

INTREPRETATIONS OF CERTAIN NEW TESTA-  
MENT PASSAGES.

Luke x. 31-33: *κατὰ συγκυρίαν ἱερέυς τις κατέβαινεν . . .  
καὶ . . . ἀντιπαρήλθεν . ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευεΐτης κατὰ τὸν  
τόπον ἐλθὼν . . . ἀντιπαρήλθεν. Σαμαρείτης δὲ τις ὄδεύων  
ἦλθεν κ.τ.λ.*

The point I wish to draw attention to has so far as I know not yet been adequately regarded. It is concerned with the words for "going" underlined above. It seems to me that while the priest and the Levite were merely passing aimlessly, strolling if you like, with plenty of time on their hands and well able to look after the wounded man, the Samaritan was actually on a serious journey (*ὄδεύων*), in which his business interests were involved, and nevertheless turned aside to do the kindness. This adds a new touch to his beneficent deed. *Ὀδεύω* is a comparatively rare word, occurring here only in the New Testament (but cf. Acts ix. 7), and seems to be selected with the distinct intention of showing the different character of the Samaritan's situation.

Luke xix. 33: *λυούτων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι  
αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς, Τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον;*

Acts xvi. 19: *ιδόντες δὲ οἱ κύριοι αὐτῆς ὅτι ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπίς  
τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν, . . . εἴλκυσαν . . .*

The three Synoptic accounts of the appropriation of the colt for the Lord's use differ considerably from one another, and one of the respects in which Luke's differs from the others is that he alone mentions *οἱ κύριοι*. In Mark it is "certain of the bystanders" (xi. 5) that object: Matthew makes no mention of any objectors. It makes no difference to the point which I wish to make where Luke obtained his *οἱ κύριοι*, whether it is a touch of his own or not. In the

passage of Acts above cited the reference is, of course, to the κύριοι of the Philippian ventriloquist slave girl. It is somewhat curious that Luke should be the only writer in the New Testament to refer to joint ownership of property and that he uses the same word in both cases. Readers conjure up an ownership by two or more men of the colt on the one hand and of the slave girl on the other. No one would deny such a possibility. What is really meant, however, by κύριοι in both passages is "master and mistress." One of the peculiarities of English is that it has no one word like this to describe a joint relationship of man and woman, but it is otherwise with some other languages, for example, Latin and German. The usage is one that ought to be better known than it is. In Latin, for instance, *fratres* may mean "brother and sister," *patres* "father and mother," *reges* "king and queen," and *domini* "master and mistress" (so also in Juvenal, *Satire* vi. 4, *paruas domos, ignemque Laremque et pecus et dominos*, though the commentators seem to have missed the point). In German we find *Geschwister*, "brother and sister." I contend that this interpretation makes much better sense of Luke xix. 33 and Acts xvi. 19. Some will see in this use of the expression οἱ κύριοι another sign of Luke's "feministic" attitude.

Romans xvi. 23: ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς Ἐραστός ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός. (Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 18, xii. 18.)

In the *Expository Times* for March and April 1907 (vol. xviii. pp. 285, 335 f.) I argued that τὸν ἀδελφόν in Second Corinthians viii. 18 and xii. 18 can only be translated "his brother." Professor J. H. Moulton, I believe, agrees, though, as some kind correspondents pointed out to me at the time, the interpretation had been ventilated and rejected by Alford and Meyer. Professor A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, in his delight-

ful book on St. Paul, mentions with something like approval the interference I thence drew that Luke and Titus were brothers. This depends on the truth of the tradition that the person referred to as *ὁ ἀδελφός* was really St. Luke. Those who reject that tradition are still bound, I feel, to translate *τὸν ἀδελφόν* as I do. That this is the natural and proper sense to give to *ὁ ἀδελφός* in such a context is absolutely confirmed by Romans xvi. 23 above cited. Nothing but blindness caused by the ecclesiastical use of the word and carelessness in dealing with "a mere list of names" would have allowed the habitual translation of that verse to pass muster for so long. We are bound to translate "and Quartus *his* brother." Every one of the men mentioned in that chapter was as much "a brother" in the ecclesiastical sense as Quartus was, and it is a sheer absurdity to translate it in any other way than I have done. It is at the same time interesting to learn a little extra fact about two friends of St. Paul, that they were brothers by blood as well as brothers in the common Faith.

ALEX. SOUTER.