



# The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1915

---

## HISTORY AND FAITH\*

The student of the New Testament should be primarily an historian. The centre and core of all the Bible is history. Everything else that the Bible contains is fitted into an historical framework and leads up to an historical climax. The Bible is primarily a record of events.

That assertion will not pass unchallenged. The modern Church is impatient of history. History, we are told, is a dead thing. Let us forget the Amalekites, and fight the enemies that are at our doors. The true essence of the Bible is to be found in eternal ideas; history is merely the form in which those ideas are expressed. It makes no difference whether the history is real or fictitious; in either case, the ideas are the same. It makes no difference whether Abraham was an historical personage or a myth; in either case his life is an inspiring example of faith. It makes no difference whether Moses was really a mediator between God and Israel; in any case the record of Sinai embodies the idea of a covenant between God and His people. It makes no difference whether Jesus really lived and died and rose again as He is declared to have done in the Gospels; in any case the Gospel picture, be it ideal or be it history, is an encouragement to filial piety. In this way, religion has been made independent, as is thought, of the uncertainties of historical research. The separation of Christianity from history has been a great concern of modern theology. It has been an inspiring attempt. But it has been a failure.

Give up history, and you can retain some things. You

---

\* An address delivered May 3, 1915, by John Gresham Machen on the occasion of his inauguration as Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary.

## CRITICAL NOTE

VON SODEN'S TEXT AND MATTHEW I. 16\*

The small edition (Handausgabe) of von Soden's Greek New Testament is a reprint of the large edition with an abbreviated critical apparatus. Both the text and the apparatus rest upon and express the results of von Soden's theory of the history of the text embodied in the three volumes of his *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1902-1910. This theory is based upon a very comprehensive examination and analysis of the materials for the criticism and history of the text. Indeed the increase and present extent of the primary materials—the Greek manuscripts—have induced von Soden not only to adopt a new system of symbols for convenient designation but also to reduce their citation in the critical apparatus mainly to the categories under which the materials are distributed by his theory. Information concerning this theory of the history of the text is given in a brief introduction; and this is followed by a statement of the principles upon which the critical apparatus is constructed and an explanation of the symbols employed.

After tracing the growth of interest in the authentic text of the New Testament in the second century which culminated in Tertullian and Origen, von Soden points out the fact that the influence of these two men in textual matters was profound. Their text was successful against that of Tatian, Marcion and a second century recension of Acts, though later texts were not free from mixture from these and other sources, especially the free citations of the early fathers, the Latin, Syriac and possibly the Sahidic versions, and from local text forms (lectionaries). About the end of the third century three efforts were made to purify the text; in Alexandria by the Hesychian recension (H), in Caesarea by the Palestinian recension (I), and in Antioch by the recension of Lucian (K). The primary task of textual criticism is to establish the text of these three recensions. Back of this

---

\* *Griechisches Neues Testament*. Text mit kurzem Apparat (Handausgabe). Von HERMANN FREIHERR VON SODEN. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1913. Pp. xxviii, 436. M. 4. 20, geb. M. 5.

where they differ, the question of origin and value must be investigated. The original form of each recension can be fixed only by means of its history. Each seems to have established itself in its own region; and there is no manuscript containing an earlier text. The H-text did not spread beyond Egypt; and it has withstood the introduction of K-readings better than I. Its chief representatives are  $\delta_1$  (B),  $\delta_2$  ( $\aleph$ )—derived from a common ancestor  $\delta_{1-2}$ .  $\delta_1$  is the purest;  $\delta_2$  has occasional I and K readings, and this is true to a larger extent also of  $\delta_3$  (C),  $\delta_{48}$  (33 etc.);  $\epsilon_{014}$  (W, the Freer manuscript of the Gospels in Washington) is a good witness in Lk and Jn. Others of diminishing purity are  $\delta_6$  ( $\Psi$ ),  $\epsilon_{26}$  (Z),  $\epsilon_{56}$  (L),  $\epsilon_{76}$  ( $\Delta$ ), etc. The history of I and K is much more complex. There is no manuscript of I as pure as the oldest representatives of H; but there are a number of good witnesses—36 manuscripts in the Gospels and 14 in the Apostle whose text is not a compromise. K-readings have entered, but in different places so that the reconstruction of the common archetype (the I-text) can be made without serious difficulty. In the Gospels a number of manuscripts constitute a group,  $I^a$ , very close to I— $\delta_5$  (D),  $\alpha_{1001}$  (E Acts),  $\epsilon_{014}$  (W), in Mk,  $\epsilon_{050}$  (Tiflis). Others show greater admixture of K and strikingly form groups representing distinct types of this mixed text—due probably to the influence of editions issued from certain centers in the fifth or fourth centuries. The later history shows the increasing intrusion of K-readings. In the Gospels there are nine such groups which again divide into sub-types. Those which preserve the I-text best are  $I^7$  and  $I^1$ . In the Apostle there are only two types which divide into two sub-types  $I^{b1}$   $I^{b2}$   $I^{c1}$   $I^{c2}$ ; and there are certain material changes probably due to an early edition of the Catholic Epistles and Paul as in the case of Acts. Reckoning mixed texts to I, K becomes a fixed quantity like H. Its representatives are later and in large number. Twelve manuscripts have a fairly pure K-text and form a group,  $K^1$ — $\epsilon_{014}$  (W) in Mt,  $\epsilon_{051}$  (Tiflis),  $\epsilon_{55}$  (E),  $\epsilon_{61}$  ( $\Omega$ ), etc. The oldest witness of the K-text is the Peshitta, made by Rabbula (411-435), for what is not K—and that is little—is retained out of pious regard for the earlier Syriac version. From the tenth century the great majority of Greek manuscripts contain

the K-text in a slightly modified form ( $K^*$ ) as compared with  $K^1$ , due to a last weak concession to I. In the twelfth century a Church edition of K was made for lectionary purposes ( $K^r$ ) including a few I-readings and certain orthographical peculiarities. This revised K-text dominates the later manuscripts. There is also a group of manuscripts representing the type of text contained in the Complutensian Polyglot which is designated  $K^c$ .

The text which von Soden seeks to establish is thus the I-H-K-text lying back of the three great recensions. The principles upon which his text is constructed are the following:

1. In orthography and purely linguistic matters uniformity is maintained except when recensions differ, in which case decision is based on the second and third principle. Punctuation and divisions of the text are uniform and without regard to the punctuation and divisions in the manuscripts. Accents and breathings follow the accepted rules.

2. When the readings of the recensions are certain, the reading supported by two recensions is generally adopted.

3. If two recensions have a reading which agrees with a parallel, the reading of the third which differs from the parallel is preferred, with exceptions.

4. The reading supported by Tatian is at once subject to the suspicion of departing from the original text. Only in the event of two recensions agreeing with Tatian and the dissenting recension agreeing with a parallel is the latter adjudged secondary; and this remains the case even when the former reading also agrees with a parallel.

5. When early, certainly mutually independent witnesses—whether they be only patristic writers or versions—agree in a reading which differs from Tatian, this reading requires serious consideration for the text even when all three recensions agree with Tatian.

It is generally conceded that von Soden and his helpers have made a most important contribution to our knowledge of the materials upon which a critical text must be based. It will also be admitted that von Soden has given a good account of the history of the K-text. The association of the H-text with Egypt and the wide influence of the I-text appear to be well established. There is room for more serious doubt however

about other matters of vital importance touching the value of K for the reconstruction of the earlier text and in regard also to the history of the text prior to the time to which von Soden assigns the origin of the I and H recensions. Does I in the Gospels preserve I-H-K better than any other recension? H admittedly does so in Paul. Are the textual phenomena in the period prior to the three recensions explicable by I-H-K and Tatian, Marcion and some edition of Acts and the Epistles? Is our knowledge of Tatian's text sufficient to bear the critical structure built upon it?

It is not possible to enter into details; yet there is one matter which although apparently based on a formulated principle can not but cause some uneasiness about the application of the principle, granting its validity. In Mt. i. 16 von Soden inserts in his text the reading supposedly underlying the rendering in the Sinaitic Syriac,—a reading which is not found in any primary authority. Von Soden's decision was foreshadowed in *Die Schriften*, I. ii. p. 1574 (cf. p. 1585) where he argued that the differences in Mt. i. 16-25 between Sy<sup>a</sup> and Sy<sup>c</sup> show the influence of Tatian in a tendency in Sy<sup>c</sup> to eliminate Joseph, a similar tendency being responsible likewise for the change in verse 16 from the text of Sy<sup>a</sup> to that of Sy<sup>c</sup>.<sup>1</sup> In support of his text von Soden adduces Sy<sup>a</sup> Bar-salibi; against it, all others omit *Ιωσηφ δε*; then follow the variants of I<sup>a</sup> as if Sy<sup>c</sup> Tert H I<sup>a</sup> K, the variants in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila, the reading in the genealogy added in the Arabic version of Tatian's Diatessaron and the reading in Aphraates. The variants have been discussed by Merx,<sup>2</sup> who defends the reading of Sy<sup>a</sup> against the weight of evidence and understands it in a natural sense, and by Zahn<sup>3</sup> who defends the H-text—according to von Soden's majority rule, the I-H-K-text—against both I<sup>a</sup> and Sy<sup>a</sup>. Of von Soden's

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, 1904, ii. pp. 220f.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Evangelium Matthaeus*, 1902, pp. 5 ff. Cf. Schmiedel, *Encyclopedia Biblica*, art., "Mary", iii. pp. 2961 f. Heer, *Biblische Studien*, xv (1910) pp. 154 ff, defends the text of Sy<sup>a</sup> but understands it in a legal sense; cf. also Jochmann, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, xi (1913), pp. 161 f., and Mader (*ibid*), pp. 281 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Einleitung i.d. N.T.*<sup>3</sup> 1907, ii. p. 298; *Das Evangelium d. Matthäus*, 1903, p. 65, n. 34; cf. Grosheide, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, xlix (1915), pp. 100 f.



decision Bousset writes:<sup>4</sup> "I add a few examples of the application of rule 5. To our amazement von Soden reads Mt. i. 16, 'But Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus.' Here von Soden has simply decided according to the rule that a widely current reading (we find it now, as is well known, entire [only Sy<sup>s</sup>] or in part attested in the Greek Codex 050, a portion of the Ferrar group, Old Latin, Syriac) must be received into the text even against the three great recensions if its wide currency can not be explained by Tatian's influence. This last [qualification] is excluded in this instance since we know that the genuine Tatian certainly did not include the genealogy." Von Soden's fifth rule requires serious consideration for a reading even if found only in the secondary evidence—patristic writers or versions—provided the witnesses are early, mutually independent and agree against Tatian. This can not be affirmed directly of the reading whose serious consideration has resulted in its incorporation in the von Soden's text. It is supported by one early secondary witness (Sy<sup>s</sup>) and, according to von Soden, by a late (12th Century) Syrian bishop, Barsalibi. Von Soden rightly follows Burkitt rather than Conybeare in interpreting the evidence in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila; and he is quite silent about Irenaeus—a silence which Conybeare's attempt to extort from Irenaeus knowledge of such a reading would scarcely have broken.<sup>5</sup> But is von Soden right in citing Barsalibi in support of the Sy<sup>s</sup> reading? It does not seem to me that he is; and it is quite possible that his error had its origin in adopting as a fact what Burkitt unfortunately formulates as an alternative possibility. After quoting a "passage from the still unpublished Commentary of Barsalibi (on Matt. i. 18: cf. Dudley Loftus, *Trans.* p. 33)" Burkitt says:<sup>6</sup> "Whether this be Barsalibi's own comment on the Peshitta text, or a quotation from some ancient writer who had before him a text like that of S, it is after all a sound exposition of the general meaning

<sup>4</sup> *Theologische Rundschau*, xvii (1914), p. 150.

<sup>5</sup> *Zeitschrift f.d. N.T. Wissenschaft*, xiii (1912), pp. 171 f; cf. also Bacon, *American Journal of Theology*, xv (1911), pp. 83 f., especially pp. 92 f.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 266.

of the passage Matt. i. 16 ff. . . ." The possibility that Barsalibi may have quoted from some ancient writer who had before him a text like that of Sy<sup>s</sup> is based on the words translated by Burkitt (or Dudley Loftus) thus:<sup>7</sup> "And when it comes to Joseph it says 'Who begat the Messiah'". The Commentary of Barsalibi has since been published<sup>8</sup> and it appears that the passage here quoted from his comment on the Peshitta text of Mt. i. 18 follows a long comment on the Peshitta text of Mt. i. 16.<sup>9</sup> Moreover it is at least doubtful

<sup>7</sup> Burkitt gives a slightly different rendering of the passage in Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, ii, 1896, p. 141 but he does not alter the words "who begat" or their treatment as a quotation.

<sup>8</sup> *Corpus Script. Christ. Orient. cur. CHABOT, Script. Syri. Dionysii Bar Salibi*, ed. I. SEDLACEK, 1906.

<sup>9</sup> Sedlacek, *op. cit.*, pp. 46 f. Barsalibi's comment on Mt. i. 16 is not free from obscurity but its main purport is plain. It begins thus: "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary from whom [dmnh] was born Jesus who is called the Messiah. But this 'from whom' [dmnh],—if it had not been supplied with a point, it might have been believed of the Messiah that he was born from Joseph. But the point however which is before the word *dmnh* shows that he was born from the Virgin and not from Joseph. But according to the meaning of the Greek version it is not so written [*i.e.* the difference in gender does not depend as in Syriac upon the diacritical point] but Joseph the husband of Mary *mn hi d* [from that one (from) whom—apparently attempting to reproduce the explicitness of the distinction in Greek by the resolution of *dmnh* into its constituent elements and by the substitution of the demonstrative pronoun in which the feminine differs from the masculine in radical structure, for the personal suffix of the preposition where the difference depends on the presence or absence of the diacritical point] Jesus was born. Thus if instead of [the] *iud* [i] of *hi* Matthew had written *uu* [*u*], it might indeed have been believed that he was the son of Joseph. But in as much as he wrote *hi* and not *mn hu* he makes it known that he was born from the Virgin and not from Joseph." From this it appears that Barsalibi's thought is fixed solely on the difference in meaning that would have resulted from the use of a different pronoun. There is no indication that he knew textual variants in the voice of the verb or in its subject or, indeed, in the pronoun. In commenting on i. 21 Barsalibi says (*ibid.*, p. 79): "But she shall bear a son. It does not say 'to thee' because the bearing was not to him but to the whole world; and again, since he did not draw near at all in his birth, it says not 'to thee'". Both Sy<sup>s</sup> and Sy<sup>c</sup> have the reading which Barsalibi, following the Peshitta, denies to Matthew. The argument however does not suggest knowledge of a textual variant and in the comment on i. 25 (*ibid.*, pp. 82 f) no al-

whether the relative particle "d" after the verb rendered "it says" is properly translated by "who" and made part of a quotation. It is more natural and certainly grammatically possible to render it as a conjunction.<sup>10</sup> If the sentence were rendered "And when it comes to Joseph it says that he begat the Messiah", the words would express Barsalibi's summary statement of Matthew's account in the genealogy of Joseph's relation to the Messiah.<sup>11</sup> After his full discussion of this relation

clusion is made to the reading "to him" which is distinctive of Sy<sup>s</sup>. It is probable that Barsalibi is simply following an exegetical tradition (cf. Chrysostom, ed. Field, i. p. 49: *τέξεται, φησὶν, υἱὸν· οὐκ εἶπε, τέξεταιί σοι, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς, τέξεται, μετέωρον αὐτὸ θεῖς· οὐ γὰρ αὐτῷ ἔτικτεν, ἀλλὰ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ πάσῃ.* Cramer, *Catena* i. p. 11: *οὐκ εἶπε δὲ τέξεταιί σοι υἱὸν, ἀλλὰ "τέξεται," ἵνα μὴ πάλιν τίς αὐτὸν ἐκ τούτου πατέρα ὑποπτεύσῃ.* *Opus imperfectum*, ed. Montfaucon, vi. p. 756: "non dixit pariet tibi filium, sicut ad Zachariam". Theophylact, ed. Humphrey, p. 22: *οὐκ εἶπε δὲ, τέξεταιί σοι, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς τέξεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ ἔτικτεν ἀλλὰ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ πάσῃ*). In the comment on i. 25 (*ibid.*, p. 86) a Greek codex is quoted and the meaning, apparently, rather than the exact wording of its text is given. Burkitt (*op. cit.* ii. p. 190) thinks that the citations from "the Greek" in Ephraim are "citations from memory of the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe"; but this can scarcely be the explanation here (cf. Burkitt, *ibid.*, ii. p. 257).

<sup>10</sup> Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik*,<sup>2</sup> 1898, p. 288, § 367.

<sup>11</sup> The reference to the word "husband" [*b'la*] in the context shows that Barsalibi has in mind the Peshitta text of i. 19—which here agrees with Sy<sup>s</sup> against Sy<sup>c</sup> and Tatian—rather than the text of i. 16 where the word for husband is *gbrh*. In spite of the apparently unnatural change in the subject and voice of the verb in his reference to i. 16 his comment is concerned not with this but with the meaning of the word "husband" in relation to the supernatural mode of the Messiah's birth. But perhaps this change was not felt to be unnatural in such a context; and this may account for the presence of the masculine pronoun in a text so late as the genealogy added in the Arabic Diatesaron (cf. Ciasca, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice*, 1888, pp. ix and 6 (Arabic text) note; Hogg, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ix (1900), p. 45, n. 6. Ciasca gives only the text of A (the Vatican MS) but Burkitt (*op. cit.*, ii, p. 264) reports that the genealogy in B (the Borgian MS) "contains no ancient element of text"). Freedom in summarizing i. 16 appears also in Aphraates for it is not likely that the form in which he gives it is a reproduction of a variant in his text of the Gospel. The context in Aphraates moreover is not unlike the context in Barsalibi. In the conclusion of his discussion of the last section of the genealogy he says (Griffin, *Patrologia Syriaca*, I, ii, 1907, p. 63, *De Acino*, xx): "And Matthan begat Jacob. And Jacob begat Joseph. And Joseph was called the father to [I] Jesus Christ. And



and in view of the context in which this statement occurs, its meaning could not well have been misunderstood. But there is at least no clear indication that Barsalibi is here quoting from another whose opinion had been formed by dependence on a text of the Gospel like that of Sy<sup>s</sup>. There remains then only the solitary witness of Sy<sup>s</sup> and von Soden's rule which specifies early, mutually independent witnesses does not require for this even serious consideration. Bousset's defence of von Soden's text is however not direct. In spite of his amazement he recognizes in von Soden's decision the mechanical operation of a rule; but the rule, according to Bousset, *habilitates* the whole because it accredits the part. But surely this is strange. Rule 5 however does not apply. The part, or the reading supposedly derived from Sy<sup>s</sup>, has attestation in an important type of the I recension and should fall under rule 2. So far from exemplifying rule 5 von Soden's text in this instance affords "un cas important où toutes ces règles sont violées."<sup>12</sup>

In other matters of large import von Soden's text does not differ from a critical text like that of Westcott and Hort. The text of the Gospel of Mark ends with xvi. 8—the variant endings being printed in different type. This is the case likewise with Jn. vii. 53-viii. 11. Von Soden's treatment of the Western Non-Interpolations is discussed in *Die Schriften*, I. ii. pp. 1570 ff. The multitude of errata in the larger work as in the smaller edition of the text is regrettable.

Princeton.

WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG.

---

Jesus was born from Mary the Virgin, from the seed of the house of David, from the Holy Spirit, as it is written: 'Joseph and Mary his betrothed, both of them from the house of David'. And the Apostle testifies that Jesus Christ was from Mary, from the seed of the house of David, in the Holy Spirit. Joseph was called father to Jesus although He was not from his seed". Again in chapter xxi (*ibid.* pp. 66 f) Aphraates traces the generations from Adam and concludes: "Matthan, Jacob, Joseph, and Jesus, the Son of God, who was born from Mary the Virgin. And Joseph was called his father".

<sup>12</sup> Lagrange, *Revue Biblique*, x (1913) p. 522; cf. Lietzmann, *Zeitschrift f. d. N.T. Wissenschaft*, xv (1914), pp. 323 f; Hoskier, *Journal of Theol. Studies* xv (1913-14), pp. 307 f.