

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 19

Article 6

1-1-1948

Miscellanea

J. T. Mueller

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1948) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*: Vol. 19, Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol19/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Miscellanea

The Sister of the Mother of Jesus

In the *Review and Expositor* (October, 1947), a Baptist theological quarterly, published by the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Prof. G. E. Evans of Taylor University, Upland, Ind., endeavors to show that the sister of the mother of Jesus was not Mary, the wife of Cleophas (as tradition has it), but Salome, the mother of the sons of Zebedee. He reads John XIX:25, not as does the Authorized Version, with commas separating the names of the women, but thus: Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother's sister; Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. For his contention he asserts (1) that it was customary with New Testament writers to divide series of names and facts into couplets (Matt. V:2 ff.; Luke VI:14 ff.); (2) that the intimate relationship between Jesus' mother and her sister caused John to put them in the first couplet; (3) that neither is named, owing to John's settled custom not to mention his own name or that of any relative, though he could not avoid reference to Jesus by name; (4) that the name of the sister of Jesus' mother was not Mary, but Salome. Hence not three, but four women stood by the cross of Jesus: (1) His mother; (2) His mother's sister; (3) Mary, the wife of Cleophas; and (4) Mary Magdalene.

Matthew, not mentioning the mother of Jesus, refers to three women (cf. XXVII:56): (4) Mary Magdalene; (3) Mary, the mother of James and Joses; and (2) the mother of Zebedee's children. Likewise Mark (cf. XV:40) mentions: (4) Mary Magdalene; (3) Mary, the mother of James the Less and of Joses; and (2) Salome, the mother of Zebedee's children and sister of the mother of Jesus (cf. Matt. XX:20 f.). Salome thus was the mother of John, who after Jesus' death played a son's part to his aunt Mary, the mother of Jesus.

Professor Evans assumes that James, Joses, Simon, and Judas (cf. Matt. XIII:54 ff.; Mark VI:1 ff.; Luke IV:22) were natural brothers of Jesus, and that Joseph was still alive when Jesus preached at Nazareth, but that he died shortly before Jesus' suffering and death (Matt. XII:46 f.; Mark III:31, 32). The James of 1 Cor. XV:7; Acts XII:17; XV:13 ff.; Gal. I:19; II:9 was not the son of Zebedee, but the natural brother of Jesus, a cousin of John, the Evangelist. Cleophas was not dead at the time of Christ's crucifixion, but very much alive (cf. Luke XXIV:18). Mary lived with her husband, Joseph, after the birth of Jesus, for more than thirty years, and it is only logical to believe that she was to him, during this long period of time, a faithful wife, bearing to him sons and daughters.

Dr. Evans, moreover, assumes that Cleophas and his wife, Mary, also had three sons, likewise called James, Judas, and Joses,

and perhaps another, called Matthew (cf. Mark II:14), who was called to be an Apostle. This Mary, while not a sister of the mother of Jesus, was a devout disciple and a distinguished Christian (cf. Matt. XXVIII:1; Mark XVI:1).

The author writes in opposition to the Roman Catholic dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary, the mother of Jesus. He concludes his article by saying: "Our study of the New Testament shows how false and absurd the whole dogma is. How much more honorable to Mary it would be to accept the truth that she was not only the mother of Jesus, but the faithful wife of Joseph, and the devoted mother of a large family of Christian men and women" (p. 485).

The question, perhaps, will not be settled to the satisfaction of all scholars, especially since ancient tradition so strongly supports the view held by the Roman Catholic Church. But Professor Evans makes a strong point for his thesis, and certainly his reading of John XIX:25 is in many respects very satisfactory.

J. T. M.

The Variant Reading in Acts 20:5

The *Theologische Zeitschrift*, edited by the theological faculty of the University of Basel, Switzerland, in the September-October number for 1947 (Vol. III, No. 5) contains a learned article on the subject "Eine Textvariante klaert die Entstehung der Pastoralbriefe auf." The variant reading in question is the one found in Acts 20:5. The reader will have to open his New Testament to see the points on which the author of the article, Dr. Christian Maurer of Beggingen (Schaffhausen), builds his hypothesis. According to the Nestle text the verse in question reads: "These preceded (*proelthontes*) and awaited us in Troas." It is the reading which is based on B³ D pm, as the footnote in the Nestle text says. The variant to which the author draws our attention is *proselthontes*. If it is the correct reading, the sentence would have to be translated: "These came (up) and awaited us in Troas." It is the reading which is sanctioned by the text in vogue in Alexandria, and by the Antioch-Constantinople tradition, Codex E, and others. Westcott and Hort, while not taking the second reading into their text, place it on the margin and indicate that they consider it of approximate equal value with the one first mentioned.

A little study is required to understand the significance of the two readings. In the beginning of Acts 20 Paul's departure from Ephesus and his journey to Macedonia are mentioned. St. Luke then relates that when Paul had passed through Macedonia he came into Greece and stayed there three months. It was at this time that he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. The place where he resided was Corinth, as we see from a comparison with Rom. 16:23. At the conclusion of this short period Paul desired to travel by ship to Palestine. But a plot of the Jews to kill him after

he would have embarked was discovered, and Paul decided not to leave Greece by sea, but to go to Asia Minor by land. This involved that he again pass through Macedonia. V. 4 states that he was accompanied by Sopatros, the son of Pyrrus of Berea, by the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus, and by Gaius of Derbe and Timothy, likewise by Tychicus and Trophimus of Asia (i. e., the Roman province Asia). Of these people the Nestle text says that they preceded Paul and Luke (note the "us") and awaited them in Troas. This reading, of course, implies that these men had been with Paul in Greece and went ahead of him on the journey to Jerusalem. If the other reading is adopted, the meaning would seem to be that the men mentioned started out somewhere in Asia Minor, came up to Troas, and there awaited Paul and Luke.

What has all this to do with the Pastoral Epistles? The author assumes that these Epistles are not genuine, but were written by a pious forger some years after Paul's death. He does not review and analyze all the material that is involved, but emphasizes one point and draws inferences from it. The right reading in Acts 20:5, he says, is not *proelthontes*, but *proselthontes*. It was this reading which the forger had before him when he read the Book of Acts. This man hence did not think of Timothy as having been with Paul in Greece, but as having remained in Ephesus when Paul left there. Bearing this in mind we can understand, says our author, the words of 1 Tim. 1:3 stating that Timothy remained in Ephesus when Paul went to Macedonia. The forger's text of Acts suggested this view to him. The forger, of course, was wrong, says Dr. Maurer, but owing to the correct reading of Acts 20:5 we can at least see why he wrote as he did. From the same point of view Dr. Maurer examines the historical data of the other Pastoral Epistles. It is his opinion that the forger endeavored to create the impression that 1 Timothy and Titus were written during the third missionary journey of Paul.

Two remarks we should like to submit. There are but few conservative scholars today who hold that any of the Pastoral Epistles were written during Paul's third missionary journey. Most of them believe that Paul was freed from the Roman imprisonment described Acts 28, and that he wrote the Pastoral Epistles after this imprisonment. Hence for them neither the one nor the other reading in Acts 20:5 has any bearing on the origin of the Pastoral Epistles.

The other remark has to do with the reading itself. Is the reading of the Nestle text to be rejected? The decision is difficult. Without having given the matter much study we incline to the view that *proselthontes* is the original reading. According to the evidence it seems to have been the more widespread reading in the early days of the Church. In its favor, too, the circumstance can be adduced that it is the more difficult reading. Besides, one has to say, so it seems to us, that even when *proselthontes*

is adopted, the historical situation can well be explained by us. The pronoun "these" in v. 5 may have reference merely to the last two of the men enumerated, Tychicus and Trophimus; they have been placed in a class by themselves, both being called men from Asia, *Asianoi*. We find that this is the view which Sir William Ramsey sponsored. Furthermore, while concerning Timothy and Sopatros (the same person as Sosipatros) we have evidence that they were with Paul in Corinth prior to his return to Jerusalem with the collection (cf. Rom. 16:21), there is no evidence of that nature for Tychicus and Trophimus. Aristarchus and Secundus may have joined the Apostle when he passed through their city on the way to the East. On the case of Gaius of Derbe we can offer no explanation; we have to assume that he, prior to joining Paul, had spent some time in Greece or Macedonia, probably as bearer of the collection given by the congregations in Galatia. If this view of a limited antecedent for the pronoun "these" is permissible, and we believe it is, the difficulty represented by the reading *proselthontes* disappears. In conclusion it should be said that the solution here offered is by no means the only one that can be presented.

W. Arndt

Comma Pianum

One of the most brilliant books ever written has the title *Janus, der Papst und das Konzil*. Its author was a great German scholar who was professor in Munich, I. von Doellinger. It will be recalled that v. Doellinger was one of those courageous Catholics who opposed promulgation of the papal infallibility decree in 1870 and who, when they persisted in their opposition, were excommunicated. With a small number of like-minded Catholics, v. Doellinger founded the party of the Old Catholics. The book mentioned was issued again after the death of Doellinger by one of his co-workers, J. Friedrich. At that time it was given the title *Das Papstthum von I. von Doellinger*. The subtitle is "Neubearbeitung von *Janus, der Papst und das Konzil*, im Auftrag des inzwischen heimgegangenen Verfassers von J. Friedrich." The book was published in Munich in 1892 by the C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. In this book one finds, p. 298, a reference to the construction of a sentence in a bull of Pius V (1566—1572), a construction on which there has been endless controversy. The question is where a certain comma is to be placed, and the Roman theologians are debating among themselves as to the precise spot where the Roman pontiff wanted this mark of punctuation to be put. An examination of the original is of no avail in this instance, because, according to the custom of the times, commas were not inserted in documents. The meaning of the Pope to many seems enigmatic. V. Doellinger himself did not submit the passage in his work, but the enlarged edition of J. Friedrich in a note contains the controversial words. For the benefit of our erudite readers we herewith reprint this note from p. 544 of the enlarged edition.

"Bei dem '*Comma Pianum*' handelt es sich um folgenden Satz am Schlusse der Bulle Pius V.: 'Quas quidem sententias stricto coram nobis examine ponderatas quamquam nonnullae aliquo pacto sustineri possent in rigore et proprio verborum sensu ab assertoribus intento haereticas erroneas . . . respective damnamus.' Denzinger, *Enchirid.*³, p. 311. Es entsteht nun die Frage, ob das Komma nach 'possent' oder nach 'intento' zu setzen sei; je nach der Setzung desselben bekommt der Satz einen anderen Sinn. Es ist aber irrefuehrend, wenn Denzinger dazu bemerkt: 'Hoc est celeberrimum comma Pianum, quod haeretici ab hoc loco ad alterum post vocabulum intento transferebant, ita ut sensus plane immutaretur.' Da die Bulle keine Interpunktionen hatte, konnten die Haeretiker etwas nicht Vorhandenes auch nicht versetzen. Der Streit zog sich sogar nach Scheeben, *Kirchenlex.*² 'Bajus,' durch den ganzen jansenistischen Streit hin; eine authentische Interpretation wurde aber vom roemischen Stuhl nicht erlassen. Fuer Hergenroether, A. J., S. 60, gilt mit Linsenmann, Mich., *Bajus und die Grundlegung des Jansenismus*, 1867, S. 266, die Frage als abgemacht."

The subject is interesting for those who wish to make a more thorough study of the many crumbling stones on which the structure of papal infallibility rests. This little note was made possible by our esteemed brother Pastor em. Jul. A. Friedrich, who presented his copy of the enlarged edition of *Janus* to the Pritzlaff Library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

W. ARNDT

