

# 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>



PATREON

<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

she will pursue her son with her agonizing love even into the realm beyond this earth, and will be sure that God's love is pursuing him too, even into the city of dreadful night. She will feel that she is God's partner in desire and in the agony of desire frustrated; and so she will carry her cross and fill up that which is lacking in the sufferings of Christ, and still believe in God's love, though with a broken heart. When once Christian love gets to its knees in intercession for a loved one, it may have to suffer agonies as it beseeches; but it will not rise without the assurance, 'And thou too dost love the one I love.'

## V.

Our brief study of this section of the Sermon on the Mount must draw to a close. Let us sum up the main truths that it has taught us. They are but two, and they are very simple. Firstly:

Prayer is natural. Man, God's child, natively desires that which is good. Prayer is the act by which the human soul seeks the air and food that minister true health to it. And secondly: Prayer works. Because God is our Father and has given freedom to us, His children, therefore, where God and man unite in desire, things happen. Prayer is the act in which we link our hands into God's to further His aims; therein the Divine desire and the human desire become fellow-workers; and from this partnership results follow. Of course, for 'a short time' the devil has power to frustrate that which God purposes. But 'I believe in God Almighty.' Because God is God, the final victory of His goodwill is sure. And for each of us the love and the service of that Will are the highest achievements to which we can aspire. To attain it is to reach the full growth of the human stature.

---

## Two Remarkable Glosses in the Text of Hebrews.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., BIRMINGHAM.

THE history of the text of the New Testament is, to an extent which has not been adequately realized, the history of its glosses, that is, of those expansions which are commonly regarded as improper accretions to the original narrative. If we could trace such accretions to their proper authors, or assign them to their approximate dates, we should certainly have done much to lift the study of textual criticism out of its present confusion as a *mêlée* of alphabets, numbers and signs and symbols. It must, however, be understood at the outset that no real progress can certainly be made so long as we speak of glosses in a sense which implies *petitio principii*. The supposed glosses may, in many cases, turn out to be part of the primitive text; there may have been reasons for removal, as well as grounds for insertion. In any case, we must not use the word 'gloss' as a 'question-begging epithet.' The study of such augmented passages, as in the Acts of the Apostles, for example, lies at the very heart of New Testament criticism.

I have recently been examining with some care a couple of these so-called glosses in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, neither of

which has the least prospect, in our present state of textual knowledge, of being given a position of dignity in the text, or a secure foothold in the apparatus to the text; they seem, however, to be deserving of some closer attention, in spite of the fact that Dr. Moffatt speaks of them contemptuously as being 'thrown up by the Latin version'; as if the Latin tradition was like the troubled sea of the Old Testament whose waters cast up mire and dirt! If the Latin tradition behaves in that way, and there is Greek attestation as well as Latin for the glosses referred to, we shall have Dr. Moffatt enlisted on the side of those who say that certain Greek MSS have latinized: for how else does the mud attach to them? But to come to our particular study.

The two glosses to which we refer are both of them in the roll-call of the deeds and the heroes of faith, which has for its formula the introductory words, 'By faith.' Two new instances are introduced, one of them referring to Moses, the other to the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. *By faith Moses*, and *By faith Israel*; so we may call them the 'By Faith' glosses, bearing in mind what we have said about avoiding preliminary prejudications.

Our first gloss adds to the text of v.<sup>23</sup> the following words :

'By faith Moses, when he was grown up (*μέγας γενόμενος*) destroyed the Egyptian, observing (*κατανοών*) the humiliation of his brethren';

the second gloss is at the end of v.<sup>28</sup>, and records that

'By faith they plundered the Egyptians when they went out.'

As regards the attestation of these two passages, it will be sufficient at this point to say that the former reading has both Greek and Latin support (the Greek evidence being that of the Codex Claromontanus, Cod. D, together with its transcript Cod. E, and another), and the latter reading has, as far as we know, only Latin support. There is no need to distract our minds by trying to decipher von Soden's hieroglyphics. Let us come to the subject-matter of the two new statements.

Each of them is concerned with the vindication of a doubtful passage in Old Testament morals: the first with the question whether Moses was a murderer who broke his own law; the second with the question whether the Israelites were robbers at the Exodus, who ran off with the jewellery of the Egyptian ladies. The similarity in the ethical problems involved invites the suggestion that the two 'By Faith' glosses are from the same hand. Perhaps they are due to an attempt at justification by faith in a non-Pauline sense. Each of them is related to objections made in very early times: the first has caused a reaction on the text of the New Testament itself; the second is meant to refute an objection made by the Marcionites, but which may very well be earlier than Marcion. Either of them, then, is early. Let us begin with Moses.

It is well known that the dispute between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses in the Epistle of Jude relates to this very question. The devil claims the body on the ground that Moses is a murderer. Satan was not afraid to speak evil of dignities, as St. Jude would say. Michael makes a stately, an almost contemptuous reply; the glossator in Hebrews has one which is more to the point. *Moses acted in faith.*

This was not the only case in which apology for Moses was necessary. His marriage with the Ethiopian girl was an early problem, which the Church solved (1) by the general rule laid down in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, that one is not to judge the actions of the prophets by ordinary standards; (2) by the explanation that the prophet

Moses was acting with a view to the mystery of the nuptials of Christ and the Church. Irenæus has preserved the argument for us as follows:

'By the nuptials of Moses, those spiritual nuptials of the Logos were intimated; and by his Ethiopian wife, the Church from the Gentiles was shown forth; and those who talk against her, and slander and make mock of her, shall not be reckoned pure (*καθαροί*). They shall be treated as lepers and put outside of the camp of the just.'

Irenæus is meeting objections of the primitive Puritans (*καθαροί*), and his retort is savage enough. Pure, indeed! they are lepers, rather. He is referring to the story of the way Miriam, the sister of Moses, was punished for criticising her brother's marriage.

To return to our theme. *Moses acted in faith when he killed the Egyptian.* The statement is meant to meet an early objection, and may, therefore, itself be early, or even original. Now with regard to the plunder of the Egyptians and their gauds and gear. As we said, it is well known that this is one of the Marcionite objections to the morality of the Old Testament; and Epiphanius explains that there was nothing wrong about it, since the Israelites were really only collecting wages for long years of unpaid servitude. We need not, however, spend time over Epiphanius. That we are dealing with a problem at least as old as the middle of the second century may be seen from the writings of Tertullian and Irenæus. The latter is especially interesting, for he devotes a whole chapter to the Spoiling of the Egyptians,<sup>1</sup> and in so doing he incorporates passages from the early Christian Father whom he calls 'the Presbyter,' who tackles the very same problem. Either, then, we have extracts from a lost *Presbyter against Marcion*, or we have a Presbyter against those who held Marcionite opinions before Marcion. Tertullian, Irenæus, and the Presbyter constitute a literature on the question of the Spoiling of the Egyptians, and it is with this literature that our second gloss must be classed. If it is not originally a part of the text, it can hardly be later than the middle of the second century. It is more simple as a solution than the laboured arguments of Irenæus, or even than those of the Presbyter.

It may, however, be worth while looking more closely into the statements of Irenæus, especially into the actual passage taken from the Presbyter in the following chapter. The underlying assumption is that the Exodus from Egypt is a type of the Exodus of the Church from among the

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Haer.* lib. iv. cxxx. Mass.

Gentiles, and the Presbyter (is he Papias or some other allegorist of the time ?) says :

'We ought not to blame the Patriarchs and Prophets for those crimes of which the scriptures themselves accuse them, nor to become like Ham, who made mirth of his father's nakedness, and so fell under a curse ; but rather we ought to give thanks to God, since their sins were forgiven by the advent of our Lord ; and indeed they also ought to give thanks and to exult over our salvation. As for those accusations which the scriptures do not make, but only relate the events simply, it is not our business to become their accusers, nor to be wiser than our teacher, but to look for the involved type.'

The Presbyter has a simple solution for the Spoliation problem : the accounts are typical, and one must not bring railing accusations. Irenæus goes much further than this, and his extended treatment shows that the Church was in the grip of Marcion. His opponents affirm (and Irenæus does not deny it) that it was by the command of God Himself that the Israelites robbed the Egyptians of the silver and gold, the vessels and vestments which were ultimately employed in the structure and the service of the sanctuary.

'Qui vero exprobant et imputant, quod profecturus populus, jussu Dei, vascula omnis generis et vestimenta acceperit ab Aegyptiis, et sic abierit, ex quibus et tabernaculum factum est in eremo, ignorantes justificationes Dei et dispositiones ejus, semetipsos arguunt, sicut et presbyter dicebat.'

Irenæus argues that we are all of us in possession of wealth which we never acquired by our own efforts, as when we brought over with us from our Gentile days the proceeds of the Mammon of Unrighteousness into the Church. Some of it was due to the avarice of our ancestors or even of our friends. As to the Egyptians, if you come to that, they owed their life to the kindness and forethought of the patriarch Joseph ; how much was due on that account ? Then there is the long tale of toil, and of servitude ; what harm if they did take a little ? If they had been let alone, they would have become rich, and could have carried off a great deal. Do not we ourselves get something (yes ! and a very great deal) from quarters where nothing was due. Think of the Romans, from whom we have the peace of our time, and the right to come and go, by land or sea, without let or hindrance ! If we get so much for nothing, it is about time for us, when we talk of the Egyptians being spoiled, to begin to pick out the chip from our own eyes. We shall only excuse the fault-finding critic who gets nothing

from any one, and stands wholly unindebted to the rest of the world, if he goes off into the mountains (naked, if you please) and lives with the beasts and like them. Thus, and more to the same effect, in the pages of the ingenious Irenæus. It is clear from the way that he piles up his argument that he has a great deal to answer. We contrast his reasoning with the simple statement of the glossator, that 'By faith they plundered the Egyptians, when they went out from among them.'

Tertullian meets the Marcionite objection in something the same manner as Irenæus, but he makes a legal statement of the situation between Israelite and Egyptian, just as if he had been engaged on one side of the case in the law courts, as follows (*C. Marcion*, ii. 20) :

'The Egyptians put in a claim on the Hebrews for those gold and silver vessels. The Hebrews assert a counter-claim, alleging that, by the written engagement of both parties, there were due to them the arrears of that laborious slavery of theirs, for the bricks they had so painfully made, and the cities and palaces which they had built. . . . It would not be compensation enough, even if the labour of 500,000 men should be valued at only a farthing a day apiece,' and so on ; a pretty statement from a lawyer's point of view.

In Marcion's case the reference to the Spoliation of the Egyptians was made not merely to draw attention to an act of injustice involved in the Israelite history, but also to the contradiction between the God of the Old Testament and the good God of the New Testament. The case is stated for us in the *Dialogue* of Adamantius, which is the nearest we can get to Marcion's own utterances ; in this *Dialogue* we find the Marcionite Megethius contending as follows :

'The God of Creation commanded Moses when going forth from the land of Egypt, saying : "Be ready, with your loins girt, your feet shod, and staves in hand, with your wallets on your shoulders, and carry off gold, silver, and everything else from the Egyptians" ; but our Lord, the Good One, when sending out his disciples into the world, said, "No shoes on your feet, no wallet, no change of shirts, no money in your pockets." See how the Good One contradicts the rules of the other.'—Adamantius, *Dial.* 10.

So much for the Marcionite and anti-Marcionite points of view. For an Oriental justification of the right of plunder see Tabari, *Book of Religion and Empire* (ed. Mingana) (p. 155).

'And Moses—peace be with him . . . when he ordered the Children of Israel to leave Egypt and

go away, he told them that the Most High God had ordered that every one of them should borrow the garments of his neighbour and acquaintance and the jewels of their wives and daughters, and that they should inform them that it was for the occasion of one of their feasts. The Egyptian people yielded to them, adorned the Israelites with what they had, and lent them both their useful and necessary things. . . . The owners of these borrowed objects, and their wives and daughters, were deprived of their loaned articles; and their treasures, a griffin carried them away; and they bit their fingers out of regret. All this was not unlawful and illicit, but was simply the right of booty and spoils, for the world belongs to the Most High God, and its Kingdom and ornaments belong to those of His servants upon whom He bestows them, as He said in His book: "Thou givest the Kingdom to whomsoever thou pleasest, and strippest the Kingdom from whomsoever thou pleasest."

It is not necessary to assume that Tabari, who had apostatized from Christianity to Islam, had Marcionite statements (*pro* or *con*) before him: the ethical problem is more general than that raised by Marcion.

Now let us return to the first of our pair of glosses, which we have conjectured to come from the same hand.

The first thing we notice is that there is a repetition in the text when the gloss is inserted: as we commonly read it, we have as follows:

'By faith Moses, when he was full-grown (*μέγας γενόμενος*), refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, counting the reproach of Christ greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt, for he had respect to the recompense of the reward.'

To this we now add:

'By faith Moses, when he was full-grown (*μέγας γενόμενος*), killed the Egyptian, observing the humiliation of his brethren.'

Now to which of these accounts does the term 'full-grown' properly belong? If we turn to the

underlying narration in Exodus, we find in the text of the LXX as follows:

'And it came to pass after those many days that Moses, now full-grown, went out to his brethren the children of Israel; and when he had observed their pain (*κατανόησας τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν*), he sees an Egyptian striking a Hebrew, one of his own brethren of the children of Israel.'

Here it is clear that the term 'when full-grown' belongs to the murder of the Egyptian. Further, it does not belong to the relation with Pharaoh's daughter, for, according to Josephus, this refusal of the royalty of Egypt took place when Moses was a child. We should accordingly expect that the Biblical text would begin with: 'By faith Moses, when he was little' (*ὅτε μικρὸς ἦν* or *ὅτε νέος ἦν*); and that the reference to his being full-grown should come later, in which case there is a strong argument for giving the gloss a place in the text. We should then have the sequence: 'Moses when he was born . . .' 'Moses when he was young . . .' 'Moses when he was full-grown.'

In that connexion we notice a peculiar dependence of the language of the gloss upon the text of the LXX. The Greek of the gloss is known to us from the Codex Claromontanus (D), and it is, as we have said before, suspect of Latinism. Over against *τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ* we have the Latin version '*dolorem fratrum ejus*.' Now this *dolorem* is again from the LXX, and answers to *τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν*. Probably *κατανοῶν* is also a Latinism for *κατανόησας*.

The conclusion, then, is that the gloss is a Latin gloss, which may answer to a primitive passage in the text of Hebrews, and is certainly of very great antiquity: and as the two glosses belong to the same mint, what is said of one of them belongs also to the other.

If neither of them is a part of the original text, then both of them are anti-Marcionite additions to the text of Hebrews, and were inserted in early Latin copies in the first instance. It would be another case of what we note in the famous Western glosses of the Acts, that, if not a part of the text, they are certainly a part of the very earliest commentary upon the text.