, a valid reason may in this case be assigned for such a change; for, since this preaching beyond the bounds of the chosen race was not authorized by an apostle, it might easily seem in the view of a later age too presumptuous to have been possible. It is evident that the Church at large had not yet heard of the baptism of Cornelius; probably, indeed, that event had not occurred when these missionaries reached Antioch. Our MSS. were written when ecclesiastical authority was rising high, and a wish to guard the supremacy of the apostles may quite as possibly have led to a change from *Ἑλληνας* to *Ἑλληνιστάς* as a wish to rightly balance the sentence, or a finer perception of the real progress of primitive church history may have led to the change of *Ἑλληνιστάς* to *Ἑλληνας*.

It should also be observed that according to Westcott and Hort's own notes on "Select Readings in the Acts," even a group containing X B may give erroneous texts. Thus in vii. 46 they read "*τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ*" with X^a A C E₂ P₂, all cursives and versions, instead of "*τῷ οἰκῷ Ἰ.*" with X B D H₂. They consider; however, *οἰκῷ* the older reading, but nevertheless a primitive error. Dr. Hort thinks the original may have been *κυριῷ*. Again, in xiii. 32 they read "*τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν*" with X A B C D, but add that it "gives only an improbable sense," and that *ἡμῶν* is probably a primitive corruption

of ἡμῶν. See also Hort's notes on xx. 28 and xxvi. 28. Instances like these, although not precisely similar to our passage, certainly diminish the weight of the evidence for Ἑλληνιστάς, forbidding us to trust too implicitly in even the best MSS. While not presuming to speak positively, we cannot but think the force of the internal evidence in this passage will continue to induce critics to retain Ἑλληνας, unless still stronger evidence to the contrary appears, or unless Ἑλληνιστάς be made to have practically the same meaning as the other word. It is possible also that in this passage a warning is given against over-confidence in even the most careful examination of groups of MSS.; for, after the best classifying and estimating of them, the possibility of error in detail still remains. If Ἑλληνας be retained, its most faithful witness D has done at least something toward redeeming its character, which just now is seriously threatened. It is doubtless far safer to be governed in determining a text by external evidence than by the supposed demands of exegesis, but as Dr. Hort has well taught us, there are limits upon every side to every rule. It should be noted in conclusion that the Revised version, which is supposed to have been much influenced by Westcott and Hort's principles of criticism, has nevertheless accepted Ἑλληνας, reading "Greeks" in the text, and merely adding in the margin, "many ancient authorities read *Grecian Jews*."

GEORGE T. PURVES.

The Discovery of Pithom-Succoth and the Exodus Route.—For Bible students, especially those engaged in Oriental researches in their relation to the Scripture evidences, the discovery just made in Egypt under the auspices of the "Egypt Exploration Fund Committee,"* has a special value. We refer to its

* The "Committee" was formed "to conduct excavations in Egypt, especially on sites of Biblical and classical interest." Work has to be done according to the Egyptian law, which strictly forbids any further exportation of "finds." All objects found in such researches are claimed for the museum at Boolak. It was stated at the recent meeting of the Society held in July that the Egyptian Government had presented to the Society two of the monuments recovered. It was decided to present them to the British Museum. However, M. Maspero, the director-general of the Egyptian museums, has consented that any "publication of results of the Society's work, within reasonable limit of time, shall belong exclusively to the Society." The superintendence of the excavations is confided to M. Naville, a Swiss Egyptologist. The discovery just made is the result of the first campaign under his direction. With an experienced engineer and some eighty laborers, M. Naville selected the Wadi Tumilat as the locality for investigation, and chose as the special spot to begin with, the celebrated mounds of Tell-el-Maskhutah, long supposed to be the site of the town "Rameses"—one of the two "treasure cities" referred to in the first chapter of Exodus as built by the Hebrews. It is interesting also to know that the Wadi was the scene of the late war. The work was begun on the 19th of January last, and continued for near seven weeks. By the end of the first week M. Naville had discovered that the site was not "Rameses," but Pithom—the other store-city of the Bible narrative. Also that Pithom was simply the sacred name of the town (as Pa-Tum, *i. e.*, the dwelling-place of the god Tum). Its ordinary name was Thukut, the Hebrew Succoth. Subsequent labors brought to light further interesting facts. (1) That Rameses II. was the founder of the town, thus identifying Rameses II. as the Pharaoh who compelled the Hebrews to build it. (2) That it was a "store-city"—the store-chambers being discovered. (3) A tablet of the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus was discovered (to be called "the stèle of Pithom"), similar in style to the Rosetta stone, except that the inscription is in hieroglyphics only, giving an account of the founding of the city of Arsinoë, at the head of the gulf, and details of work on the canal leading from the Nile to the Red Sea, on which Pithom-Succoth was a station.

A full account is reserved for the present. The committee proposes to undertake as its next work