

whom, all unknown to ourselves, we may be inspiring by our constancy and uplifting by our faith! More may be hanging on our conduct than we know, even the safety of our brethren's footsteps, the clearness of our brethren's hope. God has ordained it that without *us*, without our labour, without our suffering, they should not be made perfect.

Such are some feeble attempts to illustrate a great and a deep subject—perfection through fellowship. There is no time left to apply it. But the applications are clear and seasonable.

There is the application to Church life, the drawing of individuals into companies, the drawing, too, of different companies into one, for the furtherance of mutual communion, and the visible exhibition to a hostile world of the unity that is in Christ. The feeling is growing against needless divisions. And men in this place and in that are being increasingly impressed with the principle: *We without them, they without us, are not perfect.*

There is the application, too, to missionary endeavour. Has not heathendom a voice? Has not heathendom a message? And if it uttered that voice, if it published that message, would not the voice and the message be this: 'Come over and help us; we without you, you without us, are not perfect!' Ah, brethren, have we ever realized the fact that, apart from the welfare of the heathen, our own welfare is not full? May not much of the scepticism and discussion at home be owing to the fact that we have not as yet realized it? And

till we do realize it, till the churches awake to the consciousness, till the churches address themselves to the work, the scepticism and dissension will continue. The heathen are knocking at our doors. They say, 'Teach us, train us, save us. Do so for our sakes. Do so, for your own sakes. *Apart from us ye cannot be made perfect.*'

And once more there is the application, not only to church life and missionary endeavour, but to the character and the greatness of Christ. God wants that character completely mirrored. He wants that greatness to be completely displayed. Where? Where but in the Church, which is the reflexion of His glory—the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. It is by the Church, and by nothing but the Church, that He seeks to make known to the principalities and powers of heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God. The fact that He does so is a proof and a pledge that not one member of the Church shall be forgotten and not one member of the Church shall be left out. Each in his own fashion, each to his own degree, reflects some aspect of Christ, and is therefore necessary to the glory of the Christ he reflects. And without the weakest and the most obscure the general revelation is partial, the general roll incomplete. You are necessary to the fulfilment of God's plan, and shall never fail of God's care. Though thou wert the last lingering saint in a world from which the other saints are all taken home, Christ will wait for thee, the redeemed will wait for thee, heaven will wait for thee, for without thee they cannot be perfected.

## Little Contributions to the Greek Testament.

BY PROFESSOR EBERHARD NESTLE, D.D., MAULBRONN.

### I. JOHN xiv. 9.

How are we to punctuate?—

οὐκ ἔγνωκός με, Φίλιππε; ὁ ἑωρακὸς, οἱ οὐκ ἔγνωκός με; Φίλιππε, ὁ ἑωρακὸς.

The modern editors connect the name with the first sentence, the older ones with the second.

Wordsworth-White in their *Latin N.T.* say that the latter way—'me? *Philippe, qui*'—is found in the official Vulgate, '*et. gr. Steph. 1550.*' The latter part of this statement is wrong. I verified

the passage in the oldest editions of the Greek Testament and found—

με, Φίλιππε; ὁ in Stephen 1546. 49. 50. 51; Beza 1604;

the older punctuation—

με; Φίλιππε, ο in Compl. Erasm.,<sup>1</sup> Ald., Beza 1565. 82. 88. 98; Elzevir. 1624. 41.<sup>1</sup>

Scrivener in his useful edition 'according to the

<sup>1</sup> The Bible Society's reprints of the T.R. departed in this instance, and in many others, from the original.

text followed in the A.V., together with the variations adopted in the R.V.' (new edition, 1894<sup>1</sup>), gives in the Appendix 'a list of passages in the Greek text of this volume, wherein the readings of Beza's N.T. 1598 are departed from, to agree with those adopted by the A.V.' The passage in question is not to be found there; it must be supplied. I believe that the modern editors are right; but it is curious that the older ones are so greatly in favour of the other connexion.

## 2. MATT. xx. 15.

Herman C. Hoskier published (1890) a collation of Stephen 1550 with Elzevir. 1624, giving the additional attestation of twenty other editions. It is strange that this list was not admitted to control Scrivener's Appendix just mentioned. The very first passage occurring in both lists is Mt 20<sup>15</sup>. Here Scrivener gives—

εἰ Compl. Er., Col., Steph., etc. ἢ ALD., Bez.<sup>2-5</sup>.  
Hoskier: εἰ C., Er., ALD., Col., etc. ἢ Bez.

I verified the passage; as was to be suspected, Hoskier is right.

## 3. MARK ix. 38.

In the same list Scrivener gives—

ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Er., Ald., etc. *Om.* ἐν Compl.,  
Steph., Bez. (*per nomen tuum* Bez.).

Hoskier states that ἐν stands in Steph. 1546. 49, Beza 1598, and in four of the five minor octavo editions of Beza. Again Scrivener is to be corrected.

## 4. MARK xvi. 20.

Scrivener states that Ἀμὴν is found in Compl., Col., Steph.<sup>1-3</sup>, and omitted by Er., St.<sup>4</sup>, etc.

According to Hoskier, Ἀμὴν is omitted by Colinaeus (1534). I could not verify it, this being one of the few editions not at my disposal at Stuttgart; but no doubt Hoskier will be correct.

## 5. LUKE vii. 12.

Scrivener quotes for αὐτῆ ἦν χήρα 'St.'; for αὐτῆ χήρα Beza<sup>2-5</sup>; Hoskier showed that Steph. is divided; αὐτῆ χήρα stood in St.<sup>1-2</sup>; αὐτῆ ἦν χήρα makes its appearance in 3.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A curious misstatement about this edition is THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, v. 347, that it has xii, 670 pages; in fact it has only 658.

## 6. JOHN ix. 10.

Add in Scrivener's list (with Hoskier) 'Ald.' as witness for σου.

## 7. I COR. vii. 29.

Here is the only passage where I found a mistake in Hoskier. He gives f. 1580 for the double interpunction '· τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστίν, ἴνα.' I did not notice a trace of the full stop.

## 8. MATT. xxvi. 41.

Scrivener's edition is a delightful specimen of careful work on the part of the editor and the printers. In the passage quoted he calls attention to the fact that the marginal reading of the R.V. wishes to insert a comma after γρηγορεῖτε and to omit it after προσεύχεσθε. Likewise in Mk 14<sup>38</sup>. That is a splendid suggestion of the R.V. From the homiletical use of the passage we are accustomed to take γρηγορεῖτε in the *metaphorical* sense, which the verb has (Mk 13<sup>37</sup>); but by a comparison with Lk 22<sup>40</sup> προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν, and v.<sup>46</sup> ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε, etc., it becomes clear that Jesus bids the disciples do only one thing, pray for delivery from temptation; in order to do that, they must not sleep. In v.<sup>44</sup> and v.<sup>45</sup> Jesus, seeing them so sleepy, lets them sleep. I know of no editor, before the R.V., who inserted that comma<sup>2</sup>; and after it I have found it only in Swete's edition of the Gospel of St. Mark (1898).

## 9. EPHES. i. 19.

Another passage which gets quite a different sense by the position or omission of a comma is Eph 1<sup>19</sup> in the English text. Here the R.V. retained the comma after 'believe,' and did not notice in the margin that it may be omitted. In the Greek text most editions read without any comma—

καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ  
εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ  
κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.

Most commentators are agreed, as far as I am

<sup>2</sup> But why has this variant in Scrivener's edition—it is the only one in the whole book—no figure as mark of reference, but the letter a? Is it a later insertion? then we must be especially thankful for it.—Another minutia is that, p. 135, Mk 15<sup>3</sup>, a star (\*) is allowed to remain in the text which ought to be removed.

aware, with the A.V. and R.V., that *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν* is *not* to be joined with *ἡμῶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας*; for in this case no comma would have place after 'believe'; *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν* is commonly construed with *μέγεθος*; yet Scrivener places a comma even in the Greek text after *πιστεύοντας*, and seems to indicate by it that *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν* is to be connected with *εἰς τὸ εἶδέναι ὑμᾶς*. But now refer to the parallel passage, Col 2<sup>12</sup>, where we read *διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος*, and from this it seems impossible to doubt that Eph 1<sup>19</sup> *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν* is also to be constructed with *ἡμῶς τοὺς*

*πιστεύοντας*, and a marginal note at least ought to be added in our Testaments: 'or: believe according (without comma).' That he came to believe, was for the apostle a wonder of the same divine power which had raised Christ.

10. JOHN xviii. 16.

Westcott-Hort, Weymouth, and others place no comma after *θυρωρῶ*; Tischendorf, Weiss, Scrivener have it. In the former case we must translate 'and he (the disciple) brought in Peter'; in the latter it may be 'and she, the maid at the door, let him in.'

## At the Literary Table.

### Tamate Vaine.

THE directors of the London Missionary Society have clear notions of what a missionary's wife should be. When they licensed James Chalmers and sent him out to Rarotonga, they allowed him to take a wife with him. They had their fears. For 'the woman who goes to the mission field with a man, and is yet not in fullest accord with him as to the great work and purposes of his life, inflicts a grave injury upon both him and the cause dear to his heart. Every mission can show such cases.' But James Chalmers' wife was 'a true missionary.'

Chalmers and his wife left Rarotonga after a time, and went to dwell among the cannibals of New Guinea. On January 24, 1878, Chalmers wrote: 'We are tolerably well. I have got much lighter during the last few weeks, but am so much better that I shall soon pick up again. We have begun speaking of God's love to the people in very broken language, yet I hope sufficiently well to make them think a little. The people here are dreadful cannibals. Their finest decorations are human jawbones and other bones, and sometimes the wretches appear with pieces of human flesh dangling from their arms. There is no doubt that many of them had hoped to secure our bodies for a feast. We are warned even now not to wander too far away from the house.'

Within three months Chalmers was away on a voyage, having left his wife alone among them.

The day after he left, the natives said among themselves: 'They trust us; we must treat them kindly; they cannot mean us harm, or Tamate would not have left his wife behind.' And they were as good as they said. 'They are not at all troublesome,' she enters in her journal. They brought her food, and told her to eat plenty, so that when Tamate returned she might be looking well and strong. The experiment was successful, and was worth making. Yet 'it would be difficult,' says Mr. Lovett (we are quoting from his *Autobiography and Letters of Chalmers*<sup>1</sup>), 'in the splendid record of nineteenth-century missions to find a more courageous and self-denying action than this consent of Mrs. Chalmers to remain alone amid a horde of cannibals for the sake of Christ's work among them, and for the benefit of her Rarotongan fellow-workers. When her husband left her there was no possibility of receiving any tidings of him until he himself brought back the tale of his wanderings. She knew him well enough to realize that places of danger rather attracted him than repelled him, and that the worse the reputation possessed by any tribe or place the more likely he was to visit it. They had only a few weeks before passed through experiences which might well have unnerved the strongest. Chalmers came to know afterwards, from one of the chiefs, that again and again the murder of the whole missionary party had been determined, and that those appointed to

<sup>1</sup> *James Chalmers: His Autobiography and Letters.* By Richard Lovett, M.A. Religious Tract Society, 1902.