

NOTES ON ἐπιούσιος, AND OTHER WORDS.

ST. MATT. VI. 11 : ἐπιούσιος.—The two able papers on ἐπιούσιος in THE CHURCHMAN will still, I fancy, leave supporters of either view. For myself, I prefer Bishop Lightfoot's, and the illustrations given by Mr. Wratlslaw appear to me all but convincing. My reasons against the other view are briefly these. On the meaning of the phrase there is next to no difference of opinion : "Give us this day the bread sufficient for support." We may assume that the words were spoken in a Semitic language ; the Greek dress is due to the Jewish writer St. Matthew. The word ἐπιούσιος is not found elsewhere ; it may have been coined by St. Matthew, but perhaps it is too much to say positively "in whose Gospel the word originated." For what we call ἅπαξ λεγόμενα can only be proved ἅπαξ γραφόμενα : words more than once spoken may be only once or never written. But grant the word coined, would a Galilean be more likely to coin it from a familiar participle ἐπιούσα often used with ἡμέρα, or from οὐσία, a somewhat philosophical word ? After all, οὐσία means "substance, wealth, goods," not "needs of life;" both in classical Greek, in the LXX., and in St. Luke xv. 12. Prebendary Bassett speaks of "being" as an equivalent of οὐσία. Living in Suffolk, I hear "being" for "needful support" continually ; but I cannot find any trace of οὐσία thus used.

Of the *digamma*, I agree, a Jew would know nothing. But he would know that compounds of ἐπί, as a rule, dropped the iota (as ἐπουράνιος, ἐπαίρω, ἐπερωτάω, etc.). And in a new word he would be likely to follow this rule (and write ἐπούσιος) rather than to imitate digammatic exceptions.

Concisely : Either "bread for our being," or, "bread for the on-coming day," satisfy the meaning ; but the latter *me judice* is the more probable formation of ἐπιούσιος.

Ἄνεπαίσχυντος IN 2 TIM. II. 15.—In an interesting and scholarly paper, in a recent number of THE CHURCHMAN, Mr. Wratlslaw urged the passive sense of this word : "a workman of whom his Lord need not be ashamed." The rendering we have appears to me at least as good. Verbal adjectives in -τος are found both active and passive when from verbs of middle form ; e.g., ἀναίσθητος, mostly "unfeeling," but also "unfelt," ἀμειπτος, "unblameable," but also "not blaming." Hence, as to the form, ἀνεπαίσχυντος might be either. Ἄνεπίδεκτος is "not admitting" and "inadmissible" in the same writer.

Perhaps we might say that such verbals are commonly active when applied to persons, passive when applied to things. The passage quoted from Josephus shows ἀνεπαίσχυντον passive after this rule. It is noticeable that ἀναίσχυντος is certainly "not feeling shame." Even of a thing ἀναίσχυντον can hardly be termed passive ; it is "the act of an ἀναίσχυντος," "a thing done unblushingly ;" not "a thing which no one need be ashamed of." Hence I prefer our present translation in 2 Tim. ii. 15.

But it makes next to no difference in the sense whether Timothy

"needs not to be ashamed of his work," or is one "of whose work his Master needs not to be ashamed." The workman is to be trusty; the work such as none need blush for, in either case.

ST. LUKE XIX. 42 : *εἰ ἔγνωσ . . . νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη*.—On the the main sense of this passage I agree with Mr. Wratislaw; with his objections to our existing translations I partly disagree. There is no contrast of time between *ἔγνωσ* and *ἐκρύβη*; the meaning is not "Would that thou hadst known in time past! but now it is too late; they are hid from thine eyes." Both aorists refer to the same time; and by the addition, "yea, even in this thy day," this time is made present, viewed as present being so close, especially viewed as present by the all-seeing Lord, who knew that Jerusalem would not even now, or up to her fall, turn and see. *Εἰ ἔγνωσ . . . ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνωσ*, "O if thou knewest! but, as it is, thou knowest not." The "hadst known" and "are hid" (as far as I remember) never misled me; I always thought of the passage thus; nor surely did our translators mean it wrongly. We can say in common parlance, "If you had but known! but you do not; it is all dark to you," about a *present* ignorance. And *ἔγνωσ* is especially an aorist far from pluperfect. To "I know" it stands rather as an imperfect. In plenty of classical passages (especially in plays) it is best rendered by an English present. Nay, many Greek aorists are best Englished so, and even by perfects with "have," *pace* Dr. Kennedy. On this matter I have elsewhere written more fully.

To avoid all misunderstanding from the conflicting "hadst known" and "are hid," I suggest "if thou knewest! . . . but they are hid." And consistently in v. 44: "thou knowest not the time of thy visitation."

But we must thank Mr. Wratislaw for putting clearly the force of *νῦν δὲ*; the *presentness* is not given to the passage by *νῦν*, but by the "even in this thy day."
W. C. GREEN.

Reviews.

The Letter and the Spirit. The Bampton Lectures for 1888. By ROBERT EDWARD BARTLETT, late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Rivingtons.

WE heartily thank Mr. Bartlett for these Lectures. They widely differ from most Bampton Lectures of modern date, in that they are simple, easy reading, and yet extremely interesting. They are not over-weighted, as so many similar volumes have been, by notes and excursions. The reader can follow the lectures themselves with scarcely any interruption, and the writer makes his meaning clear