

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

and not unworthily. But there is originality in the treatment of the subject, which is that of the artist with feet of clay. 'The Perfect Knight' is at least characteristic:

#### WAS IT WORTH IT, THEN?

Was it worth it, then, to reject  
Love, too soon suspect?  
Was it worth it, to scale the peak,  
Where never a voice could speak  
And say—'I love you,' so  
As yours did, long ago?

Is it worth the triumph of will,  
To deny that I love you still?  
Or pretend to find, in the waste,  
A more ennobling taste  
Of the stuff of which life is made?  
No, but I am afraid!

Afraid of the blackness of night,  
Afraid of the huddled sight  
Of all who have died by the way—  
He who was yesterday

A man, and is now but a ghost;  
Afraid of myself the most.

Afraid of the demon within,  
Of virtue as well as of sin;  
Of my god, also, afraid,  
Who dwells in the body, made  
Half of dust and of fire,  
With a thrice-entangled desire.

So I must ever go,  
Far from the cheerful glow  
Of the cottage fire below,  
On through the deepening snow;  
Lost, and I cannot forget,  
Love might have saved me yet!

## Contributions and Comments.

### 1 Corinthians iv. 6

(EXEGESIS OR EMENDATION?).

THIS notorious *crux interpretum* has claimed the attention of all the commentators, but it is curious that all the British editors of this Epistle attempt to find a meaning in the words as they stand, and only a very few German and Dutch scholars definitely attempt a solution by a feasible emendation of the text.

The verse reads:

ταῦτα δέ, ἀδελφοί, μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἑμάντων καὶ Ἀπολλῶν δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθῃτε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου.

We are not now concerned with the exposition of μετεσχημάτισα, but with the very difficult phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται.

Let us first consider the words as an integral part of the text, and their possible meaning. The article τὸ then makes the four following words a noun clause governed by μάθῃτε.

Edwards quotes Cranmer's 'beyond that whyche is above wrytten,' and shows that this would require ἐγράφη or προέγραψα, as in Eph 3<sup>9</sup>. Hofmann's 'above what has been assigned to each by God' is similarly ruled out as requiring μεμέρισται

or τέτακται, whilst ὁ would be needed rather than ἃ. [*ὁ* is read by DG *et al.*]

There is pretty general agreement that the reference is to Scripture, but whilst Lightfoot thinks of such passages as those already quoted by Paul in 1<sup>19, 21</sup> 3<sup>19, 20</sup>, Edwards and Findlay find no such specific allusion, but refer it to the general spirit and point of view of the Old Testament. The article, as Plummer observes, is equivalent to our inverted commas, and the elliptical form, as in *ne sutor ultra crepidam* (Plummer) or μηδὲν ἄγαν (Findlay), suggests a proverb (Lightfoot), or a Rabbinical adage (Ewald).

St John Parry (*C.G.T.*) makes a new contribution. He criticizes the usual view, which refers the words to the O.T. Scriptures according to Paul's regular use of γέγραπται, because of (a) the vagueness of reference, and the absence of all indication as to what Scripture teaching is meant; and (b) the lack of any appeal to Scripture in the preceding discussion about the position and duties of teachers, so that Paul and Apollos can hardly be said to have been shown as examples of this lesson. Dr. Parry goes on to suggest that γέγραπται is used here in a technical, but not the usual technical, sense. With the help of Milligan and Moulton's *Vocabulary*, he shows that γράφειν had a

current use for framing a law or contract, and that καθ' ἃ γέγραπται is commonly used in referring to an agreement and its terms. Hence Paul means here 'not to go beyond the terms,' *i.e.* of the commission as teacher.

Lietzmann (*Handbuch zum N.T.*) quotes Heinrich's suggestion that a charge of unscriptural teaching had been flung at Paul, and that he is here neatly turning their own catchword against his opponents. Lietzmann seems to favour this interpretation, but adds the cautious reminder, 'We cannot fully understand the passage just because we have before us a private letter of the most intimate kind.'

Peake (who has himself expounded 1 Co. in his One-Volume Commentary) says: 'Apparently the point is "that you might learn not to transgress the injunction of Scripture."' But he observes that the second part of v.<sup>6</sup> is very difficult, the Greek elliptical and the meaning obscure. He first, among English commentators, says, 'the text is probably corrupt.' Moffatt has a footnote in his translation: 'The text and the meaning of the phrase between μάθητε and ἵνα μὴ are beyond recovery.' Plummer in a textual note in small type remarks that some editors propose to omit τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται as a marg. gloss. 'The sense is intelligible without these words, but a gloss would have taken some other form.' This last remark is, no doubt, true if we think of an *interpretative* gloss. But are we restricted to that alternative? May it not be a *textual* gloss?

Here, as so often, we find far the fullest treatment of the whole difficulty in Johannes Weiss's incomparable commentary. After discussing all the points that have arisen in earlier expositions, he comes to the conclusion that the text as transmitted to us is unintelligible. He then shows other objections:

(a) There is a suspicious repetition in τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ and ἵνα μὴ . . . ὑπέρ.

(b) The Latin texts do not translate the ἵνα μὴ.

(c) The difficulty lying in the juxtaposition of the double object to μάθητε.

(d) The striking absence of μὴ in DE.

Now conjectural emendation is the last resort of the harassed exegete. He must not follow the example of 'the amputative Nauck,' who struck out as a corruption every difficult line that baffled him in a classical text. It is not enough to show difficulties in the text as it stands. Any change should not only account for all the factors in the

case, but should cause the least possible disturbance to the text. It is a curious thing that (so far as I can discover) no textual suggestion for solving this difficulty has been made in any English book. Yet two (of the simplest character) have been made by foreign scholars, also a third, involving little more disturbance of the text.

Bousset (*Die Schriften des N.T.*, ed.<sup>3</sup>, 1917) and the Dutch scholar Baljon (who is quoted by Weiss) adopt the simple expedient of treating the five words as a scribe's marginal comment. The text then reads:

ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου.

What, then, does the comment mean?

(1) According to Bousset, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ α γέγραπται = the μὴ is written above the alpha (*i.e.* the final letter of ἵνα).

(2) According to Baljon, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται is the comment of a scribe who found the μὴ (missing, by the way, in DE) added over the εἰς (written in the form of the numerical symbol α).

These conjectures agree in suggesting that the perplexing words were originally a scribe's indication of the uncertain position of the word μὴ in the text as he found it.

(3) J. Weiss, after quoting Baljon's 'very clever conjecture,' hazards a further one himself. According to this the marginal gloss reads: ἃ γέγραπται ἵνα μὴ εἰς, *i.e.* 'the ἃ stands in the text; read it as ἵνα not εἰς' (or possibly ἵνα ἢ εἰς, *i.e.* how is it to be resolved, ἵνα or εἰς?). This, of course, involves a slight further adjustment of the text, thus: ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ἃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθαι κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου.

This itacistic change from pres. subj. (*v.* Moulton, *Grammar*, ii. p. 200) φυσιοῦσθε to infinitive φυσιοῦσθαι has some MS. support (*κ<sup>o</sup> et al.*). That fact is not irrelevant when considering the plausibility of such a suggestion of scribal comment.

In spite of Weiss's rather pathetic remark, 'But criticism never takes such attempts seriously,' the three suggestions offered above seem to deserve attention and respect. W. F. HOWARD.

Handsworth College,  
Birmingham.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.