

# Concordia Theological Monthly



J U L Y



1 9 5 8

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

VOL. XXIX

JULY 1958

No. 7

---

## Aids to Bible Study

### The Nestle Text

By FREDERICK W. DANKER

EDITORIAL NOTE. For the first article in this series of "Aids to Bible Study" by the same author see the March 1958 issue, pp. 161 ff.

SINCE its first edition in 1898 Eberhard Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece* has become standard equipment for students of the New Testament. The 23d edition (1957),<sup>1</sup> edited jointly by his son Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, who is to succeed Nestle as the editor, has erased some of the blemishes in its predecessors and includes the readings of Papyrus Bodmer 66.<sup>2</sup>

The interpretive possibilities of this marvelous little book are nothing short of miraculous, but experience with seminary students would indicate that many are unaware of the vast resources at their disposal. Initial exegetical courses do indeed acquaint the seminarian with the textual tradition embraced in the apparatus and attempt to help him find his way through the maze of variant readings, but little more than a casual acquaintance with all the signs and symbols and notations employed can be struck up in a course that must go on to the larger aspects of hermeneutics or isagogics.

This paper therefore aims to confine itself to those functions of the critical apparatus and especially of the marginal notations which might otherwise be completely overlooked or neglected. It aims

---

<sup>1</sup> For a preview of the 24th edition of Nestle, now in preparation, as well as for a critique of the 23d edition, see Harald Riesenfeld, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 83 (March 1958), 188—190.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Martin Scharlemann, "Papyrus Sixty-Six," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXVIII (August 1957), 573—578, for a fine summary appraisal of this papyrus. Suggestions concerning Nestle data, made by him as well as by another colleague, Prof. Victor Bartling, have added grist to the mill.

through ample illustration to show what a student, with nothing but the Nestle text and the Old Testament, can do by way of vital exposition. It aims further to aid in the development of an awareness of critical problems as suggested by the Nestle content. Certainly it is a great gain if, e. g., in the course of sermon preparation, the hints here given encourage the expositor to an investigation that he might otherwise not have undertaken. Such investigation requires detailed reference to standard exegetical tools and therefore properly lies outside the scope of this paper, whose primary objective is an introduction to Nestle. Since a cluttering of this article with Greek footnotes would not materially advance this objective either, it is presumed that each reference will be carefully checked in Nestle.

### PART I THE APPARATUS

To explore the critical apparatus in a Nestle edition is itself an adventure in Biblical learning. Here can be found much of the stuff that makes the professional commentator appear so learned. Yet it is available for less than three mills per page to any student, if only he will read. There are, first of all, those curious items that suggest fresh insights into the attitudes and approaches of early churchmen to the New Testament documents.

#### *Curios*

A striking example of the free hand applied to the Gospels is found in the critical note on Mark 16:14. The familiar **T** suggests an interpolation. The dot inside it marks it as the second in this verse. The interpolation is found in W, the Freer MS. in Washington (4th to 5th century; see Nestle, p. 14 \*). The syntax is not too clear, but we may render somewhat as follows:

And they excused themselves, saying, "This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under the domination of Satan, who through the agency of the unclean spirits does not permit the true power of God to be apprehended." "Therefore reveal now your righteousness," they said to Christ. And Christ said: "The bounds of the years of Satan's power are fulfilled, but other terrible things are drawing near. And in behalf of those who sinned I was delivered into death that they might be converted to the truth and might no longer sin,

in order that they might inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness in heaven.”

The scribe evidently felt no compunctions about improving the apostles' reputation.

At Acts 24:24 the Harkleian Syriac (see p. 72 \*) reads in the margin, “who desired to see Paul and hear his word; wishing therefore to please her. . . .” Clearly this scribe was not particularly impressed with Felix' qualifications for church membership.

Someone with antiquarian interests, possibly reflecting a recent trip to the Holy Land, is careful to insert the names of the two public enemies, Joathas and Maggattras, at Luke 23:32. Unfortunately he leaves us in the dark as to the identity of the repentant bandit. An Old Latin witness at Mark 15:27 displays a slight variation. The addition of 'Ιησοῦν in Matt. 27:16, a “noteworthy rejected reading” in Westcott-Hort (cf. Nestle, p. 76 \*), reflects early typological concerns.

We are grateful for the researches of the copyist who assures us that the rich man's name was Nineue (Finees, according to Priscillian) at Luke 16:19, but the attempt at identification seems to destroy a significant insight in the original text — God's personal interest in those who depend on His mercy and His rejection of the proud and complacent. Barreled alive in his cask of self, man dies without a name. God knows him not (cf. Luke 13:27). Though the theology of the text is obscured, yet the documentation of an early approach to the literary form is valuable. Nineue makes it at least doubtful that we are dealing here with parable, as the copyist of D believed (see the  $\overline{\Gamma}$  at v. 19), rather than what may be termed theological story.

The Magnificat has never been widely ascribed to anyone but Mary, but one must face the fact that there is very early testimony, possibly second century, for the ascription of this memorable song to Elizabeth. (Luke 1:46)

### *Translator's Aid*

Few students realize how useful the apparatus can be to help one out of an embarrassing translation situation. The critical apparatus quite often suggests clarification of the text or helps solve some particularly intricate syntax. 2 Cor. 8:24 is not nearly so obscure

when one looks at ἐνδείξασθε, the variant for the participle preferred by the editor. The student is reminded here of a familiar N. T. phenomenon related to the Semitic love for the participle to express imperatival relations. The aorist participle in Acts 25:13 might easily evoke an awkward translation, but the copyists represented in the apparatus assure us that this was not a *long-distance* salutation. But in their anxiety to rid the text of a troublesome "subsequent" aorist participle these copyists miss the point. Agrippa and Bernice not only send greetings to Festus but, astute politicians that they are, communicate them in person. Literally, "they came down to Caesarea in salutation of Festus."<sup>3</sup> The difficulty in the phrase ἐπὶ Τίτου at 2 Cor. 7:14 is immediately removed by looking at the scribal gloss πρὸς Τίτον. It is the boast that Paul made before Timothy in the latter's presence, face to face with him. And lest the novice develop careless grammatical habits, there is always the pedantic copyist with his neat classical corrections, as at 1 Thess. 3:8.

#### *Dogmatical Arena*

The apparatus also permits us to catch a glimpse of theologians engaged in heated debate. We see daring alterations of hallowed texts emerging out of earnest concerns for truth.

The alteration at Luke 2:33 is well known. The virginal conception is preserved by inserting "Joseph" in place of ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ (cf. vv. 41, 43, 49 [cf. Matt. 1:16]). A cognate concern for the doctrine of Jesus' virginal conception is evident in the interesting variant in John 1:13. In place of the plural (οἱ . . . ἐγεννήθησαν) the singular (*qui . . . natus est*) is read by b, Irenaeus (lat.), and Tertullian.

In a similar vein is the omission by a few minuscules of οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, Mark 13:32, to preserve our Lord's omniscience. The raised colon next to the word σάρκα at Rom. 9:5 alerts a significant alteration in punctuation. The apparatus indicates that Irenaeus' Latin text, Chrysostom, Tertullian, and Ambrosiaster construe the succeeding relative clause as an amplification of the preceding statement. Eusebius and others eliminate a proof-text for Christ's deity with a major stop.

---

<sup>3</sup> A parallel phenomenon occurs in Rom. 5:11, where the variant καυχώμεθα explains the participle καυχώμενοι.

An interesting omission occurs at Mark 7:4. Some of the great uncials do not include καὶ κλινῶν, but the word has catholic support. If the word was originally a part of Mark's autograph, then its omission would tend to confirm belief in a widespread practice of immersion at the time of Baptism. A copyist would observe that the immersion of dining couches was difficult if not impossible. At any rate Mark 7:4 is not the most convincing argument in favor of sprinkling. At Luke 8:29 an imperfect competes with an aorist for recognition. Vaticanus and the Byzantine texts read the aorist, undoubtedly because it was felt that a slow-motion imperfect did not do justice to Jesus' customary ability to heal with immediate results. For this the high-speed aorist was needed.

Philemon 5 presents an instructive illustration of altered word order. Instead of ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν (D), a few minuscules, and the Peshitta read πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην. The copyist or copyists originally responsible for this alteration display commendable doctrinal sobriety in placing faith ahead of works, but a little of the edge is taken off what must certainly have been Paul's original statement. It is Paul's intention to emphasize Philemon's displays of *agape*, but the present situation calls for maximum effort, and therefore Paul is grateful to hear of the faith that Philemon has to spark still more *agape*. Thus the original reading does not place faith alongside love as two separate entities but relates them vitally in such a way that faith stands midway between Philemon's past and the future that is now expected of him. On the hinge of faith Philemon's past and future swing. Later copyists missed the point, but the fact that they missed it helps us to note it.

Antisegregationists and opponents of racial intolerance would do well to take a second look at Acts 17:26 before introducing it as Biblical Exhibit A disproving white supremacy. An antiprejudice punch is there, but probably not in the doubtful variant αἵματος.

The question whether the Scriptures teach that the resurrection of the body is a signal prerogative of the Holy Spirit depends on whether the διὰ in Rom. 8:11 is followed by an accusative or a genitive.

The variant Ἰησοῦς, Jude 5, suggests an early connection of Joshua — Jesus with the Exodus and raises the question of the lengths to which the early church went in its Christological interpretation of the Old Testament.

Of ultimate significance is the variant at John 1:18. The RSV will almost be forced to shift the marginal reading "God" to the text as a result of the Bodmer Papyrus 66 reading which unequivocally asserts the deity of Jesus Christ.

### *Interpreter's Paradise*

Often the apparatus is helpful in interpreting the material accepted in the text. The Latin addition to Luke 23:48 leads one to the correct interpretation of the Passion events as God's most decisive action evoking repentance and faith. This is not to say that all who returned to their homes were repentant, but as the Latin addition suggests ("Woe . . . for the desolation of Jerusalem has drawn near"), it was not Jesus who was on trial but the nation.

The question mark suggested by commentators after the words καὶ μὲ οἴδατε καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί in John 7:28 would appear to add considerable clarity to a difficult passage. At any rate, if the declarative statement is preferred, the expositor should be able to give adequate reasons in view of the fact that the autograph was undoubtedly ambiguous here.

The jolt at John 3:25 is not really felt until one looks at the apparatus and realizes that from childhood one has been reading "with the Jews." The various conjectures which suggest Jesus in place of the singular Ἰουδαίου indicate the difficulty. The context seems to require Jesus as the second party in the dispute.

2 Cor. 10:10 with its φησὶν is appreciated much more if the plural in the apparatus is noted. Is Paul aiming at the leader of the opposition party? At any rate the reading must be taken into account in determining the background of the epistle.

A shift of comma at 2 Cor. 3:14 signaled by the apparatus permits the student to equal the feats of more experienced commentators in presenting the interpretive possibilities of this verse.

If it were not for the variant at John 6:15, φεύγει, read by Aleph first hand in place of ἀνεχώρησεν, one might miss the evangelist's point entirely. And in Acts 22:28 the point of the centurion's

remarks is really caught only when the eye catches Bede's Latin interpolation. To claim Roman citizenship is a serious matter, the centurion warns Paul.

Scribal suggestions, however, are not always premium grade. But even an erroneous interpretation can alert one to the hazards of reading something alien into the text. The allegedly niggardly character of the rich man (Luke 16:19-31) is evidently imported into the text of Luke 16:21 from 15:16. There is no suggestion in the pericope that the rich man's heart was shut to Lazarus' need. The variant (τῶν ψυχίων), however, helps document an early distortion of the intent of this story.

#### *A Note of Harmony*

Interesting questions involving harmonization of Biblical material are often suggested by the apparatus. In copying Matt. 23:35 the first scribe responsible for that portion in Sinaiticus omitted the words υἱοῦ βασιλείου, because he recognized that according to 2 Chron. 24:20-22 Zechariah was really the son of Jehoiada, as the apocryphal Gospel According to the Hebrews states. Similar genealogical harmonistic efforts are apparent in the transmission of Matthew's and Luke's genealogies.

The variants in Sinaiticus and other MSS. in Mark 14:68 and 72 (cf. 14:30) suggest concern in the minds of scribes for greater harmony with the record of the single cockcrow recorded in the other evangelists. The record of two cockcrows, on the other hand, may reflect an early attempt to make the actual events conform with a literal understanding of Jesus' prediction Mark 14:30. Some of the scribes responsible for the transmission of Matt. 26:34 cut the knot with their ἀλεκτροφωνίας, and preserve harmony with the accepted Markan text.

The apparatus to Acts indicates singular deviations of MS. D. Especially interesting is the alteration in Acts 10:40. The phrase ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ is altered to read μετὰ τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν, in conformity with Matt. 12:40 and 27:63. Similarly, Matt. 16:21, 17:23, and Luke 9:22 are brought in harmony. On the other hand there is a remarkable absence of variants in D at Matt. 20:19, Luke 18:33, or Luke 24:7.

## PART II THE MARGINS

From the bottom of the Nestle page we move upward to the margins. These are virtually inexhaustible mines of information. The average student is unaware of their potentialities, and many a preacher has wearied himself in vain while the answer to the problems in his text lay a few centimeters to the right.

*Concordance*                      A. *The Right-Hand Margin*

Often a glance at the margin will save a trip to the lexicon or spare the strain of taking Moulton-Geden off the shelf. Take, for example, 1 Cor. 7:31 and its obvious paranomasia. What is the force of the *καταχρώμενοι*? The margin refers to 9:18. (Lack of a book reference in Nestle indicates the document in hand.) In this latter passage Paul says, "What, then, is my reward? This, that in preaching the Gospel I might offer it without charge, and not insist on my full rights in the Gospel." The word he employs here in the last part of the sentence is exactly this word *καταχράομαι*. Paul does not use up his authority in the Gospel. In the former passage, then, he is saying that we should use the world, but not as people who cannot wait to *use it up*. We should use it, but not stake out a claim on it! For this cosmic pattern is outdated.

In Luke 23:43 *παράδεισος* is paralleled in 2 Cor. 12:4. The exclamation point in Nestle's margin implies that at this latter passage all the references in point will be found. A glance in the margin at 2 Cor. 12:4 leads to Rev. 2:7, where significant O. T. passages are cited, such as Gen. 2:9 and 3:22, 24. The point is clear without even a look at the initial chapters of Genesis. Paradise is symbolical of the choicest association man can enjoy with his Creator. Here on the cross Jesus is effecting a redemption which restores what Adam lost (cf. Luke 3:38). Jesus eats with publicans and sinners. Here on the cross he communicates the fellowship of God Himself to the repentant robber. Forgiveness spells fellowship with God. This word to the robber is one of Jesus' most sublime claims to Deity.

Undoubtedly the Pastorals would be consulted first if one were looking for the N. T. data on ecclesiastical offices. Experience in

dealing with the marginal references suggests immediately that at Acts 20:28 the Nestle editor has a concordance of all passages dealing with the term ἐπίσκοπος.

The margin is intensely illuminating at John 2:4. Does Jesus mean to say with the phrase ἡ ὥρα μου that He will determine the appropriate time to relieve the bridegroom's embarrassment, or is there a deeper significance? A look at John 13:1, to which the reference at 7:30 mediated by our margin points, suggests that Jesus' true Messianic function is synonymous with His Passion. It is in this larger context that the miracle at Cana is to be viewed.

### *Historical Information*

As in the apparatus so in the margin one may find much useful supplementary information. A significant insight into Paul's missionary method (assuming that the speech at the Areopagus substantially represents his missionary approach) is gained with the realization that the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν (Acts 17:28) is a citation from a poem attributed to Epimenides the Cretan. Aratus' *Phaenomena* is the source for the second quotation in this verse. Similar citations from pagan authors may be observed at 1 Cor. 15:33 and Titus 1:12.

A parallel approach to apocryphal literature, especially apocalyptic, is apparent from the marginal references in the Epistle of Jude. The Book of Enoch, popular at the beginning of the Christian era, is abstracted and cited with evident approval. The possibility of dependence on another work, the *Assumptio Mosis*, is hinted by the parenthesis at v. 9. See also 1 Peter 1:12 and 3:19.

Of even greater value is the reconstruction of the historical situation to which the various N. T. documents owe their origin. No exposition worth its salt dare be divorced from the historical roots. Of a more general isagogical nature are the handy references next to the superscriptions of many individual books. At the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel the reader finds all the references in the N. T. to one named Luke. The same applies to Mark's Gospel. There are no references at the beginning of Matthew. The parentheses at Jude 1 suggest that the letter is probably written in the name of Jesus' brother mentioned in Mark 6:3 (par. Matt. 13:55).

From the references at the superscription of 1 Corinthians it is easy to reconstruct the context of Paul's initial mission efforts in Corinth (Acts 18:1-11). 1 Thess. 3:1 ff. and Paul's entire relationship with the Thessalonians gains new point if the references to Acts 17 and 18 are checked. At Acts 18:5, in turn, the exclamation behind 15:27 in the margin alerts the reader to all references to Timothy.

These historical references must of course be employed with caution. The Nestle editor aims merely to make accessible as much relevant data as possible. Thus, for example, the references in the Pastorals to historical situations recorded in Acts should be evaluated in the light of the problems associated with the authenticity of the Pastorals. The references to a Gaius at 3 John are not to be construed as an editorial identification. In any event judicious use of the margin in this area will alert the student to many points buried in learned books on introduction.

### *Synoptic Criticism*

The Nestle margin in the Gospels, especially the Synoptists, is veritably a miniature Huck's *Synopsis*.<sup>4</sup> Identity of the source for a given pericope or portion thereof is greatly simplified by a glance at the margin. At Luke 5, for example, vv. 1-11 are identified in heavy black type. A colon indicates that the same event is probably reported in Matt. 4:18-22 and in Mark 1:16-20. A comparison with these passages would then suggest that Luke has relied heavily on his special source (L) for the story of the draught of fishes. A study of the placement of the pericopes preceding this account and paralleled in the other Synoptists, notably the story of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30), indicates that Luke adjusts the Markan outline in the interests of his own particular aims and objectives.

Between Mark 1:15 and 16 Luke has placed, first of all, the story of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (4:16-30). Mark introduces this event after Jesus' ministry is well under way, at Mark 6:1-6 according to the Nestle margin. Luke's purpose is quite apparent. He is alerting his readers to the nature of the conflict which he is

<sup>4</sup> Albert Huck, *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. 9th ed. rev. Hans Lietzmann. English ed. by F. L. Cross (Oxford, 1951).

about to describe. The story also gives him an opportunity to introduce the Gentile motif that is so close to his heart (4:25 ff.). The second alteration is the transfer of Mark 1:21-28 to a point before the calling of the first disciples (Luke 4:31-37). Mark's emphasis appears to be placed on Jesus' person. He is the Son of God, who shows His power by casting out the demons, and the disciples are to testify thereto. Luke, on the other hand, emphasizes Jesus' program. The juxtaposition of this incident with that of the rejection at Nazareth gives him the opportunity to show not only the demonic nature of the opposition that develops against Jesus but also how Jesus understands His mission, namely, as an assault on Satan's stronghold. It is in this light that Jesus' healing ministry is to be understood. Hence the incident involving Peter's mother-in-law is preserved here, especially because of the general reference in Mark to Jesus' power over the demons (Mark 1:34). Now the skill with which Luke uses the story of the draught of fishes emerges. It is in the act of taking men like Simon into His fellowship that Jesus overcomes the devices of the devil. This association with sinners, an association that plays so large a role in this Gospel, communicates the forgiving presence of God. And in forgiveness God's victory over Satan is achieved. Luke 23:43 with its gigantic *μετά* is the finest commentary on this theme. Thus a study of the Synoptic parallels suggests that in the Lukan account the emphasis is not on the disciples' ultimate activity, "catching men," but on the privilege which that activity accents.

The reference to Luke 7:1-10 at Matt. 8:5-13 is extremely instructive. Luke has placed the healing of the leper (5:12-16) before Jesus' sermon. Matthew places this story after the sermon because together with that of the centurion it emphasizes the fulfillment of Messianic expectation. The inclusion in Matt. 8:11 and 12 of material which seems originally to have been attached more closely to the context in which it is found in Luke 13 would tend to support this view. Luke's emphasis is rather on the proper response that Jesus' Word should find — faith! Hence he prefers the story of the centurion after the sermon.

The reference to Matt. 24:42, 50 at Mark 13:35 suggests how the evangelists under the guidance of the Spirit used the materials as they were shaped in the varied work of the church — in her

proclamation, polemics, instruction, and worship. A host of variants such as that in k, Mark 13:37, "but what I have said to one, I have said to all of you," points in this direction. It is quite apparent that the early church was greatly concerned to preserve the full significance of Jesus' words and thought in her own vital involvement in the destiny of the kingdom of God.

The identification of material probably taken from Q<sup>5</sup> is simplified through the use of the Nestle margins. Thus from the absence of any reference to Mark and from the presence of a reference to Luke at Matt. 6:25-33 one may conclude that the passage is generally considered to be Q material, following the rule that Q is basically material common to Matthew and Luke but not found in Mark. A word of caution, however. At Matt. 5:1, e. g., a reference to Luke 6:20-49 will be found. One may readily infer that the Sermon on the Mount is substantially Q material. But what about Matt. 6:1-6, to mention but one passage in this section? This material is found in none of the other Synoptists. In the narrower definition of Q it is not strictly Q material, but rather, for want of a better designation, M (peculiarly Matthaean) material. But the hazard is not really too great, as we shall see later in the discussion of Eusebius' canons. Alertness to the differences in presentation of Q material can be instructive, as for example in the case of the Beatitudes, Luke 6:20-23 (par. Matt. 5:3, 4, 6, 11 f.). It will be noted that Luke's version emphasizes the person of the kingdom candidates, whereas Matthew's version emphasizes the spiritual qualifications.

A study of Luke 23:37 teaches one the finer points of Nestle investigation. There is no immediate reference in the margin to the words εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν, but going back to the beginning of the pericope which is signaled by the heavy black numerals, 33-49, we find the Synoptic parallels. We follow up the Matthaean account and find that the closest parallel to our passage is in Matt. 27:40, σῶσον σεαυτόν, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Here Nestle has a reference to Matt. 4:3, with an exclamation point. Matt. 4:3 happens to contain the words of the

---

<sup>5</sup> One of the best recent introductions to the subject of Q, M, and L may be found in F. C. Grant's *The Gospels* (New York, 1957), Chs. IV and V.

devil, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Luke 4:3). We begin to grasp the point. The Passion is presented by both evangelists as a conflict with Satan in which the concept of divine sonship is at stake. The devil suggests that sonship excludes the idea of suffering and thereby the task of saving others. Save yourself! The demonic temptation is thus seen in its most concentrated and climactic dimension.

### *Cross Illumination*

The margins are especially helpful in locating specific thought parallels. The advantage of the Nestle text in this particular area was brought home most embarrassingly recently when a Bible class student made casual inquiry about the meaning of Matt. 16:28. Unfortunately it was one of those rare occasions when the writer was caught without some form of Nestle in his pocket. We managed to find the parallels, but Nestle's exclamation point behind the reference to 10:23 would have saved some time.

If the subject is woman's role in the church and if a passage such as 1 Tim. 2:11 is known, then it is helpful to have significant passages on the subject at one's finger tips at 1 Cor. 14:34. The N. T. approach to the O. T. Canon is documented at 2 Tim. 3:16 with the marginal references to 2 Peter 1:19-21 and Luke 16:29. If it is a catalog of Christian virtues one needs, the references at Gal. 5:22 will be helpful. In connection with the traditional *locus classicus* on the descent into hell the margin at 1 Peter 3:19 suggests relevant apocryphal as well as Biblical parallels.

But it is in the area of more subtle cross illumination that the Nestle margin really comes into its own. The problem of the man without a wedding garment has long been a perplexing exegetical problem. Is this part of the story really an integral part of the original parable? The reference to Rev. 19:8 at Matt. 22:11 appears to suggest the answer. In the Revelation passage the white garment is identified with the righteous deeds of the saints. Translating this information to Matthew's passage, we presume that the man without the wedding garment is one who attempts to enter without the deeds that correspond to kingdom expectations. But this interpretation does not help us much, for evidently faith, not deeds, is the means of entry into the Kingdom. But we shall

not give up our hypothesis as yet. Instead we examine the context and note that those who despised the king's invitation are the Jews, or in the later expanded context of the church's mission, those who rely on their own works or liturgical associations. The man without a wedding garment, then, is representative of formalistic Israel, whether in the Old or in the New, which indeed claims to be identified with the objectives and purposes of God, but does not bring forth the fruits of righteousness. Though in reality it rejects the invitation, yet through its liturgical claims formalistic Israel has the audacity to appear at the feast, but it is as one without a wedding garment. The fruits of the truly repentant life are missing. Thus the parable's *Sitz im Leben* seems clear. The New Israel also has its problems with those who like the rich man in the story of Lazarus rest on their Abrahamic laurels. But they will be discovered as guests who crash the party without a wedding garment.

The marginal reference to Luke 2:49 at Luke 23:46 helps tie the entire Gospel together in terms of Jesus' obedient activity, and it all hinges on the word *πατήρ*. Jesus must be in His Father's house. Now, as it were, He is "going home." The task is fulfilled. What the temple symbolized is reality. A similar type of reference at Luke 2:14 links the text with Palm Sunday and puts the Christmas message in the perspective of the events in Holy Week.

To the mind of the Nestle editor a probable solution to the meaning of Jude 6 is hinted at by the reference to Gen. 6:1-4, which suggests the demonic attempt to defile the godly community. Compare a similar suggestion for the obscure allusion in 1 Cor. 11:10. At this latter passage the question mark indicates that the evidence seems less conclusive than in the case of the Jude passage.

The logic of Luke 7:47 is much less obscure if Matt. 21:31 is checked.

The difficulty concerning Paul's argument in Galatians 3 is considerably relieved if Rom. 4:15 at Gal. 3:19 is followed up. The references to the passages in Romans 7 at Rom. 4:15 suggest that the primary function of the Law is not to curb sins but rather to have sin express itself, so that through sins man's inherently sinful nature might be made manifest.

At Mark 9:7, 2 Peter 1:17 is mentioned. A look at the latter passage in its context shows that the transfiguration was understood eschatologically in the apostolic community. That is, the Christian hope is rooted in past realities. From this interpretive point of vantage the statement immediately preceding the story of the transfiguration (Mark 9:1), that some "shall not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God coming in power," gains in point.

The reference to 2 Peter 2:22 at Matt. 7:6 suggests an entirely new and challenging interpretation of Matthew's passage. The point appears to be that there is no advantage in admonishing people who desire no moral improvement. Locating their motives will only irritate them, and they will resent your own hypocrisy.

### *Things New and Old*

The rich treasury of Old Testament passages accessible in the Nestle margins offers inspiring possibilities. The survey of passages at the end of Nestle, pages 658—671, is eminently instructive.

At Luke 7:15, 1 Kings 17:23 and 2 Kings 4:36 are cited, not only suggesting that the evangelist is here following a primitive account of the acts and words of Jesus to which he seems to make reference in 1:1-4, but also showing that Jesus is the Fulfillment of the O. T., the greater Elijah. In a similar vein at John 2:4 the citation from Gen. 41:55 (LXX) suggests Jesus as a second Joseph who comes to rescue a needy people. The passages in parentheses at Matt. 28:10 not only would tend to confirm the presence of this typological current, but the reference to Ps. 22:23 suggests an especially rewarding insight. The Messianic significance of the parable in Matt. 13:31, 32 is inescapable in the light of Dan. 4:9, 18; Ezek. 17:23; 31:6; and Ps. 104:12, all of which speak of the inrush of Gentiles in the Messianic era. The puzzling question why tongues have all but died out in the church is answered by the reference to Is. 28:11 f. at 1 Cor. 14:21.

Mark's structural development in his sixth chapter is illumined by a look at Ps. 77:20 (77:19 RSV) next to 6:48. The context of the psalm speaks of God, who delivered Israel through the

Red Sea. In connection with the preceding feeding it is evident that Jesus is identified as Israel's eschatological Deliverer and the new Israel becomes a reality. (Cf. Is. 43:16 in the Nestle margin)

At Matt. 27:5 a reference is made to 2 Sam. 17:23. The parallel is striking. Judas is to Christ as Ahithophel was to David in his counsel to Absalom. John 11:50 incidentally echoes 2 Sam. 17:3.

Complete reliance, however, must not be placed on the listed references to the O. T. Much of the point of Matt. 22:34-40, for example, rests on the allusion in v. 34 to Ps. 2:2 (LXX). But the significant words are not set in the usual heavy black type.

### B. *Left-Hand Margin*

The right-hand margins are, to be sure, the most fruitful, but the left-hand margins can also be the source of valuable exegetical insights.

#### *Paragraph Divisions*

Details on the left-hand margin are given in Nestle's Introduction, pp. 82 f. As the editor indicates, small italicized numbers are to be noted. These reproduce the paragraph divisions or κεφάλαια found in almost all Greek codices. In the Gospels they seem to antedate Eusebius and are sometimes referred to as the Ammonian sections. Their actual origin is shrouded in antique mists.<sup>6</sup> Synoptic interests dominate in the notation of the Gospel material. Both the existence of parallels and their absence may be noted by these little numbers. Thus at Matt. 13:3 the 24 reminds the reader of parallels to the parable of the sower. The 12 at John 12:3, on the other hand, suggests that Mary is not specifically mentioned in the Synoptic parallels. Consistency, however, is not a primary virtue of these κεφάλαια, and there is no suggestion, for example, of the complexity of the problem suggested by the parallels to the Matthaean version of the Sermon on the Mount. Sometimes a useful insight is suggested by these marginal

---

<sup>6</sup> For a detailed discussion of the κεφάλαια see Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen, 1911), I, 1, pp. 402—475. Detailed lists including the τίτλοι are given. Cf. also Caspar Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 858—880.

numbers. The presence of the 34 at Mark 11:25, e. g., alerts the reader to the fact that this verse incorporates an idea that was probably not originally integrally connected with the preceding account. The conjunction of material, we theorize, is probably to be traced to Mark's creative pen. A comparison with Matthew's use of the thought (6:14 f., aided by the right-hand margin) suggests that Mark as well as Matthew wishes to emphasize that in prayer a man is a beggar before God and that his beggary begins before the throne of forgiving mercy. The origin of a great faith is, then, to be found in the recognition of sin and its cure. At Luke 8:1-3, however, the originator of this system has missed the point completely, by failing to highlight the role of the women in Jesus' ministry. At Luke 11:27, on the other hand, he notes the voice of the woman who praises Jesus, with the numeral 40.

The Gospels provide the most interesting material for examination of the *κεφάλαια*, but a study of the epistles, such as the structure of 1 Corinthians, at the hand of the old Greek paragraph divisions can prove rewarding.

A second system of division is found in Vaticanus (B),<sup>7</sup> indicated by larger, upright figures. In view of the fact that despite its superiority this system was unable to dislodge the old Greek paragraph divisions used in the Gospels, it is probably of later origin. In the case of the remaining writings the question of priority is more complex.

The practical advantages of this system of division may be explored in connection with Matt. 5:17-48. If the fact that Nestle has capitalized the initial words in vv. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43 escapes the notice of the reader, the large numerals in the left-hand margin will provide a double check on a significant structural phenomenon. At Mark 8:10 the 33 should be examined closely in relation to the editor's new paragraph at v. 11. Does Mark prefer a topical or a chronological arrangement at this point?

The small heavy boldface numbers (cf. the small 3 at Acts 2:5) are additions made by a later hand.<sup>8</sup> Their chief value is historical.

<sup>7</sup> See Von Soden (n. 6, above), pp. 432—442 (Gospels); 460 (Catholic Epp., except 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John); 471 f. (Pauline Epp.).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 444 f. (Acts); 461 (Catholic Epp.); 472 (Pauline Epp.).

In many respects both the old Greek paragraph divisions and the parallel systems will be found superior to the chapter divisions standardized since Stephen Langton.<sup>9</sup>

### *Eusebian Canons*

A final word is reserved for the Canons of Eusebius.<sup>10</sup> These devices for harmonizing the four Gospels will always remain a marvel of ingenuity. Eusebius' own directions for their use as well as his acknowledgment of indebtedness to Ammonius of Alexandria are outlined in his letter to Carpianus, Nestle, pp. 32 \* f. Eusebius writes to this effect:

Ammonius the Alexandrian in an extraordinary display of industry and diligence has indeed left us a harmony of the Gospels by placing alongside Matthew's Gospel the parallel sections from the other evangelists, but with the result that the train of thought of the other three Gospels is necessarily destroyed as far as consecutive reading is concerned. Therefore, in order that you might be able to identify in each Gospel those sections which are faithfully paralleled elsewhere and yet have the entire structure and train of thought preserved intact, I have taken my cue from my predecessor, but have employed a different approach, in that I have drawn up for you the accompanying tables, ten in number. Of these the first comprises the numbers in which all four say substantially the same things, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The second in which three, Matthew, Mark, Luke. The third in which three, Matthew, Luke, John. The fourth in which three, Matthew, Mark, John. The fifth in which two, Matthew and Luke. The sixth in which two, Matthew and Mark. The seventh in which two, Matthew and John. The eighth in which two, Luke and Mark. The ninth in which two, Luke and John. The tenth in which each one has included material peculiar to himself alone. So much, then, for the basic pattern. Now this is the manner in which the tables function. In each of the four Gospels all the individual sections are numbered in sequence, beginning with one,

<sup>9</sup> On the modern chapter and verse divisions see Von Soden, pp. 475—485 and Gregory (n. 6, above) pp. 880—895 (especially the citation of Ezra Abbot's material on verse divisions, 883—895).

<sup>10</sup> Migne, *PG*, 22, 1275—1292. Full details may be found in Von Soden, pp. 388—402; cf. Gregory, pp. 861—872. See also Dr. Eberhard Nestle's article, "Die Eusebianische Evangeliensynopse" in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 19 (1908), 40—51; 93—114; 219—232.

then two, then three, and so on clear through each one of the books. Alongside each of these numbers a notation is made in red, to indicate in which one of the ten tables a given number is to be found. So for example, if the notation in red is a one, then it is clear that Table I is to be consulted. If a two, then the number of the section is to be found in Table II, and so on through the ten tables. Now suppose that you have opened up one of the four Gospels at random. You select some paragraph that strikes your fancy and wish to know not only which evangelists contain the parallels but the exact locations in which the inspired parallels are to be found. To do this you need only note the number identifying your pericope, and then look for it in the table specified by the red notation (under the corresponding evangelist). You will know immediately from the headings at the top of the table the number and the identity of the evangelists who contain parallels. Then if you note the numbers in the other evangelists that run parallel to the number you have already noted and look for them in the individual Gospels, you will experience no difficulty in locating the parallel items.

Eusebius' directions can be applied to the figures in the Nestle margin with but a slight alteration. Instead of a red notation the Nestle editor places the number of the particular table after the pericope sequence number. A comma divides the two. In this way they are to be distinguished from the paragraph divisions. Illustrations are found in Nestle, pp. 82 f. in the introduction.

It was previously noted that the Nestle editor supplies his readers with what is substantially a harmony of the Gospels. But though he identifies the longer pericopes, he does not wish to clutter up the margin. The Eusebian canons are quite useful therefore in hunting parallels to individual verses buried deep inside these longer pericopes. For example, at Matt. 24:1 one of the parallels for the pericope is Mark 13:1-37. But if one is interested in finding quickly the Markan reference for the thought in Matt. 24:36, then the Eusebian canon is the aid to use. The reference "260,6" means that I must look for number 260 under the column marked Matthew in Canon VI. Next to the number 260 in that column I find 152 in Mark's column. I proceed to trace this number through Mark's sequence until I come to it at Mark 13:32. Again, at Matt. 26:41 the notation (297,4) readily refers me to Mark 14:38 as

well as a parallel idea in John 6:63. And at John 1:18 the Eusebian canon is the only marker directing me to Luke 11:22. A singular phenomenon occurs at John 12:2. Two canons are indicated.

Little known is the textual-critical function of these canons. Mark 15:28 is located in the apparatus, to be sure, but the Eusebian notation suggests that Eusebius' MSS. had this verse, cf. Luke 23:17. The apparatus does not state it, but the presence of the Eusebian notation at Luke 22:43 suggests that Eusebius read also this significant verse. On the other hand the absence of a notation at Mark 9:46, e. g., would seem to indicate that Eusebius did not read the verse.

Study of a particular text at the hand of the Eusebian notations can be singularly illuminating. Mark 14:48, 49 is a fair example. The asterisk (see Nestle, p. 83 \*) indicates that the present verse division is different from that followed by Eusebius. The logic in Eusebius' division is readily apparent. The entire verse, up to and including με, is paralleled in all the other evangelists (Canon I), but the words ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί are found in only one other evangelist (Canon VI), in this case Matt. 26:56. Luke instead has αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὄρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτοῦς (22:53). In agreement with the Synoptists he sees in the events a fulfillment of God's purpose but wishes to highlight the demonic dimensions of things to come.

A further testimony to Eusebius' sharp insight is the notation at Mark 12:40 (136,8), instead of at v. 41, as the ancient paragraph systems have it. The reader is immediately grateful for this significant contrast between the Pharisees who devour widows' houses, and this widow, who gives God all that the Pharisees have not already taken.

Special attention should be paid to Canon X whenever it is noted in the margin. The fact that a particular verse or group of verses is found in only one evangelist may have great bearings on the interpretation. And for anyone who questions the priority of Mark a study of Canon X for Mark may turn out to be a wholesome critical leaven. The identification of material peculiar to Matthew (M) or Luke (L) is also considerably simplified by noting Canon X (Nestle, pp. 36 f. \*)

A little practice in the use of Eusebian canons is required, but the initial effort, followed by constant judicious use, will more than repay the student in valuable insights that often escape the most astute commentator.

Whether it is the Eusebian canons, the ancient paragraph divisions, the right-hand margin, or the apparatus that one happens to use at a given moment, there is no student who can fail to feel his indebtedness to the editors and to the publishers of the Nestle text for the maintenance of enviable scholarly traditions and publishing standards marked by imagination and laudable integrity, which have made so much of the New Testament accessible for so little.

St. Louis, Mo.