

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

every Christian mind is, that it lies in our own power to compensate in some degree for past neglect, and to mitigate the indifference with which the labour of the Great Shepherd is regarded. Each of us can secure that He be welcomed and appreciated by at least one heart: that there be one heart in which His actions are rightly interpreted and by which it is clearly recognised that the work he has done is work which cannot be bought, and which nothing can accomplish for us but Divine self-sacrifice and patience. If the stroke of His crook be at times painful, it saves us from a pain that is greater. If again and again in life we find that to be forbidden which alone seems desirable, it is forbidden for reasons truly valid. Much that pains and wounds and grieves us is proof of the care, not of the carelessness of Him who guides and tends us. He feels for us in all our pain and will compensate for all our loss. He who laid down His life for the sheep will save them from all that threatens to make His sacrifice fruitless. And the imagination can picture no happier condition than that of the man who passes through all the darkness and troubles of this life with a constant and faithful docility, and suffers Christ to accomplish in him the whole design and desire of His infinite love.

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

On Rev. i. 14.—In Rev. i. 14 we read, amidst the description of the Son of man seen by St. John, Ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὡς¹ ἔριον λευκὸν ὡς χιών— words which may easily be translated with the A.V., though not exactly with the common punctuation, “His head and His hairs were white like¹

¹ The reading ὡσεὶ for one or the other ὡς will make no practical difference. But the introduction of that reading, if as is probable it is not original, shows

wool as white as snow." But this seems a very strange standard of comparison. We can understand either phrase, "white as wool" or "white as snow," but the combination of the two, by comparison first of the wool to the snow, and then of the hair to the wool so compared, seems very far-fetched.

And the only alternative punctuation leaves the sense, or at least the style, not much better. If we put a comma after instead of before *λευκόν*, we can translate, "His head and His hairs were white as *white* wool, as snow:" but that this is an awkward phrase is tacitly confessed by the Revisers of the A. V., while they adopted this view of the construction. They repeat the words, "as white" in the second clause, which then runs smoothly; but "white as white wool" is cumbrous if not redundant. If "wool" does not of itself suggest whiteness, what fitness has it for a standard to express the highest degree of whiteness? and when the plainly fit standard, "white as snow," is available, why should this be used, which so to speak needs elaborate preparation to fit it for a standard?

Now peculiar as the style and grammar of the Apocalypse are, it is certain that cumbrous and otiose phrases are not characteristic of it. It is also certain that St. John's double standard of whiteness is suggested by the description in the Book of Daniel of the Ancient of Days, "Whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His head as the pure wool." In Daniel the double comparison is perfectly natural in thought and style: whence comes the confusion in St. John?

It seems worth asking, whether it may not be from a primitive corruption of the text. One late MS.—only one, so far as I know, that has yet been even partially collated—gives a reading for which the internal evidence seems as strong as can be when external attestation is at the very minimum—*αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὡσεὶ ἔριον, καὶ τὸ ἐνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιών*. Here, though Daniel is not textually quoted, the order of his clauses being changed, the sense is the same as with him, and the order is as clear and natural. The MS. containing this reading is that provisionally numbered 122 by Dr. Burgon in his list of MSS. prefixed to the last edition of Scrivener's *Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.*—in the Chigi Library, R. v. 33. Though not older than the four—that early scribes felt the awkwardness of the double *ὡς*. The frequency of the redoubling of the last syllable of *λευκαὶ* (*λευκαὶ καὶ ὡς, κ.τ.λ.*) has perhaps the same significance.

teenth century, it has an excellent text, reading *e.g.* in i. 6, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς; and in v. 10,¹ βασιλεύουσι. It is however rather carelessly written; and we cannot suspect the scribe himself of having made such a brilliant conjecture as this would be; he doubtless derived it, as other readings are derived, from a tradition of probably great antiquity.

I do not, however, venture to suppose that its antiquity was absolutely primordial. Even if the reading be right, it is likelier (in Dr. Hort's words)² to be "due only to a" [perhaps hardly] "casual and unconscious emendation of the erroneous current reading" than' to have been "transmitted from the autograph, and preserved by some rare accident of mixture, notwithstanding the otherwise complete extinction of the line of transmission by which it had been conveyed." Nor, tempting as the reading is, is even the internal evidence unmixedly in its favour. The seven words are exactly the same as in St. Matt. xxviii. 3, which would explain their occurring "casually and unconsciously" to the mind of a scribe: and the "pure wool" of Daniel is possibly a reason for accepting as genuine the epithet here. But, true or not, the reading is at any rate interesting and worthy of record.

WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX.

Notes and News.—Prof. Cheyne of Oxford will publish in the autumn a new book on the Wisdom-literature of the Old Testament, entitled *Job and Solomon*. Unlike his *Prophecies of Isaiah*, this work does not profess in any degree a suspense of judgment on the critical problems of date and origin. Its leading principle, however, is one advocated in that earlier work, viz. the necessity of a thorough study of the exegesis of the Old Testament as a preliminary to a fruitful study of its criticism.

¹ In the limited time that I had available for work in the Chigi Library, I was able only to collate the first four chapters of the Revelation in this and Cod. 72. But I looked at the place cited, and a few farther on. I may take this opportunity of stating that Cod. Apoc. 68 in the Vatican Library contains c. i. 11–ii. 20; iii. 16–vi. 9; vii. 17–ix. 5—a good deal more than (I suppose) Scholz stated (I take as his the statement from Scrivener's *Introduction*). On the other hand, either the MS. does not contain xx. 1–xxi. 17, or I missed seeing it: the last passage, as far as I observed, begins καθαρόν, ὁμοιον ἰαλῶ καθαρῶ.

² Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*, Introduction, § 367, cf. § 360.