

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

New Testament of 1797, from which Rudolf Stier appears to have derived them.

The proposed substitution of *Ἐνώχ* for the received text (or the addition of the word) is therefore a proposal of at least 139 years' antiquity, and it may be far older. It would be interesting to trace Bowyer's note to its original author. S. T. Bloomfield (A.D. 1828) refers to it contemptuously (*Recensio Synoptica*, viii. 671), but he seems to imply that several authors had made or continued the proposal. "Some resort to critical conjecture, which merits no attention." Who are the "others" referred to by Stier? *Nihil sub sole novum!* GEORGE FARMER.

#### THE HISTORY OF A CONJECTURAL. EMENDATION.

MR. FARMER has, in the preceding note, made the important observation that the conjectural restoration which was proposed in this magazine for the difficult passage 1 Pet. iii. 19 is more ancient than I had supposed, and that it was already extant in Bowyer's *Conjectures to the New Testament*, from whom it passed into the *Sylloge Conjecturarum* at the end of Knapp's New Testament, and thence into the footnotes of the Polyglot edition of Stier and Thiele. His discovery adds new force to some remarks of my own, when trying to do justice to those who had independently lighted upon the emendation, either in the form which I gave or one closely related to it. I think that I pointed out that if three independent workers (say Dr. Cramer, Dr. James, and myself) had suggested the correction, the subjectivity which is the bane of conjectural restoration is reduced nearly to zero, and that we might use Shakesperian language, and say that there were "three justices' hands to it." Mr. Farmer tells us that the number three must be raised to four, and that one

of the justices, viz. the anonymous one in Bowyer, has been largely quoted and endorsed, which certainly does not diminish the value of his ruling.

Thus the wider question than that of a particular Petrine emendation is before us, and we are invited (as I suggested in a previous communication) to discuss how far the value of a correction is increased, when two or three or twenty persons light upon it independently.

May we say that when the personal equation has been got rid of by the combination of many observations, that we are entitled to affirm modestly, what the ordinary conjectural-emendator says positively (and the more so when no one endorses him) that "this is now certain"?

In order to clear one's ideas on the matter, suppose we leave 1 Peter iii. 19 alone for a while, and try and discuss a similar question where the emendator has made a splendid venture, and been well received, and where the question of his originality comes up precisely as it does in the problem of the restoration of the name of Enoch to the text of Peter.

One of the most brilliant restorations of the last few years is one which Dr. Blass proposed in his *Philology of the Gospels* for the passage Acts vi. 9,<sup>1</sup> where, in place of the perplexing 'synagogue of the Libertines,' we are invited to read τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν λεγομένων Λιβυστίνων, and so to restore geographical unity to the expression Λιβερτίνων καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων, where the grouping of the names is of itself sufficient to suggest a single synagogue, especially when contrasted with the following words καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας. Accordingly Dr. Blass says :

"We are utterly ignorant of a synagogue in Jerusalem bearing the name of Λιβερτίνων, or the Freedmen, and there is this additional difficulty, that the words καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων seem to form a

<sup>1</sup> Blass l.c. p. 69.

part of the same appellation, although Cyrenians and Alexandrians belong to definite towns, and freedmen existed everywhere. I have tried in my Commentary to disjoin these words from *Λιβερτίνων* and to bring them into connection with *καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας*: but the right way lay in quite an opposite direction. Mr. F. C. Conybeare and Mr. J. Rendel Harris directed my attention, some time afterwards, to Armenian versions of the Acts and of the Syriac Commentaries upon that book, and in those sources I found the reading *Libyorum* instead of *Λιβερτίνων*, a reading given already by Tischendorf, but at the first disregarded by me. Now I saw at once that something like *Λιβύων* would suit the context very well indeed, as the Greek towns lying westwards from Cyrene would come quite appropriately under that designation. But can *Λιβερτίνων* be a corruption of *Λιβύων*? Of course not, nor does *Λιβύων* seem to be the right appellation for those Jews, as the Libyans were nothing but barbarous tribes. But *Λιβυστίνων* will both suit the sense, design them as inhabitants of Libya, and come very near to the corrupted *Λιβερτίνων*, there being but two letters different. It is easy to establish that this form of the adjective from *Λίβυς* was a current one, from Catullus' (60, 1) *Montibus Libystinis* and from the geographical lexicon of Stephanus Byzantinus, etc. This therefore is the true reading."

The question might be raised at the outset whether this is a conjectural restoration at all. For the presence of the variant in the critical apparatus, even if only in a single quarter, is evidence of the existence of the reading. We do not know that Tischendorf's reading *Libyorum* is the right representation of the Armenian form or rather of the Greek which underlay it. And, as Blass points out, there is a further accession of Syriac and Armenian testimony in the evidence beyond what was known to Tischendorf. But suppose we grant it to be a conjecture and not an extant reading, at least so far as the substitution of "Libyistine" for "Libyan" goes. We have then an admirable emendation proposed by Blass concerning which he is (a) certain that it is correct, (b) satisfied that no one thought of it before. He says definitely, "the conjecture has not really been made so far as I know; nevertheless it might have been made by a reflecting critic." I propose

to accept the correction, and to test my friend Dr. Blass for priority (which seems a better word to use than originality).

If we turn to Schleusner, *Lex. N.T.* s.v. (A.D. 1824), we shall find as follows :

“Unde quidam (v.c. Beza, Clericus, Jac. Gothofredus, et Fr. Spanhemius (*Misc.* iii. 2, 17, *Tom* ii. p. 320) h.l. pro  $\Lambda\iota\beta\epsilon\rho\rho\iota\upsilon\omega\nu$  legi volunt  $\Lambda\iota\beta\upsilon\rho\rho\iota\upsilon\omega\nu$ . Vide Wetsteini *N. T.* ii. 492 et aliorum. Satis confirmatur et magnam veri speciem habet, tamen palmam cedit eorum sententiae qui ob orationis seriem (nam *Alexandrinorum*, Asianorum, Cyrenaeorum et Cilicum scholis et coetibus proxime junguntur), per Libertinos intelligunt Judaeos, incolas et cives Liberti Africae propriae, sive Carthaginiensis, quae et proconsularis dicebatur sive oppidi (secundum Pearceium in comm. ad. h.l.) sive regionis.”

Here then is Dr. Blass' emendation, supported by a string of authorities, and in competition with another emendation or rather explanation (also supported by a string of authorities), according to which latter suggestion the name is that of a North African town.

When we turn from Schleusner, we find the New Testaments and Commentaries well acquainted with the matter which he has digested for us.

Thus in Knapp's New Testament we have the following note :

$\Lambda\iota\beta\epsilon\rho\rho\iota\upsilon\omega\nu$ ]  $\Lambda\iota\beta\upsilon\rho\rho\iota\upsilon\omega\nu$  Beza, Cleric., J. Gothofredus [prob. Relando et Valck. [sic versio *Arm.*].

Here are some of Schleusner's authorities, and some fresh ones, as well as the authority of the Armenian version.<sup>1</sup>

If we turn to Griesbach we find the brief note

$\Lambda\iota\beta\upsilon\rho\rho\iota\upsilon\omega\nu$ . Conject. et sic *Arm.*,

which shows that Griesbach knew the correction and the support for it in the critical apparatus. It does not seem

<sup>1</sup> The first Knapp edn. is A.D. 1797. I am quoting the 4th edn. of 1828.

that Griesbach equated the Armenian reading with *Libyorum*, but with *Libystinorum*.

Mill, in his New Testament of 1707 notices the conjecture, but only to dismiss it contemptuously, as the following will show :

Λιβερίνων] corruptum quidam suspicantur ex Λιβυστίων inani conjectura, siquidem libri omnes in vulgata lectione consentiant.

Wetstein in his folio edition of 1731 does not follow Mill in dismissing the emendation ; he says :

Λιβυστίων. T. Beza in Annotatt. ed. 1, 2, J. Clericus, Jac. Gothofredus.

And in the footnotes he quotes Catullus, Aelian, Macrobius, and Stephanus in justification of the form. So here is the Blass-emendation accompanied by the Blass-confirmations, and again we are pointed to Theodore Beza as the author. The emendation will also be found in the edition of Wetstein's *Prolegomena* which antedates the New Testament.

No doubt it was from Wetstein that Bowyer, the learned printer, took the substance of his note on the text ; it runs as follows :

“As the other synagogues are named from countries, so here, perhaps, we should read Λιβυστίων *Libyensium* with Oecumenius, Jac. Gothofred., Cod. Theod., tom. iii. xvi. p. 221, J. Clericus, etc., etc.”

I do not see why Beza's name is dropped, and we have a fresh and surprising suggestion which seems to be from Bowyer's own hand, or that of one of his friends, to the effect that the reading is given in Oecumenius.

It would be easy to show that the acquaintance which the great editors of the New Testament show with the Libystine emendation is faithfully reflected in the commentaries. For example, Rosenmüller, in his *Scholia in N.T.*, writes :

“Satis apparet *Λιβερτίων* non esse nomen regionis. Ex quo simul intelligitur, supervacaneam esse quorundam conjecturam qui pro *Λιβερτίων* legendum putarent *Λιβυστίων*, contra omnium Codd. et Vers. antiq. auctoritatem.”

Spanheim (1632–1701), to whom Schleusner refers us, has the following note in his *Dissertation on the Period of St. Paul's Conversion* :

“Quod si in textu quid audendum, mallet legi *Λιβυστίων*, non de Libyis Africanis, sed de Judaeis qui Iberiam, Colchidem, ac vicina loca frequentes incolerent . . . quibus esset sua Hierosolymis synagoga. Stephanus de Urbibus: *Λιβυστίνοι, ἔθνος παρακείμενον Κόλχοις.*”

Here it appears that the Blass-emendation was known to Spanheim, who only differs from it in the matter of interpretation, a piece of hypercriticism in which he found no supporter.

John Clericus (le Clerc) (1657–1736), whom Blass recognizes as the first to propose the theory of a double edition of the Lucan writings, was also familiar with the emendation, as the following extract from his commentary will show :

“Malim legi, quamvis codices dissentiant, *Λιβυστίων*, quia cum Alexandrini et Cyrenenses, populi Libyae vicini memorati essent, nemo poterat iis aptius conjungi quam Libyes aut Libystini; nam utroque modo nomen *ἐθνικόν* formatur, ut docebit Stephanus.”

Here then we again have the Blass-emendation, as well as one of the Blass authorities for the form of the word.<sup>1</sup> So far the language employed suggests that they are discussing a correction which had already been proposed, and upon a comparison with what we now have to bring forward, it will appear that the author from whom they all depend is Theodore Beza, who proposed the correction in his edition of 1559, in which he calls it “haec mea conjectura,” and abandoned it, in an excess of critical modesty, in 1565. The note is interesting to the student,

<sup>1</sup> See also Valeknaer, *Schol. in Act. Apost.*, p. 413.

for comparison with the later annotators, and runs as follows :

“*Λιβερτίων*. Ridiculum est profecto quod a quibusdam est annotatum, Libertinos scilicet istos Romanos fuisse, quia Latinum est vocabulum, et a Livia Augusti conjuge sic cognominatos. Alii alias causas afferunt, quarum nulla mihi quidem adhuc probari potuit. Neque enim video qua ratione Lucas istos appellet ex conditione, caeteros vero ex gente ac patria. Itaque quo propius hunc locum inspicio, eo magis confirmor in ea opinione, ut existimem fuisse a librariis depravatum, et pro *Λιβερτίων* reponendum esse *Λιβιστίων*. Idem sunt autem Libistini qui et Libyes et Libyci, ut diserte testatur Stephanus, ex Libya scilicet oriundi; quae quum inter Cyrenaicam et Aegyptum media sit interjecta, merito scilicet junguntur cum Cyrenaicis et Alexandrinis, sicuti rursus Cilices cum Asiaticis. Occasionem autem erroris praebere potuit partim summa nominis affinitas inter Libistinos et Libertinos, partim etiam quod ipsi multo frequenter Libyes, quam Libistini dicantur, ut imperitus facile suspicari potuerit locum esse depravatum, quam ipse tamen depravarit. Sed quid si potius haec mea conjectura quod recte scriptum est, perverteret? nam certe mirum est omnium codicum consensus. Quamobrem ne apicem quidem mutare volui; tantum placuit, lector, quod suspicares, bona fide proponere, ut aliquid constituent istarum rerum peritiores.”

In 1565 the passage is slightly altered and the following words are added, “Sed praeterquam quod omnes codices quos inspexi, summo consensu legunt *Λιβερτίων*, non est etiam necesse ad hanc conjecturam venire,” and in later editions I believe the whole note is wanting. A further suggestion occurs in Bowyer to the effect that the reading *Λιβιστίων* can be found in Oecumenius. I have not been able to verify this, though there is something that seems to point in that direction. As a matter of fact Oecumenius is merely digesting scraps of Chrysostom, and it is quite possible that a search amongst the MSS. of Chrysostom’s commentaries on the Acts might lead to the recovery of the lost reading in Greek. I hope no one will think any the worse either of Dr. Blass or of his emendation because it has been shown to have been so abundantly anticipated.



In reality the case for the correction is much stronger in consequence of the investigation and Dr. Blass's acuteness can take care of itself.

I pass on to a somewhat similar instance, not quite so striking as the passage in the Acts, but not without critical importance. When Mrs. Lewis first published her Syriac palimpsest gospels from Mount Sinai, she made the following annotation on a passage in Mark:

"In Mark x. 50 we are told that blind Timai, son of Timai, took up his garment when he rose and came to Jesus. This, to any one who has watched Eastern habits, seems a more natural action than if he had cast it away."

I do not see that this alteration of the text of the Syriac gospels has provoked as yet an inquiry into the Greek text which is involved. But a little examination will show that on the Greek side we have struck an interesting conjectural emendation, viz. the substitution of ἀπολαβὼν for ἀποβαλὼν. It will be in order if we inquire whether any one has anticipated the correction.

A reference to Wetstein *in loc.* provides us with the following:

ἀποβαλὼν] ἀπολαβὼν. Versio Aethiop.  
Samuel Battierius

and this note is the foundation of the following in Bowyer's *Conjectures*:

F.<sup>1</sup> ἀπολαβὼν, *taking his garment*, which, in so short a way, would be but a small impediment. *Battier. Bibl. Bremens.*, class vi. p. 88, and the Ethiopic version.

The reference to the Bibliotheca Bremensis is meant to confirm the reference to Samuel Battier, and it is clear that Samuel Battier had made a conjectural emendation of ἀποβαλὼν to ἀπολαβὼν, and that this conjecture was supported by the Ethiopic Version as it is now by the Lewis

<sup>1</sup> I.e. forsitan.

Syriac. Samuel Battier was a Swiss doctor of Basel (1667–1744). He made many prælections and notes upon the plays of Sophocles and Euripides and upon other Greek writers including the New Testament, and some of his guesses found favour in the eyes of Wetstein and other eighteenth century scholars. I have examined the emendation of Mark x. 50 in the *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, and on turning to the *Museum Helveticum* of Zurich I find further a prælection delivered by Battier in 1705 and printed in 1749 in the xiiiith part of the *Museum* which contains a further statement of the very matter that we are in search of. He is discussing the critical restoration of corrupt passages of Euripides and writes as follows :

p. 23. “ Hoc λαβὼν positum pro βαλὼν in Euripide admonet me loci cujusdam in Evangelio Marci c. x. v. 50, ubi de Bartimæo caeco illo dicitur, cum Salvator Jesus eum ad se vocasset: ‘Ο δὲ, ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἀναστὰς ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. *Ille autem abjiciens vestimentum suum, surgens venit ad Jesum.* Iam prudentibus considerandum propono, an non veri maxime sit simile, quod pro hoc ἀποβαλὼν sit scribendum, ἀπολαβὼν, *cum recepisset.* Cuius enim notum est mendicos in compitis et viis sedentes ad stipem colligendam exteriora sua vestimenta et tunicas deponere, aut etiam insidere. Itaque verisimile et Bartimæum idem fecisse; cumque Jesus ipsum vocasset, vestimento suo recepto non vero abjecto, ad ipsum venisse.”

The parallel between the observations of S. Battier and of Mrs. Lewis will be at once remarked. And if a reading which is apparently extant both in Syriac and in Ethiopic can be called a conjecture, then Battier anticipates Mrs. Lewis, and the anticipation is in reality a confirmation of some strength in regard to the proposed reading, in spite of the apparent harshness of ἀπολαβὼν.

It would no doubt be easy to give further illustrations of the same kind; but it is time to return to Peter and Enoch.

As Mr. Farmer has pointed out, we have before us the

problem of finding the source from which Bowyer was working, when he made the note

F. ΕΝΩΧ καὶ. See Jud. 19.<sup>1</sup> S.

And as Mr. Farmer points out, the emendation was taken up into Knapp's *Sylloge Conjecturarum* with an express acknowledgment of dependence upon Bowyer, and some amplifications, as follows:

19. ἐν φ̄ καὶ] Ἐνώχ καὶ S. ap. Bow. alii ἐν φ̄ καὶ Ἐνώχ (cf. Ep. Jud. 14, 15).  
Alii Νῶε καὶ [cp. vs. 20, 2 Pet. 2, 5, Matt. 24, 37, 38. Heb. 11. 7.

Here we have really three emendations, of which the second is our form, and the first is Bowyer's.

From Knapp it passes into Stier and Theile, as Mr. Farmer suggests. But it also passed into Griesbach's New Testament in the form

νῶε s. ἐνώχ s. ἐν φ̄ ἐνώχ.

It is certainly not a little curious that a reading which Griesbach honoured with a place at the foot of his page should have been so completely lost sight of. It might easily have escaped notice in the modest and almost enigmatical form in which it occurs in Bowyer, but its occurrence in one of the great historical editions ought to have secured a more ample and permanent recognition.

The first question to be resolved is the person who is indicated by the letter S in Bowyer's Conjectures. When the learned printer first made his collection of Conjectures, he drew upon (a) printed books, (b) the contributions of a circle of erudite friends. In the former case he usually gave the name of the person who made the conjecture; in the latter case he used an initial, or the sign *Anon.* Thus we shall find the marks B, L, O, R, S, Z, and *Anon.* Of these by far the commonest is R, which stands for his friend Jeremiah Markland. This is clear, not only from a number

<sup>1</sup> l. 14.

of passages in the published correspondence between Markland and Bowyer, as from the fact that when Bowyer's partner Nichols, assisted by his friend Dr. Owen, brought out an enlarged posthumous edition of the Conjectures in 1782, the initials at the end of the paragraphs are replaced by the names, and Markland always stands for R.<sup>1</sup>

By the same showing, O is Dr. Henry Owen, L is Bishop Law (except in 2 Tim. i. 18, where it is corrected to Bishop Sherlock); B (Heb. x. 30) is Bowyer himself; and *Anon.* is Thomas Mangey, the editor of *Philo.* Unfortunately S, which occurs, as far as I know, only in 1 Peter iii. 19, and Z, which occurs in two supplementary notes at the end of the original volume, remain unexplained. We may at least infer that neither Nichols (who was his partner's Boswell), nor Owen who professed to verify all the references, had any knowledge of the persons covered by the initials.

We are thus left in the dark on the very point that we were in search of. Meanwhile we have gained one or two points.

It was observed above that the emendation, in the triple form, is in Griesbach; but it is not in the Griesbach of 1775, and it appears to have been added in the second edition (1796-1806), probably from Knapp. Thus the emendation emerges in 1772, from a hand as yet unrecognized, and in the course of the next ten years or so becomes modified in the direction which we find taken in Knapp and Griesbach; but who suggested *Nôe* instead of *'Ενώχ*, or *ἐν ᾧ καὶ 'Ενώχ* for *'Ενώχ καὶ* does not appear.

<sup>1</sup> We should have expected M, but Markland appears to have been nervously anxious to conceal his identity, as the following letter from him to Bowyer will show:

July 30, 1770.

“In mine to you yesterday I expressed some unwillingness of having anything printed which is written in the margin of my Greek Testament; I had not then thought of an obvious expedient which has occurred since, viz. that my name may be concealed (the chief thing I aimed at); and at the end of each note, if any be made use of, may be put the letter R.”

The British Museum copy of Bowyer contains a MS. note, directing us to a sermon by Smith, and this must mean a sermon on 1 Peter iii. 19, by William Smith in 1668.<sup>1</sup> But since the sermon does not appear to contain the emendation, we have one more conjecture to add to the mass of the unverified suggestions of the ingenious; while the three emendators of the passage continue to elude us in a very perplexing manner.

The British Museum Catalogue contains a list of persons who contributed conjectural emendations to Bowyer, viz. Bishop Barrington, Mr. Markland, Professor Schultz, Professor Michaelis, Dr. Owen, Dr. Woide, Dr. Gosset, and Mr. Weston; two of these names, Schultz and Woide, being erased with a pen. The list, with these exceptions, is taken from Nichols' preface to the third edition, and does not relate to the first edition at all. I. C. F. Schultz is the German translator (A.D. 1774), of Bowyer. He does not seem to have been an original contributor, although, according to Nichols, "valuable additions by him are printed in the edition of 1812."

And here, for the present, we must leave the matter of the identification, having travelled already very far afield in search of those *qui ante nos nostra dixerunt*.

As in the previous cases to which we have alluded, the re-emergence of a forgotten emendation is of greater critical weight than if the conjecture were entirely new. And we may hope that, in view of the number of minds to whom the correction of 1 Peter iii. 19 has occurred independently, that place will be found for it in the theology of unprejudiced scholars.

It is interesting to notice also that the interpreters and the critics have been advancing side by side in the explanation of the passage. Before the complete text of Enoch

<sup>1</sup> Its title is: "A Sermon preached before the Right Worshipful Company of Merchants trading in the Levant," etc.

had been recovered in Ethiopic, and when only a few Greek fragments had been brought to light, Daniel Heinsius<sup>1</sup> saw the importance of those fragments for the interpretation of 1 Peter iii. 19; and this suggestion was taken up by a number of later scholars; and it only needed a closer knowledge of the Book of Enoch, and a proof that 1 Peter depends upon it, to make it reasonably certain that the "spirits in prison" can be nothing else but the fallen angels of Genesis. And that Enoch is their preacher (*κῆρυξ*), in the judgment of the early Church, may be gathered from the following passage of Irenaeus:

Iren. iv. 27, 2: "Sed et Enoch, sine circumcissione placens Deo cum esset homo, *Dei legatione ad angelos fungebatur.*"

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

## *DIALOGUES ON THE CHRISTIAN PROPHETS.*

### V.

Who are the Prophets now?—No Fear of Reconstruction—Bishop Butler on new Discoveries in Holy Scripture—Function of the Prophets—Their Subject-matter—Fulfilments—Endurance.

*Mason.* Don't you think, Riddell, it would be better if you were to state plainly, before we proceed further, the position which you take with regard to the Christian Prophets?

*Riddell.* By all means, Mason. I have been trying to do so for some time past, and evidently I shall have to continue my poor endeavours for some time longer. For instance, a dear friend of mine, with all the agility of a female intellect, has pressed me to tell her who are the Christian Prophets now.

*M.* And what was your answer?

*R.* There are none. What else could I say?

*M.* The lady meant, of course, "Who are their direct successors?"

<sup>1</sup> See Heinsius: *Exerc. Sac.* (A.D. 1639).