

"saw the holy city Jerusalem coming down new out of heaven."¹ This is a form of expression highly characteristic of Hebrew idealism. We perhaps may with equal justice think of the new Jerusalem as fashioned in the course of the ages upon this our earth, and then, for its "perfect consummation and bliss," transported into that ideal world, where the boldest aspirations are the most fully realized and the strongest faith receives the largest reward. Just as we say that Christ's Church must, in spite of appearances, possess unity, because He asked for it, so we must believe that the City of which the Church is, under Christ, the builder is growing in heavenliness as the years roll on, and that we are surely and swiftly moving towards that great dedication-festival, when, in the words of the psalmists, we shall "sing unto the Lord a new song,"² and when,—

*"They that sing as well as they that dance (shall say),
All my fountains (of life, and joy, and peace) are in thee
(O Zion)."*³

Then shall we indeed, according to that fine primitive use of the phrase, celebrate our true "birthday," wherein we, with "the nations of them that are saved," shall be delivered for ever from temptation and sin and sorrow, and be "born again" into the perfect life.

T. K. CHEYNE.

DR. HATCH'S "ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL GREEK."

WHATEVER differences of opinion there may be as to the value of Dr. Hatch's contributions to ecclesiastical history, there is likely to be none as to the value of this contribution to biblical scholarship. The book, indeed, has a certain

¹ Rev. xxi. 2 (R.V. marg.). ² Ps. xcvi. 1; cf. Rev. v. 9. ³ Ps. lxxxvii. 7, R.V.

incompleteness of form, explained by its consisting, as we are told it does, of the substance of the author's Grinfield Lectures on the LXX; it is hardly one book, but seven "essays" on separate though kindred subjects. Sometimes, however, we perceive a certain connexion and progress, even between one essay and another; and in all or nearly all severally the matter is most valuable, the method most thorough and scholarly, and the results always suggestive, even if they are not, or do not claim to be, final.

Perhaps the author at the outset somewhat overstates the extent to which the study of biblical Greek has been hitherto neglected. But it would be hard to name any yet existing work in which that language is studied on so thoroughly sound a method as here—with so impartial a view of the conditions, and by means of inductions so rigid and scientific. Of course, it is no novelty to recognise that biblical Greek is a form, not of the classical Attic, but of the *κοινή* or Hellenic dialect; and, again, that a larger or smaller "Hebraistic" element has been introduced into it: partly by the very nature of the LXX as a translation from the Hebrew, and by the influence of that translation on the writers of the New Testament; partly also by the fact that the writers both of the LXX and of the New Testament were Jews and thought as Jews, even when they wrote and perhaps thought in Greek. But the novelty is, to meet with a writer who not only recognises these facts—not only feels their proportionate importance—but is able to trace in detail the varying extent to which each influence prevails.

Of the seven essays, the two that open the widest prospect of advancement of critical science are the fourth, "On Early Quotations from the LXX," and the sixth, "On Origen's Revision of the LXX Text of Job,"—or rather, in fact, "On the LXX Text of Job before Origen's Revision." The former encourages the hope that materials

not wholly inadequate exist for retracing the history of the LXX text to a time not far from its origin; the latter shows that the LXX text, if once critically reconstructed, is likely to throw light of incalculable importance on the criticism of its Hebrew original. It is to be hoped that these promises will not prove delusive; that the scholars of this generation and the next will utilize the materials, the value whereof is pointed out here. All Dr. Hatch's readers will join in the further hope, that he himself may be able to take a leading part in the work.

May we here venture to point out, that Dr. Hatch makes his theory of the textual history of Job needlessly startling, and weights it with a needless difficulty, by one sentence near the close of his essay?

In the analysis (such it is, rather than a table of contents) he suggests, and regards the facts as confirming, the hypothesis "that the existing Hebrew text is itself the expansion of an originally shorter text, and that the original LXX text corresponded to the original Hebrew." But it is not a necessary part of this hypothesis, that it was "in the interval between the original" [so-called LXX] "translation and that of Theodotion" that "large additions were made to the" [Hebrew] "text by a poet whose imaginative power was at least not inferior to that of the original writer." All that need be assumed, as regards the date of "the interval between the original translation and that of Theodotion" is, that no text of Job was then officially recognised as canonical; that, if it be true that the book was written in a shorter form, and afterwards expanded, both the shorter and the longer edition—perhaps more than one form of the longer—were co-ordinately current: not that the longer Hebrew text dates from so late a period.

It seems indeed presumptuous for any one to offer a correction of any of Dr. Hatch's theories who has not

studied the subject with some approach to thoroughness like his own. But if it be a critic's business to criticise, the least satisfactory of the essays is the fifth, "On Composite Quotations from the LXX." The theory proposed, "that collections of excerpts from the Old Testament" were "in existence among the Greek-speaking Jews of the dispersion," and that Christian writers, canonical and other, sometimes quoted from these rather than from the Bible at first hand, is no doubt a possible one; and it perhaps derives some confirmation from the way that both St. Paul and St. Justin quote Psalm xiv. (xiii.) in a form expanded by a cento of texts from other psalms and prophecies. But the case is not adequately stated, when no notice is taken of the other possible explanation of the facts: that Justin derived his expanded version of the psalm, not from a common source with St. Paul, but from St. Paul himself. What is here a possible view, deserving discussion if not assent, is in another case decidedly probable—it is the view in possession. Both the Roman and the Alexandrian Clement quote continuously a cento of verses from three psalms; the Roman has quoted two other texts immediately before, but *not* continuously with these, while the Alexandrian quotes them all as continuous. Every one except Dr. Hatch infers that the Alexandrian borrowed the quotations from the Roman.

Dr. Hatch tells us, in fact, in his preface, that he "has abstained from a discussion of the views which have been already advanced, . . . because he thinks that in biblical philology, even more than in other subjects, it is desirable for a student in the present generation to investigate the facts for himself, uninfluenced by the bias which necessarily arises from the study of existing opinions." Surely this is a mistake, and one which was the source of the irritation produced by some of the author's earlier works. No wise man is provoked, when a competent student draws from

the facts inferences inconsistent with "the views that have been already advanced"; but competent students who hold those views, and think the evidence justifies them, *are* provoked, when the propounder of the new theory calmly "abstains from a discussion of" them. And indeed there is a danger to the author himself of something more than missing the favourable reception that he might deserve. It is practically impossible to carry the "investigation of facts" far, without colligating them by an at least provisional hypothesis: and a "bias arises" (if indeed that be a mode of motion proper to biases) far more "necessarily," if the only hypothesis available be the investigator's own, than if he feels free to use one supplied by "the study of existing opinion."

But we have done with the ungracious task of faultfinding. To the average student, who knows enough to learn from Dr. Hatch, but not enough to criticise, hardly enough to develop his teaching, the most interesting and useful of the essays will be the second, "Short Studies of the Meanings of Words in Biblical Greek," and, in a hardly less degree, the third, "On Psychological Terms in Biblical Greek." The latter is a welcome blow in behalf of the freedom of the many who can read St. Paul from dependence on the few who can read Philo—a scientific proof that St. Paul used psychological terms, as Matthew Arnold used to say, in a literary not a scientific manner. Of the former, the method is to establish, from the Hebrew words which a Greek word is used to represent by the LXX and other translators, what was its sense in biblical Greek; and then to apply the result to the exegesis of passages where it is used in the New Testament.

Every reader must find this essay eminently instructive and suggestive; but the value of the different "Short Studies" differs widely. Perhaps it may be said that to its merit, in establishing certain real but unobvious mean-

ings of words in biblical Greek, there is a certain set-off in the writer's inclination to narrow the general use of the word to the meaning which he has discovered. Thus we see the method at its best, when all the New Testament uses of ἀπερὴ, with perhaps one exception, are cleared up by the proof that in the LXX the word practically means "glory." Still more valuable is the light thrown on Matthew vi. 19-24, when it is proved from the Son of Sirach that πονηρός may mean "niggardly": as ἀπλοῦς may certainly mean "liberal," the antithesis in the 22nd and 23rd verses, and the connexion with the preceding and following, are cleared up at once. But one wishes it had not been attempted to narrow the sense of πονηρός to the same meaning "niggardly" in Matthew vii. 11, or to the (equally real) sense of "hurtful" in v. 39, vi. 13, etc.

Again, it is only giving us "glimpses of the obvious" to prove that πειράζω and πειρασμός are used of "trials" in the sense of affliction, both in the LXX and in the New Testament. But truism passes into paradox, when we are told that "the meaning, the existence of which is thus established by evident instances, will be found more appropriate than any other in instances where the meaning does not lie on the surface": these instances being Matthew vi. 13, Luke xi. 4 (the Lord's Prayer), and Matthew iv. 1, Mark i. 13, Luke iv. 2, πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, "to be tried," *i.e.* afflicted, "by the devil." It is no doubt true, that in Hebrews iv. 15 (still more in ii. 18), the notion of affliction is by no means absent. But no one ever supposed that the senses of "trial" and "temptation," as we distinguish the words in modern English, were kept distinct in biblical or ecclesiastical language: they pass one into the other in these passages; and so they do in common Christian language, at least as late as the *De Imitatione*. Dr. Hatch does not quote, as he might, James i. 2, 12, as an example of the sense of "trial," but surely

in ver. 13 the sense of "temptation" is almost exclusively dominant.

It is a contribution to the exegesis of Matthew vi. 1 to prove that in the LXX *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἐλεημοσύνη* are often used as interchangeable. But it is surely rash to say that "this meaning of *δικαιοσύνη* is clear," *l.c.* : it is a quite possible reading of the passage, that we first are warned against making display of "righteousness," good works in general; and that afterwards the principle is applied in detail to the special good works of alms, fasting, and prayer.

WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX.

*THE COMPOSITION OF THE SYNOPTICAL
GOSPELS: A REPLY.*

LIKE all the readers of THE EXPOSITOR—possibly, indeed, more than any of them—I have read with keen interest Mr. Plummer's article published in the July number of this year, in which that scholar attempts to throw light on the obscure question of the origin of the synoptic gospels from the mode of composition and the mutual relationship of certain mediæval documents.

The object of the writer in drawing this comparison has been to refute certain objections raised by me to the way in which most critics in our day explain the striking relations of harmony and of discrepancy which exist between the writings of the different evangelists.

I had maintained¹ that the conduct of the evangelists, as represented by those critics who consider that two of them copied the third, or that one copied the other two, sometimes literally, sometimes more freely, and with greater or slighter modification of the narrative of their predecessors, was in accordance neither with the good sense

¹ *Commentary on S. Luke.* 3rd edition, 1888, 1889.